



National Library  
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale  
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service

Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada  
K1A 0N4

## NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

## AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Childhood aggression and withdrawal and  
perceived parental discipline style as predictors of  
perspective-taking skill in adolescence.

Gloria Smith

A Thesis  
in  
The Department  
of  
Psychology

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
for the Degree of Master of Arts at  
Concordia University  
Montréal, Québec, Canada

July 1989

© Gloria Smith, 1989



National Library  
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale  
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service    Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada  
K1A 0N4

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-51307-1

## ABSTRACT

Childhood aggression and withdrawal and perceived parental discipline style as predictors of perspective-taking skill in adolescence.

Gloria Smith

It was hypothesized that a) adolescents identified during childhood by peers as being withdrawn (N = 15) or aggressive and withdrawn (N = 25) would demonstrate poorer perspective-taking skill than those adolescents who had been identified by peers as normative (N = 94) or aggressive (N = 13) and b) adolescents who perceive their parents as more controlling will also have poorer perspective-taking skill. Six years after peer nomination screening, the friendship section of the Selman Interpersonal Awareness Scale, the WISC-R or the WAIS-R Vocabulary test, and the Parental Control Measure were administered to this sample when their mean age was 15.84 (S.D. = 1.25). Staged hierarchical regression analyses indicated that verbal intelligence and sex were the significant predictors of perspective-taking skill. Being verbally bright and being female were associated with this skill. These findings were interpreted as reflecting the limited capacity of the measures used to capture the multi-faceted nature of social relationships. Future researchers may reconsider how secondary factors such as motivation may complement essential social reasoning skills in determining interpersonal behavior.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Introduction .....	1
Method .....	20
Results .....	29
Discussion .....	34
References .....	40
Appendices .....	52

## LIST OF APPENDICES

	PAGE
APPENDIX A	
Tables.....	52
APPENDIX B	
Scoring Manual for Interpersonal Understanding Interviews	59
APPENDIX C	
Questionnaire sur l'amitié.....	69
APPENDIX D	
Pupil Evaluation Inventory.....	73
APPENDIX E	
Parental Control Measure - Child Form.....	79
APPENDIX F	
WISC-R.....	84
APPENDIX G	
WAIS-R.....	86
APPENDIX H	
Marlowe Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Inventaire des réactions personnelles).....	88

Perspective-taking or role-taking is the ability to infer another person's thoughts, feelings, attitudes or intentions. This construct has several interrelated aspects: 1) a perceptual aspect referring to the ability to take another's visual perspective; 2) a cognitive component which involves recognizing another person's knowledge or intention; 3) an affective component which allows one to interpret how other people feel in a variety of situations (Castle & Richards, 1979). The majority of studies on role-taking have dealt with one or more of these aspects of the construct. Selman (1980) has studied role-taking from the perspective of social cognition. For Selman, social role-taking includes "an understanding of how human points of view are related and coordinated with one another" (Selman, 1980, p. 22). Social role-taking thus refers to an awareness of what others think or feel in the context of social interactions.

Role-taking ability involves a developmental step in socialization from egocentrism to a gradual awareness of the thoughts, feelings, motives and intentions of others. It was postulated by early theorists such as Piaget (1928) that this process was facilitated through interactions with peers. In the course of contacts with other children, and especially as a result of conflicts and arguments, the child is forced to reexamine his own views in the light of those of others (Flavell, Botkin, Fry, Wright, & Jarvis, 1968). Peer relations, and especially friendships, afford children the opportunity to become interpersonally sensitive, experience intimacy, achieve mutual understanding, and in general acquire skills for later interpersonal adjustment (Piaget, 1965; Selman, 1980; Sullivan, 1953; Youniss, 1980).

Role-taking ability is thus a central feature of effective socialization (Baldwin, 1906; Mead, 1934) and is believed to be related to various forms of prosocial behavior such as moral development (Hoffman, 1970; Kohlberg, 1969; Kurdek, 1978a; Moir, 1974; Piaget, 1965; Selman & Damon, 1975), cooperation (Cook & Stingle, 1974; Hartup, 1970; Youniss, 1975) and altruism (Buckley, Siegel, & Ness, 1978; Underwood & Moore, 1982; Rubin & Schneider, 1973). Role-taking skills have also been related to social competence (Kurdek, 1982; Kurdek & Krile, 1983; Selman, Schorin, Stone & Phelps, 1983). Furthermore, deficiencies in role-taking ability are believed to be related to childhood problem behavior such as aggression (Feshbach & Feshbach, 1969) as well as to adult disorders such as schizophrenia (Cameron, 1954; Sullivan, 1954) and psychopathic deviance (Gough, 1948; Sarbin, 1954). In the following sections, studies relating role-taking to these various social behaviors will be examined in greater detail.

#### Role-taking and prosocial behavior

Role taking is generally regarded as a prerequisite of prosocial behavior. The relationship between these two constructs, however, appears to depend largely on what type of role-taking ability is being measured. When the role-taking tasks are of a perceptual nature, one seldom finds a relationship between such tasks and prosocial behavior. For example, in a study with children between the ages of three and seven, Waxler, Yarrow and Smith (1977) found no significant relation between prosocial behaviors such as helping, sharing, and comforting and four perceptual role-taking tasks.



When the role-taking tasks are of a cognitive nature, the relation between such tasks and prosocial behavior appears more promising; nonetheless some inconsistencies in these relations remain. Rubin and Schneider (1973) found that altruistic seven year olds achieved higher scores than less altruistic children on a referential communication task designed to measure cognitive role-taking ability (Glucksberg, Krauss & Weisberg, 1966). Other investigators have failed to find such relations; for example Waxler, Yarrow and Smith (1977) found no significant relation between prosocial behavior and six cognitive role-taking tasks. When role-taking tasks measure the affective component of role-taking, the ability to infer what another is feeling, one generally finds a relationship between such tasks and prosocial behaviors such as helping and sharing (Buckley et al., 1978; Rubin, 1976).

Researchers have offered numerous reasons to explain the discrepancies in the findings relating role-taking to prosocial behaviors. Criticisms of the studies discussed thus far raise both methodological and conceptual issues as to the construct validity of "role-taking". One obvious shortcoming of almost all of the studies reported is the lack of control for intellectual ability. Numerous investigators have shown at least a moderate relation between role-taking skills and intellectual ability (Damon, 1975; Feffer & Gourevitch, 1960; Rubin, 1973; Rubin & Schneider, 1973; Selman, 1971; Shantz, 1975; Wolfe, 1963) and more specifically between vocabulary and role-taking skills (Rubin, 1976).

Another major problem is that in many of these studies, subjects have been younger than eleven years of age. This is particularly true of

affective role-taking studies. Piaget (1926) spoke of role-taking ability or decentering as developing progressively till late childhood (around twelve years old) at which time the child is more fully capable of taking the perspective of the other. Younger subjects were often used since investigators were attempting to demonstrate that children develop role-taking skills prior to the age estimated by Piaget.

The lack of consistency in findings across different types of role-taking skills (i.e. perceptual, cognitive and affective) has led some investigators to conclude that perspective taking is not a unitary construct but rather may best be viewed as being composed of a hierarchy of abilities (Keller, 1976; Kurdek, 1978a; Urberg & Docherty, 1976). Support for the multidimensionality of role-taking comes from studies which show a lack of correspondence among these different types of abilities (Kurdek, 1977; Kurdek & Rogdon, 1975). Even within the same type of role-taking ability, different tasks are used from study to study with no apparent rationale given for favoring one over another. This is especially true in cognitive perspective taking studies where a variety of tasks are used which do not intercorrelate very highly (Kurdek, 1977; Rubin, 1978).

Other reasons for the discrepancies in the findings may be related to the construct validity of certain measures. For example, Borke's (1971) task for assessing affective role-taking has been criticized in this context. After being told a story, the children were asked to select from four drawings (representing emotions of happiness, sadness, fear and aggression) the one best depicting how the child in the story may have felt. As Chandler and Greenspan (1972) point out, this task

does not require children to take a perspective which differs from their own. Non-egocentric thought, in the sense implied by Piaget (1928), involves more than simply anticipating what someone else might think or feel in a situation, particularly when these thoughts and feelings are different from one's own. This debate has led some authors to distinguish role-taking (or social decentering) from what may best be described as part of the construct of person perception (see reviews by Chandler, 1976; Hill & Palmquist, 1978; Shantz, 1975) or what is also sometimes referred to as "projective role-taking" (Kurdek, 1978a; Urberg & Docherty, 1976). Person perception research examines the developmental changes in the child's knowledge about the thoughts, feelings or motives of others but does not necessarily require subjects to decenter from their own viewpoint.

Very few studies to date have focused on the coordination of perspectives in the way conceptualized by Mead (1934), Piaget (1928), and Selman (1980). This distinctive type of decentering involves what is variously called simultaneous or social decentering, social role-taking or interpersonal understanding. In this tradition, understanding of feelings, motives, and intentions are used as the content or situational context in which viewpoints of different actors can be perceived to differ and/or be in need of coordination; in such tasks the other's viewpoint is often deliberately engineered to be different from one's own. To accomplish the task, the child needs to simultaneously balance and coordinate different viewpoints.

### Social role-taking skills and social competence

The studies discussed in this section make use of the construct of social role-taking or interpersonal understanding as defined by Selman. Although these studies are generally free from the types of methodological errors of previous studies, most researchers still fail to control for verbal intelligence. Much of the work in this area has focused on attempts to show that social role-taking is a meaningful construct that can be related to social competence or social skills. Children who are socially competent are often described as having well-developed interpersonal skills and are characterized as getting along with peers. These characteristics resemble those that are also used to describe children who are popular with peers. Studies have shown that popular children compared to unpopular children are more adept at knowing how to initiate a friendship, more able to communicate effectively, to integrate themselves into a group conversation, to monitor their social impact, and to match their skills to the demands of a particular situation (Asher & Renshaw, 1981; Gottman, Gonso, Rasmussen, 1975; Ladd & Oden, 1979; Marcus, 1980; Peery, 1979; Rubin, 1972).

Children with favoured peer status have also been shown to have high levels of both social role-taking ability and perceived self-competence; likewise children with good personal adjustment perceive themselves as being socially competent and also have high levels of social role-taking ability (Kurdek & Krile, 1983). In addition, children with well-developed perspective taking also demonstrate effective social behavior as assessed by means of naturalistic observations, teacher ratings, clinical assessments and

laboratory task performance (Kurdek, 1982).

Another example of the relation between level of social understanding and social competence comes from a study by Selman, Schorin, Stone and Phelps (1983). Social competence in this study was assessed by measuring levels of reflective communication as well as levels of strategies used in the course of task negotiations. They found that those children who demonstrated superior social understanding under interview conditions were more socially competent in the context of group task negotiations.

#### Role-taking skills and maladaptive social behaviors

If role-taking abilities are related to social competence, it would be logical to assume that deficits in role-taking skills would be associated with maladjustment. This in fact seems to be the case. The inability to interpret the actions and intentions of others leads children to respond inappropriately in social situations. Chandler (1973) found that delinquents between eleven and thirteen years of age had more difficulty in adopting the perspective of others than nondelinquents. In a similar vein, Chandler, Greenspan and Barenboim (1974) found that children between the ages of eight and fifteen who were experiencing chronic adjustment problems had lower scores on cognitive role-taking tasks than better adjusted peers. A study by Ianotti (1978) also suggests an inverse relation between cognitive role-taking skills and aggressive behavior.

Similarly, deficits in the area of social perspective taking have been found to be associated with maladjustment (Gurucharri, Phelps &

Selman, 1984). Seventeen emotionally disturbed boys were compared longitudinally across three assessments, at two- and four-year intervals, with those of a better adjusted group of male peers. The authors found that the sequence of progression through levels of social role-taking was the same for both the disturbed and normal subjects but that the developmental trend of the troubled subjects lagged behind that of the higher functioning group. In addition, low levels of social role-taking were related to the self-reported use of physical and avoidant strategies to resolve conflicts, as opposed to strategies mentioning emotional or psychological factors. Subjects who had low levels of social role-taking had more of a tendency to perceive conflicts as being external to the self (rather than "interpersonal") and/or to resolve conflicts through physical actions (as opposed to discussions).

Although the above studies indicate that aggressive and/or delinquent subjects show deficits in role-taking ability, at least one study presents evidence to the contrary. Using a social perspective taking task, Kurdek (1978b) found that seven to ten year olds considered aggressive by their teachers were among the good role-takers in their class. This finding is consistent with Piaget's (1926) idea that the decline in egocentrism occurs through interaction with peers. The author concluded that aggressive children were good role-takers because of relatively frequent interaction with peers.

If one follows this line of reasoning, it would be reasonable to infer that children who interact less with other children, i.e., socially withdrawn children would be poor role-takers. There is some support for this hypothesis. Rubin (1976) found that the lowest scores on a

cognitive role-taking task were obtained by preschoolers who played beside other children but did not engage them in conversation nor actively share toys or material. Good role-takers were involved in more associative and cooperative play. Bergeron (1980) found that grade seven withdrawn children had relatively poor social role-taking skills whereas those who were considered aggressive by their peers were equivalent to the normative group on this dimension.

Studies comparing children from different social backgrounds lend further support to this hypothesis. Seven- and nine-year olds living in remote Norwegian farm communities where there are low levels of social-verbal interaction achieved lower role-taking scores than village or town children (Holos & Cowan, 1973; Holos, 1975). These findings were replicated in a sample of rural and urban children in Iceland (Edelstein, Keller & Whalen, 1984).

Studies on role-taking raise some interesting theoretical questions as to what exactly is being measured. Although there are studies reporting relations between role-taking abilities and social competence, the exact nature of this relationship is unknown. Flavell and his colleagues (Flavell, Bolkin, Fry, Wright, & Jarvis, 1968) present a five-stage model which describes what a child needs to know in order to successfully make use of role-taking skills: These five knowledge areas include 1) existence, the fact that the child needs to be aware that there is such a thing as perspective, that is, that two people may perceive, think or feel differently in a given situation; 2) need, the awareness that an analysis of the other's perspective is called for in this particular situation; 3) prediction, or the ability to carry out

this analysis, that is, he needs to possess the ability to discriminate and predict what the relevant role attributes are; 4) maintenance, the capacity to maintain in awareness the cognitions yielded by this analysis since these cognitions are assumed to be in active competition with one's own point of view; 5) application, or the ability to actually apply these cognitions to the end at hand.

The gap between these last two stages represents the distinction that is sometimes made between competence and performance. Competence refers to an abstract, logical representation of what the organism knows or could do in a timeless, ideal environment whereas performance represents the psychological processes by which the information embodied in competence actually gets accessed and utilized in real situations (Flavell & Wohlwill, 1969). Such a distinction is important in helping to identify where deficits in role-taking may lie. A child may have the knowledge to perform the skill but for various reasons may be unable to apply his knowledge.

Another theoretical issue raised by studies on maladjustment is related to the constructs of children's social behavior. Many of these studies are based on the assumption that categories of behavior such as "aggressive" or "withdrawn" represent unitary constructs. Such constructs say nothing about the possible differences between children within the same category of behavior nor do such constructs give indications as to underlying motives. For example, a child may be aggressive because he is angry or because he is trying to get attention; similarly, a child may be withdrawn because he enjoys being alone or because he is rejected by other children.



The motives underlying behavior and the globality of constructs such as "aggressive" or "withdrawn" may explain in part the discrepant findings reported across studies of maladjusted children. Deficits in role-taking skills, which on the surface may appear similar, may be due to deficits in either competence or in performance. For example, a withdrawn child may perform poorly on a role-taking task because of extreme shyness but may have the requisite skills in his repertoire. A child who is both aggressive and withdrawn, on the other hand, is deviant on two major dimensions of maladjustment; such a child may not have developed the social skills at all, i.e., he may lack the competence to engage in role-taking tasks.

As can be seen from the foregoing studies, social role-taking or interpersonal understanding appears to be an important construct related to various areas of social adjustment. Socially competent and popular children are better role-takers than children who are socially incompetent and maladjusted.

How one develops adequate interpersonal understanding is an open question. The numerous studies mentioned thus far point to contact with peers as a necessary prerequisite. One could also point to parents as being influential in the development of this ability since they are primary agents of socialization. The next section examines how the role of parents relates to the socialization of their children and how this factor affects relationships with peers.

#### Parental rearing practices and the child's socialization

According to Hartup (1983), there is considerable support for the

theory that the child's relation with his parents provides the emotional and instrumental bases for success in peer relations. Successful interaction with peers at a later age may be related to early family socialization practices. Studies comparing "secure" and "anxious" attachment in toddlers support such a hypothesis. In their later relationships with peers, anxiously-attached toddlers are more likely to be socially withdrawn. Securely-attached children on the other hand, are described as socially active, sought out by other children, sympathetic to peer distress, and reactive to overtures from other children (Waters, Wippman, & Sroufe, 1979).

Such studies raise numerous questions as to what skills or abilities can possibly be learned through interactions with parents that are also relevant for successful peer interactions and how such skills may generalize from one situation to another if such is the case. For example, if role-taking ability is relevant for successful peer interactions, one may question whether there are factors in one's relationship with one's parents which may facilitate or enhance the development of such a skill.

Although Piaget (1928) emphasized peer interactions as being essential to role-taking ability, he also recognized that parents may play an important role in fostering the acquisition of role-taking skills. Youniss (1980) postulates that such skills may be acquired through conflict discussion between parents and children. Conflict regarding discipline is one example of the type of conflict providing a forum for parent-child interactions that may subsequently influence interactions with peers.

As early as 1949, Baldwin and his colleagues (Baldwin, 1949; Baldwin, Kolhorn, & Breese, 1949) examined the relation between parental discipline style and children's interactions with peers. They found that children of authoritarian parents had low levels of social interaction with peers and that they tended to be dominated by their peers.

Early studies on parental rearing practices classified discipline techniques under two major headings: 1) power-assertive discipline, including yelling, shouting, forceful commands and threats; and 2) "love-oriented" discipline, including showing disappointment, isolation, withdrawal of love, praise, contingent giving of affection, and reasoning (Maccoby & Martin, 1983).

A more complex form of classification emerged from the work of Baumrind (1967, 1971; Baumrind & Black, 1967), who described four major classifications of child rearing practices: 1) authoritarian-autocratic; 2) indulgent-permissive; 3) authoritative reciprocal; 4) indifferent-uninvolved. Each pattern of child rearing was related to prosocial behaviors or deficits. The main findings of interest are related to the negative effects of the authoritarian pattern, a discipline style resembling power assertiveness. Nursery school children of authoritarian parents were described as unhappy and socially withdrawn (Baumrind, 1967; Baumrind & Black, 1967). Children of authoritarian parents have also been described as lacking social competence with peers. They tend to withdraw, not to take social initiative, and to lack spontaneity; they show less "conscience" and are more likely to have an external as opposed to an internal moral orientation (Maccoby & Martin, 1983).

Baumrind found that the pattern which produced the most socially

competent children was the pattern described as authoritative. In this pattern, firm enforcement of rules is accompanied by open communication between parents and children, with parents listening to the children's point of view, as well as expressing their own (Baumrind, 1967, 1971). This approach can be seen as a combination of power assertion and what Hoffman (1970) refers to as induction.

Hoffman (1970, 1984; Hoffman & Saltzstein, 1967) proposes a simpler classification than that offered by Baumrind. He describes three types of discipline techniques. The first category is referred to as power-assertion. In this technique, the parent seeks to control the child by capitalizing on his physical power or control over material resources; this includes physical punishment, deprivation of material objects or privileges, the direct application of force, or the threat of any of these. The second category, love-withdrawal, includes techniques whereby the parent more or less openly withdraws love by ignoring the child, turning his back on the child, refusing to speak to him, explicitly stating that he dislikes the child, or isolating him. The third category, inductions toward parents, appeals to the child's guilt potential by referring to the consequences of the child's action for the parent. Examples include telling the child that his action has hurt the parent, that an object he damaged was valued by the parent, that the parent is disappointed, etc. Thus, induction includes the use of explanations or reasons given by parents, their appeals to the child's pride or desire to be grown up, and appeals to their concern for others.

Results using these dimensions have again confirmed the negative effects of power assertive techniques. Parents who rely on coercive

discipline techniques tend to have children who are low on resistance to temptation, guilt following transgression, social responsibility, and concern for others (Hoffman, 1970). The frequent use of power-assertion by the mother in a middle class sample was consistently associated with weak moral development (Hoffman & Saltzstein, 1967). Successful socialization involves internalizing positive social values and standards; discipline techniques that rely on external pressure seem to retard this process of internalization (Dix & Grusec, 1983).

Reports on the effect of love withdrawal have been more ambiguous. In some instances, no relation has been found between love-withdrawal and moral internalization. Love-withdrawal is believed to exert a powerful motive to comply with the demands of adults by arousing anxiety over the possible loss of love (Hoffman, 1984). Although love-withdrawal and power-assertion use different tactics to elicit compliance, one factor that they have in common is that both focus on the consequences of the action for the child.

In contrast, an inductive style of reasoning focuses on the consequences that the child's actions may have for another person, i.e., the parent. The development of this type of interpersonal awareness is quite similar to the type of awareness required in role-taking. Thus, according to Hoffman (1984) induction is the technique most likely to help the child perceive the causal connections between his actions and the physical or psychological state of others. Hoffman and Saltzstein (Hoffman, 1970; Hoffman & Saltzstein, 1967; Saltzstein, 1976) have further distinguished between parent-oriented induction and peer-oriented induction. They found that parents of children with an internal moral

orientation were likely to call attention to the effects of a child's behavior on peers rather than on the parents themselves. Thus it could be argued that this particular style of induction would be the most conducive to fostering the development of role-taking skills.

#### Rationale for the present study

This section will briefly recapitulate some of the weaknesses and inconsistencies of the studies discussed thus far and will explain the rationale for the present study.

Whether there is a relationship between role-taking and social behavior seems to depend on the type of measure being used. Perceptual role taking is generally unrelated to social behavior whereas cognitive role-taking studies have yielded inconsistent results. Tests of affective role-taking have been related to social behavior but are flawed with numerous methodological weaknesses.

In contrast, the relation between social role-taking and social behavior has been more clearly demonstrated: good role-taking is associated with social competence and deficits in this ability are associated with maladjustment. When compared to other dimensions of role-taking ability - i.e. perceptual, cognitive, and affective dimensions - social role-taking represents a broader, more inclusive definition of role-taking: the awareness of thoughts and feelings in the context of social relationships.

One of the important limitations of many of the studies which explains at least in part the lack of significant findings is related to

the age of the subjects. According to Piaget (1928), the ability to truly adopt the perspective of another does not occur until the preadolescent period. Few studies, apart from Selman's validation studies have been done with children older than eleven. It would therefore be pertinent to investigate social role-taking in an adolescent sample.

Most of the studies reviewed have failed to control for intelligence. A modest relationship exists between intelligence and role-taking skills (Shantz, 1975). Since the Selman scale is based on an interview technique, it would be crucial to control for verbal intelligence.

Another reason why some studies have failed to find significant results may be related to the fact that investigators have used adult ratings of social deviance. Some of the studies on prosocial behavior suffer from this drawback (Waxler et al., 1977). Studies using peer nomination rely on children's evaluation of social deviance by their peers. Rolf (1972) has shown that peers are better able than adults to identify children who are vulnerable to behavior pathology. For these reasons, a peer nomination instrument such as the Pupil Evaluation Inventory (Pekarik, Prinz, Liebert, Weintraub & Nezie, 1976) would be an appropriate choice to evaluate the social behavior of children. Using the PEI in a sample of seventh graders, Bergeron (1980) found that withdrawn and aggressive-withdrawn subjects had poorer role-taking ability than aggressive or control subjects.

In the present study, the central question was whether peer-identified social deviance in childhood would have a bearing on role-

taking skill in adolescence. That is, would Bergeron's (1980) findings be obtained on a follow-up of a similar sample of children. Finally there is evidence that parental rearing style may influence the child's role-taking skills among peers. Controlling parents may hinder while explanation-giving parents may enhance the child's development of an interpersonal perspective.

The purpose of the present study was threefold:

- 1) To test the prediction that adolescents identified by peers as withdrawn or aggressive and withdrawn during childhood would have relatively poor role-taking ability. The premise for withdrawn children was that limited contact with peers would retard the development of role-taking ability, or alternatively, deficient role-taking ability had limited their contact with peers. The premise for the aggressive-withdrawn children was that poor role-taking skill was one aspect of a general social immaturity and maladjustment that either continued or had an impact on social skills in adolescence. By contrast, the adolescents who had been identified by peers as aggressive children were expected to have role-taking skills comparable to socially normative adolescents: Kurdek (1978) found that aggressive children were good role-takers disconfirming earlier theories that aggressive children would present deficits in most areas of social awareness. Bergeron (1980) found that aggressive and normative children achieved higher scores on the Selman Interpersonal Awareness Scales than either the withdrawn or the aggressive-withdrawn subjects. Both authors argued that peer interaction may be an important factor in learning social role-taking.
- 2) To test the hypothesis that parental discipline style as perceived by



adolescents influences role-taking skills. It was predicted that adolescents who identified the rearing style of their parents as inductive would show more role-taking ability than those who perceived their parents as controlling. The assumption was that adolescents' perceptions of their parents' disciplinary style as explanation or induction-oriented is positively associated with interpersonal awareness. It was also assumed that parental discipline style as reported by adolescents referred to stable rearing practices of parents that were used throughout childhood and adolescence. Thus, although parental rearing style was assessed in adolescence at the same time as interpersonal understanding, it was conceptualized as a precursive influence in childhood on the development of interpersonal understanding in adolescence.

The instrument developed by Hoffman and Saltzstein (1967) was selected to assess parents' reliance on inductive and controlling techniques as judged by their children. While the scale does not tap a controlling parental rearing style as such, it can be argued that the subscales of Power Assertion and Love Withdrawal have in common an underlying theme of control of the child's behavior through coercive techniques. In contrast, inductive techniques involve an attempt to educate the child regarding the consequences of his or her actions on others. Thus there is a conceptual distinction between the Power Assertion and Love Withdrawal subscales on the one hand and the Induction subscale on the other that was examined in the present study.

3) To assess the relationship between childhood social status and parental rearing style. The question here was whether both factors acted in concert on role-taking ability.

## Method

### Sample

The sample consisted of 147 adolescents (62 boys and 85 girls) between the ages of 13 and 17 years. The mean age of the sample was 15.81 years (S.D. = 1.25). These adolescents were attending French language schools in Montreal and were part of the large sample being followed by the Concordia Risk Project to assess risk for major forms of psychopathology in adulthood. Children who had been identified by peers as aggressive, withdrawn, both aggressive and withdrawn or socially normative comprised the large sample that was being followed by the project.

Screening for aggression and withdrawal in a large community population of school children was based on a French translation of the Pupil Evaluation Inventory (Pekarik, Prinz, Liebert, Weintraub, & Neale, 1976), a peer nomination instrument. Aggression and withdrawal were chosen as target behaviors since they have been shown to be related to maladjustment (Roff & Sells, 1968; Rolf, 1972; Schwartzman & Ledingham, 1985). The Pupil Evaluation Inventory (PEI) was used to assign adolescents to one of four groups: aggressive, withdrawn, aggressive-withdrawn and normative control. The PEI contains 35 items which load on three factors: Aggression, Withdrawal and Likability. Pekarik and associates (1976) report robust psychometrics for the PEI. Internal consistency is above .70 and short term test-retest correlation coefficients are above .80 across the three factors. The French version of the PEI also shows good internal consistency across the factors (above .80) and moderate stability over a three-year interval (see Moskowitz,

Schwartzman & Ledingham, 1985). Pekarik et al (1970) report median peer-teacher correlations of .65 and .53 for aggression and withdrawal respectively. On the French version of the PEI, peer-teacher correlations of .75 and .52 for aggression and withdrawal are reported by Ledingham, Younger, Schwartzman and Bergeron (1982).

The PEI was administered in 1977 to students in the first and fourth grades, approximately five to six years prior to the administration of the role-taking, discipline style, and vocabulary measures. The children were asked to nominate those boys and girls in their class who best fitted the description of each of the 35 items on the questionnaire. Boys and girls were rated in separate PEI administrations; for each item, children were allowed to nominate up to four classmates of each sex.

The total number of nominations received by each child was calculated separately for items loading on the aggression factor and for items loading on the withdrawal factor. Raw scores for each factor were transformed using a square root transformation to reduce skew. They were then converted to  $z$  scores for each sex within each class to remove the effects of age and sex on baseline rates of aggression and withdrawal, and the effect of differences in class size on total scores.

Those subjects who obtained a  $z$  score on the aggression factor exceeding the 95th percentile and withdrawal  $z$  scores below the top quartile were designated as aggressive. Similarly, those assigned to the withdrawn group obtained  $z$  scores on the withdrawal factor exceeding the 95th percentile and aggression  $z$  scores below the top quartile. Those scoring in the top quartile on both aggression and withdrawal were assigned to the aggressive-withdrawn group. Nondeviant subjects were

chosen from among those children below the 75th percentile and above the 25th percentile on both aggression and withdrawal (Ledingham, 1981). The distribution of the sample of the present study by sex, grade and PEI classification is given in Table 1.

Table 1

Sample frequency distribution by Pupil Evaluation Inventory (PEI)  
classification and sex

n = 147

		PEI classification			
		Aggressive	Withdrawn	Aggressive- withdrawn	Nondeviant
Grade 1	Boys	1	1	2	10
	Girls	1	1	5	16
Grade 4	Boys	4	8	8	28
	Girls	7	5	10	40
	Total	13	15	25	94

### Measures

Social Cognitive role-taking: A French translation of the Selman Interpersonal Awareness Scale (Selman, 1976) was administered by three trained interviewers. The scale was first translated into French then re-translated into English as a reliability check. One section of this instrument assesses the adolescent's social cognitions in relation to close friendships. The subject is first presented with an audio-taped story in the form of an interpersonal dilemma related to friendship. The adolescent is then interviewed as to how he or she would personally solve such a dilemma. The interview consists of a structured series of questions designed to measure the subject's level of interpersonal reasoning on six "issues" relevant to friendship (e.g. trust, jealousy, conflict resolution). Follow-up questions called "probes" may then be asked to further help the subject respond at his or her highest level of interpersonal reasoning.

Since the Selman Interpersonal Awareness Scale is time-consuming to administer and score, a shortened, modified version of this manual was developed by the present author and adapted to the specific characteristics of this sample (i.e., a group of francophone adolescents attending regular schools.) Interviews were audio-taped. Responses to each of the six issues were coded into one of five stages of reasoning extending from early childhood to adulthood (See Appendix B for description of stages.) Each score represented the subject's highest level of interpersonal reasoning. Since there were six issues and five stages, a subject could receive a maximum total score of 30.

The Selman has excellent inter-rater reliability: inter-rater

agreement on the highest level obtained between trained scorers was .96 (Selman, 1980). Level of perspective-taking was correlated with age ( $r = .88, p < .001$ ). No sex effect was found. Selman (1980) interpreted the age effect as lending strong support to the idea that social perspective taking represents a sequential development corresponding to a conceptual-developmental "reality" in children's thinking. Follow-up studies over a three-year interval showed that no subject scored lower at Time 2 than at Time 1, which support the claim that the levels define a cumulative ordinal scale; and subjects did not skip levels thereby supporting the concept of an invariant sequence of levels (Selman, 1980).

Selman's perspective-taking levels have been related to Kohlberg's stages of moral development (Selman, 1971; 1980; Selman & Damon, 1975). Naturalistic studies have shown that higher levels of social understanding were associated with more competent communications with peers and with the use of higher level strategies for task negotiations (Selman, Shorin, Stone & Phelps, 1983; Stone & Selman, 1982). Children presenting a variety of social difficulties (e.g. conduct disorders) requiring placement in a special school showed a developmental lag on the Selman scale when compared to a normative sample (Selman, 1976). Children with low levels of interpersonal awareness were also given negative sociometric ratings by peers (Selman, 1976).

Since the manual used in the present study was a modified version of the original manual, a reliability study was undertaken to examine its psychometric properties. Inter-scorer reliability was calculated by computing the correlation between each rater's total score. Reliability was excellent ( $r = .93$ ). Internal consistency was also high

(Cronbach's alpha = .85).

Parental discipline style: A French adaptation of Hoffman and Saltzstein's (1967) measure of parent rearing style was used. The same procedure was used as that used for the Selman: the scale was first translated into French then re-translated into English. Parents completed the parent form and children completed the child form of this questionnaire. The task for the subject is to imagine four situations where a child: (1) delays complying with a parental request, (2) is careless and destroys something, (3) talks back to a parent, and (4) does poorly at school. In the parental form of the measure, the parent is asked to respond in terms of what he or she would typically do in the situations described, situations commonly involving the application of discipline techniques; in the child form, the child describes his or her perception of what the parent's typical response would be. After each scenario, nine common parental reactions are randomly presented in a fixed order for all subjects (see Appendix E). Each of these reactions are prototypic of one of three parental control techniques: power-assertion (e.g. physical punishment, direct application of force or the threat of either of these), love-withdrawal (e.g. refusing to talk to the child or isolating him), and induction (e.g. telling the child that his action has hurt or disappointed the parent). The respondent is asked to record the frequency of occurrence of each of the reactions on a six-point scale ranging from "not at all" to "all the time". Total scores for each discipline style are summed across situations for each style category. As noted earlier, validity data have been provided by Hoffman (Hoffman, 1970; Hoffman & Saltzstein, 1967) which relate power assertive



techniques in parents to weak moral development in their children; such children are also found to be low on measures of resistance to temptation, guilt following transgressions, poor social responsibility, and concern for others. No reliability data, however, have been reported for this measure.

Verbal intelligence: In order to control for verbal intelligence, the adolescents under 16 years of age received a French translation of the Vocabulary Subtest of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children - Revised. Subjects who were 16 years of age or older received a translation of the Vocabulary Subtest of the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale - Revised. The standard procedure as given in the WISC-R and WAIS-R manuals was followed in administering and scoring the test. The age norms provided by the manuals were used to compute scaled scores. The psychometric properties of the WISC-R and the WAIS-R have been well established.

The Vocabulary Subtest correlates .78 with the WISC-R Verbal IQ and .85 with the WAIS-R Verbal IQ. Reliability coefficients for the two Vocabulary subtests range from .86 - .92 for the WISC-R depending on the age of the sample, to .96 for the WAIS-R. Test-retest coefficients are .93 for both Vocabulary tests (Sattler, 1988).

Social Desirability: In order to control for social desirability response bias, subjects were administered the Crowne and Marlowe (1964) Social Desirability Scale. This scale is made up of 33 items containing two types of statements: approximately half are culturally acceptable but probably untrue, the other half are true but undesirable. One point is scored for each response in the socially desirable direction with

scores therefore varying between 0 (no social desirability) to 33 (maximum social desirability).

The items retained in the scale were those that had originally correlated at the .05 level with total scale scores. Internal consistency (Kuder-Richardson 20) is .88 (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964). Test-retest correlation over a one-month interval was also .88. The validity of the scale is supported by studies showing that people who present themselves in socially desirable terms also had more favourable attitudes towards extremely dull and boring tasks; were more susceptible to verbal conditioning and persuasion; demonstrated more social conformity; had a tendency to give popular word associations; were cautious about setting goals in a risk-taking situation; and were more reactive in a "dirty word" perceptual-defense task (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964).

#### Procedure

The adolescents were invited to spend the day at the Risk Project laboratory where they completed the Parental Control Measure and the WISC-R or the WAIS-R Vocabulary Subtest. They were also interviewed on the Selman Interpersonal Awareness Scale by one of three trained interviewers. These measures were administered as part of a battery of tests. Subjects received payment for their participation in the study. The testers were blind as to the PEI classification of the adolescents.

## Results

The child's report of the mother's discipline style was used to represent the perceived discipline style of both parents for several reasons. Preliminary analysis (see Table A-1) indicated that children reported more consistency between mothers and fathers on the use of particular discipline styles than did the parents themselves (see Table A-1). Because of this consistency, it was possible to include the children of single mothers in the study thereby increasing the size of the sample. Preliminary analysis also indicated a moderate correlation between the Power Assertion and Love Withdrawal subscales (see Table A-1), a finding which supported the planned merging of the two subscales into one, and subsequently referred to as the Controlling subscale. Preliminary analyses revealed as well that the Inductive subscale was not independent of the other two subscales. This aspect will be examined and discussed later.

Preliminary analyses were conducted to examine the distributions of scores on the principal variables of the study. No outliers greater than three standard deviations from the mean were found; nor was skewness in the distribution of scores problematic. Girls demonstrated superior performance on the Selman compared to boys,  $t(151) = -3.14, p < .005$ . Sex was therefore included as a control variable in all subsequent analyses.

The means and standard deviations for all of the relevant variables used in the study are given in Table 2. Pearson product-moment correlations between the principal predictor variables (peer classification and PCM), the control variables (age, vocabulary score,

Table 2

Means ( $\bar{X}$ ) and Standard Deviations (SD) as a Function of PEI  
Classification by Age, Sex, Vocabulary Score (Voc), Selman Score,  
Parental Control Measure (PCM), and Social Desirability (So De)<sup>a</sup>

		PEI classification <sup>b</sup>				Overall
		A	W	A/W	C	
Age	$\bar{X}$ (SD)	16.09 (.82)	16.44 (1.21)	15.32 (1.19)	15.84 (1.28)	15.84 (1.25)
Voc	$\bar{X}$ (SD)	7.36 (2.31)	9.47 (3.26)	7.69 (2.09)	9.11 (2.08)	8.75 (2.34)
So De	$\bar{X}$ (SD)	17.07 (4.95)	17.29 (3.96)	18.46 (4.54)	17.27 (4.61)	17.46 (4.54)
Selman	$\bar{X}$ (SD)	34.29 (5.54)	34.88 (4.62)	32.92 (5.56)	35.59 (4.99)	34.94 (5.14)
PCM	CTL $\bar{X}$ (SD)	41.46 (12.53)	41.00 (12.88)	39.28 (11.06)	38.17 (12.31)	38.93 (12.12)
	IND $\bar{X}$ (SD)	39.93 (10.55)	42.33 (10.63)	41.24 (13.17)	45.48 (13.62)	43.93 (13.08)

<sup>a</sup>n=147

<sup>b</sup>A - aggressive; W - withdrawn; A/W - aggressive-withdrawn;  
 C - control

sex, and social desirability) and performance on the Selman were computed. Given the interrelations among these variables (for details see Appendix A-4), multiple regression was the main method selected for statistical analysis of results.

To test the two principal hypotheses of the study, a staged hierarchical regression was performed with scores on the Selman as the dependent variable. This procedure assesses the unique contribution of each factor to the predictive power of a set of variables. The control variables (age, vocabulary score, sex of child, and social desirability score) were entered in Step One while peer classification status (aggressive, withdrawn, aggressive-withdrawn and normative control) was entered in Step Two as a test of the first hypothesis of the study. The child's perception of the mother's reliance on control and inductive discipline styles was entered in Step Three as a test of the second hypothesis.

Neither of the principle hypotheses of the study was supported by the results. Inspection of the R square change associated with the first step revealed that age, vocabulary score, sex, and social desirability together accounted for a significant proportion of variance on the Selman,  $R^2 = .24$ ,  $F$  change (4, 142) = 11.00,  $p < .001$  (See Table 3). This reflects the significant contribution of vocabulary scores and sex to the prediction of Selman scores (see Table A-5). Neither peer classification nor perceived parental rearing style contributed to the prediction of Selman scores above and beyond that of the control variables (see Table 3).

The extent to which Selman scores could be predicted by the

Table 3

Staged Hierarchical Regression Summary Table: Predicting Selman Scores using Age, Vocabulary Score (Voc), Sex, Social Desirability (So De), Peer Classification (PEI), Parental Discipline Style (PCM), and Interactions<sup>a</sup>

Step	Variables	R	R <sup>2</sup>	Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	R <sup>2</sup> Change	F Change
1	Age, Voc, Sex, So De	.49	.24	.22	.24	11.00*
2	PEI	.50	.25	.21	.01	.76
3	PCM	.51	.26	.21	.01	1.33
4	PEI x PCM	.55	.30	.22	.04	1.38
5	Sex x PCM	.56	.31	.22	.01	1.18
6	Sex x PEI	.56	.31	.22	.00	.23

\*  $p < .001$

<sup>a</sup> $n=147$

interactive effects of peer classification and rearing style, sex and rearing style, and peer classification and sex was tested next by entering the relevant sets of variables in successive steps in the regression equation. None of these interactions contributed significantly to the prediction of Selman scores (see Table 3).

Because of the failure to find a relationship between perceived parental rearing style and performance on the Selman, the psychometric properties of the Parental Control Measure were examined. Cronbach's alpha coefficient was calculated within and across the three subscales. While Cronbach's alpha coefficient indicated a high degree of internal consistency for the individual subscales (range = .73 - .83), an equally high degree of internal consistency was also found across the three subscales (Cronbach's  $r = .86$ ). This finding suggested that a factor common to all three subscales of the PCM was being tapped. The two scales were therefore merged into one in an exploratory post-hoc attempt to determine whether the combined measure of parental influence, tentatively labelled as parental involvement, predicted interpersonal awareness as measured by the Selman Scale. As before, a staged hierarchical regression analysis was performed. The control variables were entered in Step One, peer classification in Step Two, and parental involvement in Step Three. Parental involvement as defined was not a significant predictor of Selman performance (See Table A-6).

### Discussion

The main purpose of the present study was threefold: 1) To investigate the relationship between peer-identified childhood social status and role-taking skills in adolescence; 2) to investigate the relationship between perceived parental discipline style and role-taking skills; and 3) to determine whether peer-identified childhood social status, perceived parental discipline style, and role-taking skills were interrelated.

The hypotheses were not supported by the findings. Peer classification and perceived parental rearing style did not bear on interpersonal understanding as measured by the Selman scale in the present study once the effects of age, sex, and intelligence were removed. In contrast to the results reported by Selman (Selman, 1981; Stone & Selman, 1982), no relationship was found in the present study between interpersonal understanding, as assessed by the Selman Scale of Interpersonal Understanding and indices of social deviance as measured by the PEI. The finding that girls demonstrate more mature interpersonal understanding than boys is consistent with the results of certain studies (e.g. Smollar & Youniss, 1982) but not with those of others (e.g. Selman, 1981). The positive correlation observed between intelligence and interpersonal understanding is not surprising; it has also been noted by other investigators (e.g. Selman, 1971; Shantz, 1978).

To understand the pattern of results obtained in the present study, two questions must be considered: 1) Are there discrepancies between what the principal measures attempt to assess and what they actually assess? 2) How do these variables and the relationships among them



change over the course of development?

With regard to the first question, it would appear that the Selman Scale reflects the capacity to verbally communicate an understanding of interpersonal relationships but not necessarily the interpersonal understanding itself. In the present study, the relationship between interpersonal understanding and peer classification (e.g. between Selman score and aggressive-withdrawn status) was accounted for in good part by verbal ability. Thus the Selman measure may discriminate against those adolescents who actually have the interpersonal understanding but cannot articulate it.

One must also consider the possibility that knowledge of interpersonal relationships, as measured by the Selman Scale, and the capacity to apply this knowledge are not equivalent. On the one hand, the Selman Scale addresses in a clear-cut way very practical issues (e.g. "how do fights between friends get resolved?") and recognizes the maturity inherent in a very concrete response (e.g. "I listen to his side, he listens to mine and we each try to understand where the other is coming from."). On the other hand, it does so outside the actual in vivo interpersonal context in which such knowledge is applied.

Flavell's (1968; Flavell & Wohlwill, 1969) distinction between competence and performance is relevant here: What you know and what you do in a real-life situation may be quite different. To quote from Rubin (1982) "it is conceivable that many of the behavioral concomitants of childhood maladjustment ... cannot be identified ... from the administration of hypothetical-reflective social-cognitive tests in the laboratory" (p. 366). He goes on to conclude that "there is little

relation between what children say they would do to solve a given social problem and what they in fact do when faced with the same problem in the real world" (p. 366). Selman's description of the most highly verbal and socially knowledgeable 10 year-old in one study (Stone & Selman, 1982) is a case in point - despite her superior performance on the Selman Scale of Interpersonal Understanding, she lacked the behavioral strategies to implement it and acted towards her peers in a bossy, pseudoadult manner.

For Renshaw and Asher (1982), the distinction between competence and performance can help clarify the exact nature of the deficit of the children who lack social skills. According to these authors, a child may "have knowledge of the appropriate social strategies to use in a particular peer situation (competence) but fail to implement the strategies (performance) because of anxiety, expectations of failure, fear of rejection by peers, and so on" (Renshaw & Asher, 1982, p. 381). Another factor affecting performance may be poor impulse control. For example, an aggressive child may know how to resolve conflicts in a mature way when questioned during an interview but when fighting with a friend may be unable to control his aggressive impulses. It is also possible that an adolescent may know how to react when actually fighting with a friend but may have difficulty communicating this knowledge in the context of an interview.

One must also consider whether the Parental Control Measure is a valid instrument for the assessment of parental discipline style since no clear conclusions regarding its relationship to interpersonal understanding can be made in the present study. Clearly, the lack of thorough psychometric evaluations of this and other measures of parental

influence is problematic and should be dealt with before further research in this area is conducted (See Holden & Edwards, 1989 for a comprehensive review). With regard to the Parental Control Measure, such an evaluation might involve selecting or creating items aimed at achieving a reliable and valid distinction between controlling and inductive styles. Several features of parental rearing style in addition to those examined in the present study are likely to be relevant influences in the development of interpersonal sensitivity in children. Although there was assessment of parental involvement in the present study, it was at best indirect and exploratory. It would be useful to measure directly the parameters of parental involvement and interest in children not only by means of self-report and reports by others, but also by means of behavioral observation.

Researchers examining the impact of parental discipline style on children's social behavior should also consider the consistency of the parents' disciplining behavior as an important variable. Parental discipline style may vary cross-situationally as a function of the severity or nature of the child's transgression, the parent's mood state, and the sex of the child. The consistency with which a discipline technique is used is important because it may influence the child's ability to successfully assimilate such a mode of relating into his or her repertoire of interpersonal skills, and more generally to internalize the perspective of another. The more consistent parents are, the less confused a child is likely to be when trying to understand how to behave towards friends and what to expect from them, whether they are simply disagreeing or actually fighting. The cross-situational consistency of

discipline style can be evaluated by comparing the techniques relied on in each of the four scenarios outlined in the PCM.

One might also expect inconsistencies between the parents to exist with regards to discipline style. While this was the case in the present study according to the parents' self-reported protocols, children reported more consistency in the discipline style across the two parents. Children's reports of parental discipline style may therefore reflect the perception and impact of discipline style rather than the actual discipline practices of parents. Researchers may find it useful to test this possibility in future studies.

Other qualities of the parent-child relationship reflected in the use of a particular style should also be examined, especially if they have an indirect effect on interpersonal understanding and peer interactions. For example, the use of an inductive style is likely to be accompanied by respect and acceptance for the child's unique viewpoint. Zahn-Waxler's description of parents as influencing "prosocial behavior through their capacity as models ... as tutors... and as caregivers" (Zahn-Waxler, Iannotti, & Chapman, 1982, p. 153) suggests that a child may assimilate social strategies explicit to and implicit in a particular style. A child raised in a cooperative vs a competitive family environment is also likely to adopt these goal structures when interacting with peers (Zahn-Waxler, Iannotti, & Chapman, 1982).

In evaluating the negative results obtained in the present study, one must also consider that peer status was established six years prior to the administration of the Selman Scale. In the Concordia Risk Project, one quarter of the children remained in the same classification

group three years after the initial screening (Moskowitz, Schwartzman & Ledingham, 1985).

The stability of children's sociometric status over a 6-year period cannot be assumed. It is possible that social deviance in childhood will vary not only with age but also with milestone developmental adjustments. For example, withdrawn behavior in grade one may reflect a temporary adjustment reaction to the demands of starting school while the same behavior in grade four may reflect a more stable personality disposition.

The main question addressed in the study, however, was whether children identified by their peers as socially deviant during childhood would have less developed interpersonal understanding in adolescence. From that perspective, the stability of children's sociometric status over the course of childhood and adolescence was not relevant to the question asked in the study. Nevertheless, it is important to differentiate those children whose social maladjustment persists from those who do not.

Finally, it would be useful to consider the influence of motivational (Berndt, 1981) and affective factors (Flavell, 1981; Hoffman, 1981) in studies of interpersonal awareness when the factors of age and intelligence are controlled. A child may know how to relate to a friend and so will perform well on a measure such as the Selman Scale but may be unwilling or emotionally unable to behave in a prosocial manner, thus being viewed as socially deviant by peers. Addressing these factors in future research should improve our understanding of the impact of children's social adjustment and the discipline style of their parents on interpersonal awareness in adolescence.

## References

- Asher, S.R. & Renshaw, P.D. (1981). Children without friends. In S.R. Asher & J.M. Gottman (Eds.), The development of children's friendships. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Baldwin, A.L. (1949). The effect of home environment on nursery school behaviour. Child Development, 20, 49-61.
- Baldwin, A.L., Kolhorn, J. & Breese, F.H. (1949). The appraisal of patient behaviour. Psychological Monographs, 63, No. 299.
- Baldwin, J.M. (1906). Social and ethical interpretation of mental development. New York: Macmillan.
- Baumrind, D. (1967). Child care practices anteceding three patterns of preschool behaviour. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 75, 43-83.
- Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. Developmental Psychology Monographs, 4, No. 1, Part 2(a).
- Baumrind, D., & Black, A.E. (1967). Socialization practices associated with dimensions of competence in preschool boys and girls. Child Development, 38, 291-327.
- Becker, W.C. (1964). Consequences of different kinds of parental discipline. In M.L. Hoffman & L.W. Hoffman (Eds.), Review of Child Development, (Vol. I). New York: Russel Sage Foundation.
- Bergeron, G. (1980). Social and cognitive role-taking concepts in aggressive and withdrawn children. Unpublished master's thesis, Concordia University.

- Berndt, T.J. (1981). Relations between social cognition, nonsocial cognition, and social behaviour. In J.H. Flavell & L. Ross (Eds.), Social cognitive development: Frontiers and possible futures. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Borke, H. (1971). Interpersonal perceptions of young children: Egocentrism or empathy? Developmental Psychology, 5, 262-269.
- Buckley, N., Siegel, L., & Ness, S. (1978). Egocentrism, empathy, and altruistic behaviour. Developmental Psychology, 15(3), 329-330.
- Cameron, N. (1954). Experimental analysis of schizophrenia thinking. In J.S. Kasanir (Ed.), Language and thought in schizophrenia. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Castle, K.S., & Richards, H.C. (1979). Adult/peer interactions and role-taking ability among preschool children. The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 135, 71-79.
- Chandler, M.J. (1973). Egocentrism and antisocial behaviour: The assessment and training of social perspective-taking skills. Developmental Psychology, 9, 326-332.
- Chandler, M.J. (1976). Social cognition: A selective review of current research. In W.F. Querton & J.M. Gallagher (Eds.), Knowledge and development (Vol. 7): Advances in research and theory. New York: Plenum Press, 1976.
- Chandler, M.J., & Greenspan, D. (1972). Ersatz egocentrism: A reply to H. Borke. Developmental Psychology, 7, 104-106.

- Chandler, M.J., Greenspan, D., & Barenboim, C. (1974). Assessment and training of role-taking and referential communication skills in institutionalized emotionally disturbed children. Developmental Psychology, 10 (4), 546-553.
- Chevrier, J.M. (1967). Echelle D'intelligence de Weschler Pour Enfants. Montreal: Institut de Recherches Psychologiques Inc.
- Cook, H., & Stingle, S. (1974). Cooperative behaviour in children. Psychological Bulletin, 81, 918-933.
- Crowne, D., & Marlowe, D. (1964). The approval motive. New York: Wiley.
- Damon, W. (1975). Early conceptions of positive justice as related to the development of logical operations. Child Development, 46, 301-312.
- Dix, T., & Grusec, J. (1983). Parental influence techniques: An attributional analysis. Child Development, 54, 645-652.
- Edelstein, W., Keller, M., & Wahlen, K. (1984). Structure and content in social cognition: Conceptual and empirical analysis. Child Development, 55, 1514-1526.
- Feffer, M.J., & Gourevitch, V. (1960). Cognitive aspects of role-taking in children. Journal of Personality, 28, 383-396.
- Feshbach, N.D., & Feshbach, S. (1969). The relationship between empathy and aggression in two age groups. Developmental Psychology, 1, 102-107.



- Flavell, J.H. (1981). Monitoring social cognitive enterprises: Something else that may develop in the area of social cognition. In J.H. Flavell & L. Ross (Eds.), Social cognitive development: Frontiers and possible futures. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Flavell, J.H., Botkin, P., Fry, C., Wright, J., & Jarvis, P. (1968). The development of role-taking and communication skills in children. New York: John Wiley.
- Flavell, J.H., & Wohlwill, J.F. (1969). Formal and functional aspects of cognitive development. In D. Elkind & J.H. Flavell (Eds.), Studies in cognitive development: Essays in honor of Jean Piaget. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Glucksberg, S., Krauss, R.M., & Weisberg, R. (1966). Referential communication in nursery school children: Method and some preliminary findings. Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 3, 333-342.
- Gottman, J.M., Gonso, J., & Rasmussen, B. (1975). Social interaction, social competence, and friendship in children. Child Development, 46, 709-718.
- Gough, H.G. (1948). A sociological theory of psychotherapy. American Journal of Sociology, 53, 359-366.
- Gurucharri, C., Phelps, E., & Selman, R. (1984). Development of interpersonal understanding: A longitudinal and comparative study of normal and disturbed youths. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 52 (1), 26-36.

- Hartup, W.W. (1970). Peer interaction and social organization. In P.H. Mussen (Ed.), Carmichael's manual of child psychology, Vol. 2. New York: Wiley.
- Hartup, W. (1983). Peer relations. In E.M. Hetherington (Ed.), Socialization, personality and social development. Vol. IV, John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Hill, J.P., & Palmquist, W.J. (1978). Social cognition and social relations in early adolescence. International Journal of Behavioural Development, 1, 1-36.
- Hoffman, M.L. (1970). Moral development. In P.H. Mussen (Ed.), Carmichael's manual of child psychology, Vol. 2, New York: Wiley.
- Hoffman, M. (1981). Perspectives on the difference between understanding people and understanding things: The role of affect. In J.H. Flavell & L. Ross (Eds.), Social cognitive development: Frontiers and possible futures. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hoffman, M.L. (1984). Parent discipline, moral internalization, and development of prosocial motivation. In E. Staub, D. Bar-Tal, J. Karylowski, & J. Reykowski (Eds.), Development and maintenance of prosocial behaviour. New York: Plenum Press.
- Hoffman, M.L., & Saltzstein, H.D. (1967). Parent discipline and the child's moral development. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 5 (1), 45-57.
- Holden, G.W., & Edwards, L.A. (1989). Parental attitudes toward child rearing: Instruments, issues, and implications. Psychological Bulletin, 106(1), 29-58.

- Hollos, M. (1975). Logical operations and role-taking abilities in two cultures. Child Development, 46, 638-649.
- Hollos, M., & Cowan, P.A. (1973). Social isolation and cognitive development: Logical operations and role-taking abilities in three Norwegian social settings. Child Development, 44, 630-641.
- Ianotti, R.J. (1978). Effect of role-taking experiences in role-taking, empathy, altruism, and aggression. Developmental Psychology, 14 (2), 119-124.
- Keller, M. (1976). Development of role-taking ability: Social antecedents and consequences for school success. Human Development, 19, 120-132.
- Kohlberg, L. (1969). Stage and sequence: The cognitive-developmental approach to socialization. In D. Goslin (Ed.), Handbook of socialization theory and research. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Kurdek, L.A. (1977). Convergent validation of perspective taking: A one-year follow-up. Developmental Psychology, 13 (2), 172-173.
- Kurdek, L.A. (1978a). Perspective taking as the cognitive basis of children's moral development: A review of the literature. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 24 (1), 3-28.
- Kurdek, L.A. (1978b). Relationship between cognitive perspective taking and teachers' ratings of children's classroom behaviour in grades one through four. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 132, 21-27.
- Kurdek, L.A. (1982). Long-term predictive validity of children's social cognitive assessments. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 28 (4), 511-521.

- Kurdek, L.A., & Krile, D. (1982). A developmental analysis of the relation between peer acceptance and both interpersonal understanding and perceived social self-competence. Child Development, 53 (6), 1485-1491.
- Kurdek, L.A., & Krile, D. (1983). The relation between third-through eighth-grade children's social cognition and parents' ratings of social skills and general adjustment. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 143, 201-206.
- Kurdek, L.A., & Rodgon, M.M. (1975). Perceptual, cognitive, and affective perspective taking in kindergarten through sixth-grade children. Developmental Psychology, 11 (5), 643-650.
- Ladd, G.W., & Oden, S. (1979). The relationship between peer acceptance and children's ideas about helpfulness. Child Development, 50, 402-408.
- Ledingham, J.E. (1981). Developmental patterns of aggressive and withdrawn behaviour in childhood: A possible method for identifying preschizophrenics. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 9, 1-22.
- Ledingham, J.E., Younger, A., Schwartzman, A., & Bergeron, G. (1982). Agreement among teacher, peer, and self-ratings of children's aggression, withdrawal, and likability. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 10 (3), 363-372.
- Maccoby, E., & Martin, J. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interactions. In E.M. Hetherington (Ed.), Socialization, Personality and Social Development, Vol. IV. John Wiley & Sons, New York.

- Marcus, R.F. (1980). Empathy and popularity of preschool children. Child Study Journal, 10, 133-145.
- Mead, G.H. (1934). Mind, self and society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Moir, D.J. (1974). Egocentrism and the emergence of conventional morality in preadolescent girls. Child Development, 45, 299-304.
- Moskowitz, D.S., Schwartzman, A.E., & Ledingham, J.E. (1985). Stability and change in aggression and withdrawal in middle childhood and early adolescence. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 94 (1), 30-41.
- Newcomb, A.F., & Bukowski, W.M. (1984). A longitudinal study of the utility of social preference and social impact sociometric classification schemes. Child Development, 55, 1434-1447.
- Peery, J.C. (1979). Popular, amiable, isolated, and rejected: A reconceptualization of sociometric status in preschool children. Child Development, 50, 1231-1234.
- Pekarik, E.G., Prinz, R.J., Liebert, D.E., Weintraub, S., & Neale, J.M. (1976). The pupil evaluation inventory: A sociometric technique for assessing children's social behaviour. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 4, 83-97.
- Piaget, J. (1926). The language and thought of the child. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Piaget, J. (1928). Judgment and Reasoning in the Child. New York: Harcourt, Brace.
- Piaget, J. (1965). The moral judgment of the child. New York: Free Press.

- Renshaw, P.D., & Asher, S.R. (1982). Social competence and peer status: The distinction between goals and strategies. In K.H. Rubin & H.S. Ross (Eds.), Peer relationships and social skills in childhood, New York, N.Y.: Springer-Verlag.
- Rolf, J. (1972). The academic and social competence of school children vulnerable to behaviour pathology. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 80, 225-243.
- Rubin, K.H. (1972). Relationship between egocentric communication and popularity among peers. Developmental Psychology, 7, 364.
- Rubin, K.H. (1973). Egocentrism in childhood: A unitary construct? Child Development, 44, 102-111.
- Rubin, K.H. (1976). Social interaction and communicative egocentrism in preschoolers. The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 129, 121-124.
- Rubin, K.H. (1982). Social and social-cognitive developmental characteristics of young isolate, normal, and sociable children. In K.H. Rubin & H.S. Ross (Eds.), Peer relationships and social skills in childhood. New York, N.Y.: Springer-Verlag.
- Rubin, K.H., & Schneider, F.W. (1973). The relationship between moral judgement, egocentrism and altruistic behaviour. Child Development, 44, 661-665.
- Saltzstein, H.D. (1976). Social influence and moral development: A perspective on the role of parents and peers. In T. Lickona (Ed.), Moral development and behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Sarbin, T.R. (1954). Role theory. In G. Lindzey (Ed.), Handbook of social psychology, Vol. 1. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

- Sattler, J.M. (1988). Assessment of children. Third edition.  
San Diego: Jerome M. Sattler, Publisher.
- Schaefer, E.S. (1959). A circumplex model for maternal behaviour.  
Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 59, 226-235.
- Schwartzman, A.E., & Ledingham, J.E. (1985). Adaptation sociale émotive et intellectuelle des enfants agressifs et renfermés. Final research report submitted to the Conseil Québécois de la Recherche Sociale.
- Schwartzman, A.E., Ledingham, J.E., & Serbin, L.A. (1985). Identification of children at risk for adult schizophrenia: A longitudinal study.  
International Review of Applied Psychology. Sage: London. Vol. 34, p. 363-380.
- Selman, R.L. (1971). The relation of role-taking to the development of moral judgment in children. Child Development, 42, 79-91.
- Selman, R.L. (1976). The development of conceptions of interpersonal relations: A structural analysis and procedure for the assessment of levels of interpersonal reasoning based on levels of social perspective taking. Unpublished scoring manual. Revision of Harvard-Judge Baker Social Reasoning Project.
- Selman, R.L. (1980). The growth of interpersonal understanding: Development and clinical analyses. New York: Academic Press.
- Selman, R.L., Beardslee, W., Schultz, L.H., Krupa, M., & Podorefsky, D. (1986). Assessing adolescent interpersonal negotiation strategies: Toward the integration of structural and functional models.  
Developmental Psychology, 22 (4), 450-459.

- Selman, R.L., & Damon, W. (1975). The necessity (but insufficiency) of social perspective taking for conceptions of justice at three early levels. In D. DePalma & J. Foley (Eds.), Contemporary issues in moral development. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Selman, R.L., Jacquette, D., & Lavin, D. (1977). Interpersonal awareness in children: Toward an integration of developmental and clinical child psychology. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 47 (1), 264-274.
- Selman, R.L., Schorin, M., Stone, C.R., & Phelps, E. (1983). A naturalistic study of children's social understanding. Developmental Psychology, 19 (1), 82-102.
- Shantz, C.V. (1975). The development of social cognition. In E.M. Hetherington (Ed.), Review of Child Development Research, Vol. 5. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Smollar, J., & Youniss, J. (1982). Social development through friendship. In K.H. Rubin & H.S. Ross (Eds.), Peer relationships and social skills in childhood. New York, N.Y.: Springer-Verlag.
- Stone, C., & Selman, R.C. (1982). A structural approach to research on the development of interpersonal behaviour among school grade children. In K.H. Rubin & H.S. Ross (Eds.), Peer relationships and social skills in childhood, New York, N.Y.: Springer-Verlag.
- Sullivan, H.S. (1953). The interpersonal theory of psychiatry. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Sullivan, H.S. (1954). The language of schizophrenia. In J.S. Kasanin (Ed.), Language and thought in schizophrenia. Berkeley: University of California Press.



- Underwood, B., & Moore, B.S. (1982). The generality of altruism in children. In N. Eisenberg-Berg (Ed.), The development of prosocial behavior. New York: Academic Press.
- Urberg, K.A., & Docherty, E.M. (1976). Development of role-taking skills in young children. Developmental Psychology, 12, 198-204.
- Waters, E., Wippman, J., & Sroufe, L.A. (1979). Attachment, positive affect, and competence in the peer group: Two studies in construct validation. Child Development, 50, 821-829.
- Waxler, C.Z., Yarrow, M.R., & Smith, J.B. (1977). Perspective-taking and prosocial behaviour. Developmental Psychology, 13, 87-88.
- Wolfe, R. (1963). The role of conceptual systems in cognitive functioning at varying levels of age and intelligence. Journal of Personality, 31, 108-123.
- Youniss, J. (1975). Another perspective on social cognition. In A.D. Pick (Ed.), Minnesota Symposia on Child Psychology, Vol. 9. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 173-193.
- Youniss, J. (1980). Parents and peers in social development: A Sullivan-Piaget perspective. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Zahn-Waxler, C., Iannotti, R., & Chapman, M. (1982). Peers and prosocial development. In K.H. Rubin & H.S. Ross (Eds.), Peer relations and social skills in childhood. New York, N.Y.: Springer-Verlag.

APPENDIX A

Tables

Table A-1

Correlation Matrix for the Parental Control Measure: Discipline Style of  
Fathers and Mothers, as Reported by Children<sup>a</sup>

---

	Mother		Father		
	LW	OI	PA	LW	OI
Mother - PA <sup>b</sup>	.46*	.32*	.65*	.21	.26
LW	---	.36*	.23	.53*	.28*
OI		---	.12	.42*	.78*
Father - PA			---	.34*	.14
LW				---	.48*
OI					---

---

\*  $p < .001$

<sup>a</sup> $n=117$

<sup>b</sup>PA - power assertion; LW - love withdrawal; OI - other induction

Table A-2

Correlation Matrix for the Parental Control Measure: Discipline Style of  
Fathers and Mothers, as Reported by Parents<sup>a</sup>

---

	Mother		Father		
	LW	OI	PA	LW	OI
Mother - PA <sup>b</sup>	.50*	.58*	.08	-.03	.09
LW	---	.52*	-.04	.18	.17
OI		---	.16	.14	.35*
Father - PA			---	.48*	.38*
LW				---	.31*
OI					---

---

\*  $p < .001$

<sup>a</sup> $n=117$

<sup>b</sup>PA - power assertion; LW - love withdrawal; OI - other induction

Table A-3

Correlation Matrix for the Parental Control Measure: Discipline Style of  
Fathers and Mothers, as Reported by Parents and Children<sup>a</sup>

---

	Parent Report					
	Mother			Father		
	PA	LW	OI	PA	LW	OI
Child Report						
Mother - PA <sup>b</sup>	.39*	.23	.27*			
LW	.17	.27*	.14			
OI	-.04	.01	-.04			
Father - PA				.29*	-.02	.02
LW				.11	.06	-.07
OI				.22	.30*	.21

---

\*  $p < .001$

<sup>a</sup>n=117

<sup>b</sup>PA - power assertion; LW - love withdrawal; OI - other induction

Table A-4

Correlations among Selman Scores, Peer Classification, Parental Control Measure (PCM -Child Form for Mother's Style), Age, Vocabulary Score (Voc), Sex, and Social Desirability (So De)<sup>a</sup>

	Peer Class <sup>b</sup>			PCM <sup>c</sup>		Age	Voc	Sex	So De
	A	W	A/W	CTL	IND				
Selman	-.04	.02	-.18*	.10	.18*	.18*	.37**	.26**	.08
Peer Class.									
A	----	-.11	-.14	.07	-.09	.05	-.21**	.02	-.05
W		----	-.15	.06	-.04	.16*	.17*	-.12	-.06
A/W			----	.01	-.09	-.17*	.21**	.02	.12
PCM									
CTL				----	.41**	-.08	.01	.06	-.17*
IND					----	-.10	.12	.20**	.03
Age						----	.29**	-.11	.02
Voc							----	-.04	-.08
Sex								----	.02

\*  $p < .05$

\*\*  $p < .001$

<sup>a</sup> $n=147$

<sup>b</sup>A - Aggressive; W - Withdrawn; A/W - Aggressive-Withdrawn;

<sup>c</sup>CTL - Controlling Discipline Style; Ind - Inductive Discipline Style

Table A-5

Correlations among Variables after the Last Step in a Staged Hierarchical  
Regression Predicting Selman Scores (see Table 3)

Step	R <sup>2</sup> Change	F Change	p	Variable	r	r <sup>2</sup>	B <sup>a</sup>
1	.24	11.00	.00	Age	.18	.033	.109
				Sex	.26	.066	.257
				Voc	.37	.140	.394
				So De	.08	.064	.083
2	.01	.76	ns	A	-.03	.001	.030
				W	.01	.002	-.024
				A/W	-.18	.032	-.111
3	.01	1.33	ns	CTL	.10	.010	.102
				IND	.18	.033	.131
4	.04	1.38	ns	A x CTL	-.03	.001	.120
				A x IND	.02	.001	.591
				W x CTL	-.01	.000	.067
				W x IND	-.02	.000	.076
				A/W x CTL	-.17	.028	-.063
				A/W x IND	-.13	.018	.245
5	.01	1.18	ns	Sex x CTL	.25	.061	-.044
				Sex x IND	.25	.062	-.043
6	.00	.23	ns	Sex x A	.05	.003	-.136
				Sex x W	.07	.005	.033
				Sex x A/W	-.08	.006	-.031

<sup>a</sup>Unstandardized regression coefficient after the last step

Table A-6

Staged Hierarchical Regression Summary Table: Predicting Selman Scores using Age, Vocabulary Score (Voc), Sex, Social Desirability (So De), Peer Classification (PEI, and Parental Involvement (PI)<sup>a</sup>

Step	Variables	R	R <sup>2</sup>	Adjusted R2	R <sup>2</sup> Change	F Change
1	Age, Voc. Sex, So De	.49	.24	.22	.24	11.00*
2	PEI	.50	.25	.21	.01	.76
3	PI	.51	.26	.22	.01	2.57

\*  $p < .001$

<sup>a</sup><sub>n=147</sub>



APPENDIX B

Scoring Manual for Interpersonal Understanding Interviews

## Perspective-taking

### General description of the stages of perspective-taking i.e.

- the relation between the perspectives of self and others

### Stage 1 - Egocentric or undifferentiated perspectives

#### Characteristics

- recognizes the reality of subjective perspectives (e.g. thoughts and feelings) within the self and within other

#### Limitations

- does not clearly distinguish his own perspective from that of other
- does not understand that although two people's perception of a social experience may be similar, their interpretation of the event may differ
- confusion between the subjective or psychological, and the objective or physical aspects of the social world

e.g. - between feelings and overt acts

or - between intentional and unintentional acts

### Stage 2 - Subjective or differentiated perspectives

#### Characteristics Gains

- new concern with the uniqueness of the covert, psychological life of each person
- understands that two people may perceive the same social experience but that their perspective or interpretation of the situation may differ
- similarly the self and other may perceive the same actions but attribute to these actions different reasons or motives

#### Limitations

- not capable of reciprocity of thoughts and feelings (e.g. I know that he likes me; he knows that I like him)

- only capable of reciprocity of actions (he does for me, I do for him)

### Stage 3 - Self-reflective or reciprocal perspectives

#### Characteristics Gains

- able to reflect on his own thoughts and feelings from another's perspective
- i.e. able to take a second-person perspective, to put himself in the other's shoes and to see the self as a subject to other
- capable of reciprocity of thoughts and feelings rather than merely reciprocity of action

#### Limitations

- can take only one person's perspective at a time, i.e. not able to coordinate two perspectives simultaneously

### Stage 4 - Third person or mutual perspectives

#### Characteristics Gains

- acquires the ability to abstractly step outside of an interpersonal interaction and to simultaneously coordinate the perspectives of each party in the interaction (third person perspective)
- aware of the infinite regress potential of the chaining of reciprocal perspectives (I know that he knows that I know ...)
- the ability to take the third person perspective leads to the awareness of the mutuality of the self-other relationship, i.e. the subjective perspectives of two people towards one another

### Stage 5 - Societal or in-depth perspectives

#### Characteristics Gains

- mutuality (i.e. the subjective perspectives of people towards one another) may exist simultaneously on various levels:

- e.g. two people may share perspectives at the level of superficial information, at the level of common interests or at the level of deeper feelings
- perspectives among persons are seen as forming a network or system
- these networks of perspectives become generalized: e.g. into the concept of society's perspective, or the legal or moral point of view

Perspective-taking applied to the domain of close dyadic friendships

I Friendship Formation

A Motives

1. Why are friends important?

Stage 1 - Momentary physicalistic playmates

Characteristics

- friendship characterized by momentary physicalistic interactions
- friendship based on proximity: a close friend is someone who lives close by with whom the self happens to be playing at the moment

Limitations

- no distinction between the physical and psychological qualities of persons
- therefore the subjective nature of the people involved in a relationship is not recognized

Typical responses:

1a) Reference to own experiences

Cause I have a lot of friends

1b) Friends not distinct from activity with self

So I have someone to play with, someone to have fun with.

Stage 2 - One-way assistance

Characteristics/Gains

- close friendships are one-way: the friend performs specific activities which the self wants done
- interpersonal conceptions are also one-way i.e. focused on only one person's subjective perspective at a time

- new awareness of the role of psychological factors in forming a friendship i.e. the psychological reaction of one person to the action taken by the other in attempting to form a friendship.

#### Limitations

- incapacity to consider both parties' perspectives at the same time
- psychological awareness is very limited: a friend provides physical or concrete assistance in times of difficulty (e.g. helping you with your homework)
- such assistance is of psychological value to the self but is not a call for psychological support.

#### Typical responses:

##### 2a) Friends seen as serving needs of self

If you don't have a friend, you don't have anyone to talk to.  
He plays the games you want to play.

##### 2b) Assistance in times of trouble

He helps you push your bike up the hill.  
He helps you with your homework.

#### Stage 3 - Fairweather cooperation

##### Characteristics/Gains

- awareness of interpersonal perspectives as reciprocal:
- able to adopt the second-person perspective - i.e. to see the self as a subject to the other
- psychological awareness includes the ability to take into account another's motives, thoughts and feelings and to be aware that the other is similarly able to consider the self's covert psychological dimensions
- capable of reciprocity of thoughts and feelings e.g.

- aware that both parties must adjust to coordinate the likes and dislikes of self and other (find a game you both like)
- friendship is "fairweather": friends are friends when they are "getting along" but during periods of fighting are no longer friends
- reciprocity is also "fairweather" or context specific i.e. an agreement around specific activities, incidents or issues
- psychological awareness includes the concept of psychological assistance from a friend
- part of a friend's function is to help the self transform one's psychological state
- dim awareness that people need friends for the social relationship itself and
- a vague awareness of intimacy

#### Limitations

- reciprocal or second-person perspective is limited to being able to view one person's perspective at a time
- not able to maintain in consciousness two perspectives simultaneously
- intimacy is one-sided (not mutual) and superficial
- agreement between two friends limited to activities but no mention of deeper bonds of affection
- concerns are more for immediate activity or the alleviation of the self's boredom or loneliness
- main limitation of this stage: subject still sees the basic purpose of reciprocal awareness as the services of the self's interest rather than the service of mutual concerns

#### Typical responses:

3a) Friends seen as engineers of psychological change

They cheer you up when you're sad.

Help you from getting bored: you feel lonesome if you're not with a friend.

3b) Friends seen as validating one's self value

You need people to think you're good.

You need people to like you.

3c) Reveal true inner attitudes

A good friend will tell you what he's really thinking.

3d) Unelaborated mention of talk about your problems

Sometimes you need someone to talk to, to confide in.

3e) Unilateral trust, dependency

A friend is someone you can count on.

3f) Merging of likes, shared activities

A good friend is someone who likes to do the same things as you; you like the same music.

A friend is someone you go to school with, you go out together on week-ends.

Stage 4 - Intimate and mutually shared relationshipsCharacteristics/Gains

- able to adopt third person perspective i.e.
- able to abstractly step outside of the interpersonal interaction and simultaneously coordinate the perspectives of each party in the interaction
- focus is on the relationship itself as opposed to each individual separately



- stage characterized by intimate mutual sharing: a friend is someone with whom there is a bonding of affection and intimacy
- gain is towards a notion of collaboration for mutual interest and sharing
- friendship functions as a general mutual support over a period of time

#### Limitations

- friends are possessive of one another
- over-emphasis on the two person clique

#### Typical Responses:

##### 4a) Mutual companionship and intimacy

Your friend listens to your problems and you do the same for her.

##### 4b) Mutual support

You help your friend and he helps you.

##### 4c) Mutual trust

You trust your friend and you know that she trusts you.

##### 4d) Compatibility of ideas, interests mutual concern

A good friend shares some of your values and concerns. You agree on issues that are important.

#### Stage 5 - Autonomous interdependent friendships

##### Characteristics/Gains

- autonomous interdependence: friendships are viewed as open relational systems
- people viewed psychologically as having complex and sometimes conflicting needs which can be met by different types of relationships e.g. close intimate relations, business relations etc.
- both dependence and independence are valued: friends rely on each

other for psychological support, but each person accepts the other's need to establish other relations and to grow through such experiences.

- a close friendship also provides one with a sense of personal identity:

- a friend may act as a mirror to the self by revealing both one's strengths and weaknesses and

- by providing feedback not usually found in more superficial forms of interpersonal relations

Typical Responses:

5a) Sense of personal identity

Through friends, people realize more about themselves, what they think and how they feel.

5b) Support yet freedom

Friends allow you to be dependent yet independent at the same time: don't tie you down but are there when needed.

APPENDIX C

Questionnaire sur l'amitié

## L'AMITIE

Lucie et Johanne sont de bonnes amies depuis l'âge de cinq ans. Maintenant, elles sont à l'école Secondaire et Johanne essaie d'être choisie pour jouer dans une pièce de théâtre à l'école. Comme d'habitude, elle est très nerveuse au sujet de sa performance, mais Lucie est venue l'encourager et lui donner un support moral. Néanmoins, Johanne est inquiète que la nouvelle venue, Claire, obtienne le rôle. La nouvelle, Claire, est venue féliciter Johanne pour sa bonne performance et elle a demandé aux filles si elle pouvait se joindre à elles pour le dîner. Tout de suite, Lucie et Claire semblent très bien s'entendre ensemble. Elles parlent de l'endroit d'où vient Claire, et des choses qu'elle peut faire dans sa nouvelle école. Johanne, par contre, ne semble pas aimer beaucoup Claire. Elle la trouve un peu trop arrogante, et peut-être est-elle un peu jalouse de toute l'attention que Lucie donne à Claire.

Lorsque Claire les quitte, Johanne et Lucie décident de se réunir le samedi suivant parce que Johanne voudrait parler à Lucie d'un problème qu'elle a. Mais la journée suivante, Claire appelle Lucie pour lui demander de venir avec elle à Ottawa pour assister à une pièce de théâtre ce samedi-là.

Lucie ne sait pas trop quoi faire. Elle aurait immédiatement sauté sur l'occasion d'aller avec Claire, mais elle a déjà promis d'aller chez Johanne. Elle se dit que Johanne pourrait peut-être comprendre et être contente que Lucie ait la chance de faire le voyage, ou d'un autre côté elle pourrait sentir qu'elle perd une bonne amie alors qu'elle en a réellement besoin.

## Questionnaire sur l'Amitié

Pré-enquête

- a. As-tu une bonne idée de ce qui s'est passé dans l'histoire?
- b. As-tu un bon ami? Quel est son nom?

I. Formation

1. Est-ce important un bon ami? (Motifs)
2. Pourquoi a-t-on besoin d'un bon ami? (Motifs)
3. Est-ce facile ou difficile de se faire un bon ami? Pourquoi est-ce facile (ou difficile)? (Mécanismes)
4. Qu'est-ce qui fait qu'une personne est un bon ami? (Qualités)

II. Rapprochement et Intimité

5. Quel genre d'amitié penses-tu qu'ont Lucie et Johanne? Qu'est-ce qu'un bon ami? Quel genre de choses de bons amis connaissent-ils l'un sur l'autre?
6. Quel genre de choses de bons amis se disent-ils lorsqu'ils sont ensemble? Est-ce que des amis ordinaires et de bons amis parlent du même genre de choses? Est-ce qu'ils discutent de problèmes?
7. Quel est la différence entre le genre d'amitié que Lucie et Johanne ont, et celui de Lucie et Claire? Quelle est la différence entre une bonne amitié et une amitié ordinaire?
8. Vaut-il mieux n'avoir qu'un bon ami ou encore plusieurs amis ordinaires? Pourquoi?

III. Confiance et Réciprocité

9. Comment peux-tu montrer à quelqu'un que tu es son meilleur ami? Est-il important de s'entraider entre bons amis? Pourquoi?
10. Est-ce que la confiance est un élément important entre bons amis? Pourquoi?
11. Qu'est-ce que cela veut dire, pour toi, la confiance? Est-ce que cela veut seulement dire de garder des secrets? Est-ce que cela veut dire quelque chose de plus profond?

#### IV. Jalousie

12. Penses-tu que Johanne est jalouse? Pourquoi est-elle jalouse?
13. Q'est-ce que cela veut dire "être jaloux"? Est-ce que la jalousie peut nuire à une amitié?

#### V. Résolution de conflits

14. Des amis peuvent-ils se chicaner? Comment peuvent-ils faire une telle chose alors qu'ils sont bons amis? Pendant la chicane sont-ils de bons amis?
15. Comment se résolvent de telles chicanes entre bons amis?
16. Quelles sont des sujets de chicanes entre bons amis? Quel genre de choses cause des chicanes entre bons amis?

#### VI. Séparation

17. Qu'est-ce qui amène de bons amis à se séparer? Qui décide que l'amitié est terminée?
18. Que perds-tu lorsque tu perds ton meilleur ami?
19. Pourquoi est-ce que des amis vont parfois s'éloigner l'un de l'autre? Qu'est-ce que ça veut dire de s'éloigner d'un bon ami?

APPENDIX D

Pupil Evaluation Inventory





8. Ceux qui font les clowns et font rire les autres.
9. Ceux qui commencent la chicane à propos de rien.
10. Ceux qui ne semblent jamais s'amuser
11. Ceux qui sont bouleversés quand ils ont à répondre aux questions en classe.
12. Ceux qui disent aux autres enfants quoi faire.
13. Ceux qui sont d'habitude les derniers choisis pour participer à des activités de groupe.
14. Ceux que tout le monde aime.

LES AUTRES


MOI

	3 (8-17)
	3 (18-27)
	3 (28-37)
	3 (38-47)
	3 (48-57)
	3 (58-67)
	3 (68-77)

	LES AUTRES				MOI	
15. Ceux qui s'embêtent tout le temps et se mettent en difficultés.						4 (8-17)
16. Ceux qui rient des gens.						4 (18-27)
17. Ceux qui ont très peu d'amis.						4 (28-37)
18. Ceux qui font des choses bizarres.						4 (38-47)
19. Ceux qui sont vos meilleurs amis.						4 (48-57)
20. Ceux qui ennuiant les gens qui essaient de travailler.						4 (58-67)
21. Ceux qui se mettent en colère quand ça ne marche pas comme ils veulent.						4 (68-77)

22. Ceux qui ne portent pas attention au professeur.
23. Ceux qui sont impolis avec le professeur.
24. Ceux qui sont malheureux ou tristes.
25. Ceux qui sont particulièrement gentils.
26. Ceux qui se comportent comme des bébés.
27. Ceux qui sont méchants et cruels avec les autres enfants.
28. Ceux qui souvent ne veulent pas jouer.

LES AUTRES


MOI


5 (8-17)

5 (18-27)

5 (28-37)

5 (38-47)

5 (48-57)

5 (58-67)

5 (68-77)

	LES AUTRES				MOI			
29. Ceux qui vous regardent de travers.								6 (8-17)
30. Ceux qui veulent faire les fins devant la classe.								6 (18-27)
31. Ceux qui disent qu'ils peuvent battre tout le monde.								6 (28-37)
32. Ceux que l'on ne remarque beaucoup.								6 (38-47)
33. Ceux qui exagèrent et racontent des histoires.								6 (48-57)
34. Ceux qui se plaignent toujours et qui ne sont jamais contents.								6 (58-67)
35. Ceux qui semblent toujours comprendre ce qui se passe.								6 (68-77)

APPENDIX E

Parental Control Measure - Child Form

## Parental Control Measure - Child Form

Sexe: \_\_\_\_\_ I.D.: \_\_\_\_\_

Nous sommes intéressés par la façon que les parents parviennent à faire faire des choses par leurs enfants. Par exemple, imagines que tu regardes une émission de télévision que tu aimes. Ton père te demande de faire quelque chose tout de suite. Il reste encore une demi-heure avant la fin de ton émission de télévision. Tu lui réponds qu'aussitôt que ton émission sera finie, tu vas faire ce qu'il t'a demandé.

Voici une liste de choses que les parents font quelques fois dans un cas comme celui-ci. Lis chaque item attentivement et dis-nous à peu près combien de fois ton père fait chacune de ces choses, en encerclant le numéro approprié.

- |   | 1      | 2                 | 3           | 4                     | 5       | 6                   | 7        |
|---|--------|-------------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------|---------------------|----------|
|   | Jamais | presque<br>jamais | quelquefois | la moitié<br>du temps | souvent | presque<br>toujours | toujours |
| 1. Il te frappe ou te donne une fessée.   | 1      | 2                 | 3           | 4                     | 5       | 6                   | 7        |
| 2. Il ne te parle pas pendant un certain temps.   | 1      | 2                 | 3           | 4                     | 5       | 6                   | 7        |
| 3. Il te prend par le bras et t'amène faire ce qu'il veut.  | 1      | 2                 | 3           | 4                     | 5       | 6                   | 7        |
| 4. Il t'explique que ce qu'il t'a demandé est plus important que la télévision.                       | 1      | 2                 | 3           | 4                     | 5       | 6                   | 7        |
| 5. Il te dit "Comment aimerais-tu que je te dise la même chose?"                                      | 1      | 2                 | 3           | 4                     | 5       | 6                   | 7        |
| 6. Il te dit que tu peux regarder la télévision, mais de ne pas venir plus tard pour t'excuser.       | 1      | 2                 | 3           | 4                     | 5       | 6                   | 7        |
| 7. Il te dit que tu peux regarder la télévision, mais de ne pas venir le voir si tu as des problèmes. | 1      | 2                 | 3           | 4                     | 5       | 6                   | 7        |
| 8. Il te dit que tu ne pourras pas sortir pendant les jours suivants.                                 | 1      | 2                 | 3           | 4                     | 5       | 6                   | 7        |
| 9. Il te dit qu'il le ferait lui-même s'il se sentait mieux ou moins fatigué.                         | 1      | 2                 | 3           | 4                     | 5       | 6                   | 7        |

## Situation 2

Il arrive, quelque fois, que des enfants soient insouciants et brisent de la vaisselle ou une lampe, ou répandent quelque chose sur le tapis ou le divan, ou quelque chose du genre. Lorsque cela se produit, les parents font ou disent quelque chose.

S'il-te-plaît, lis chacun des items qui suivent attentivement, et dis-nous à peu près combien de fois ton père fait chacune de ces choses, en encerclant le numéro approprié.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Jamais	presque jamais	quelquefois	la moitié du temps	souvent	presque toujours	toujours
1. Il te frappe ou te donne une fessée.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
2. Il te dit que tu vas perdre ton allocation ou un autre privilège si tu le fais encore.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
3. Il ne te parle pas pendant un certain temps.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
4. Il te dit qu'il est triste et t'explique comment tu pourrais faire plus attention la prochaine fois.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
5. Il te prend par le bras et t'amène nettoyer ton dégat.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
6. Il te dit de l'aider afin que tu aies une idée de la somme de travail nécessaire pour garder une maison propre.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
7. Il ne te dit presque rien, mais t'ignore pour un bo it de temps.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
8. Il te demande de partir avant que tu fasses plus de dommage.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
9. Il te dit: "Tu devrais porter attention a ce que tu fais, parce que cela peut coûter cher à la longue."						1 2 3 4 5 6 7	

## Situation 3

Il arrive quelque fois que des enfants répondent ou sont impolis envers leurs parents. Lorsque cela se produit, les parents font ou disent quelque chose.

S'il-te-plaît, lis chacun des items qui suivent attentivement, et dis-nous à peu près combien de fois ton père fait chacune de ces choses, en encerclant le numéro approprié.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Jamais	presque jamais	quelquefois	la moitié du temps	souvent	presque toujours	toujours
1. Il te frappe ou te donne une fessée.							
2. Il ne te laisse pas avoir quelque chose que tu aimes, ou faire quelque chose que tu aimes.							
3. Il te dit que si tu lui parles sur ce ton, que cela ne l'encourage pas à te répondre calmement.							
4. Il te dit que tu vas recevoir une fessée si tu lui parles sur ce ton encore une fois.							
5. Il te dit qu'il n'aime pas que tu lui parles sur ce ton, et qu'il desire que tu lui dises calmement ce qui te tracasse la prochaine fois.							
6. Il te dit qu'il ne veut pas te parler si tu continues à agir de la sorte.							
7. Il te montre qu'il n'aime pas ça en ne te parlant pas pour un certain temps.							
8. Il te dit: "J'en ai assez de toi".							
9. Il te montre que cela ne t'aide pas à obtenir ce que tu veux.							



## Situation 4

Il arrive souvent que des enfants ne font pas leur devoirs et étudient leurs leçons aussi bien qu'il/elle le pourrait. Lorsque cela se produit, les parents font ou disent quelque chose.

S'il-te-plaît, lis chacun des items qui suivent attentivement, et dis-nous à peu près combien de fois ton père fait chacune de ces choses, en encerclant le numéro approprié.

- |  | 1      | 2                 | 3           | 4                     | 5       | 6                   | 7        |
|--|--------|-------------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------|---------------------|----------|
|  | Jamais | presque<br>jamais | quelquefois | la moitié<br>du temps | souvent | presque<br>toujours | toujours |
| 1. Il ne te parle pas pendant un certain temps.  | 1      | 2                 | 3           | 4                     | 5       | 6                   | 7        |
| 2. Il te donne moins d'argent pour ton allocation, ou il t'enlève quelque chose que tu aimes.  | 1      | 2                 | 3           | 4                     | 5       | 6                   | 7        |
| 3. Il te dit que si tu ne fais pas tes devoirs et tes leçons, il va te donner une fessée.  | 1      | 2                 | 3           | 4                     | 5       | 6                   | 7        |
| 4. Il te dit que tu dois rester dans ta chambre tant et aussi longtemps que tes devoirs et leçons ne seront pas faits à sa satisfaction. | 1      | 2                 | 3           | 4                     | 5       | 6                   | 7        |
| 5. Il t'explique que c'est toi et non pas lui qui va bénéficier d'un bon travail à l'école.  | 1      | 2                 | 3           | 4                     | 5       | 6                   | 7        |
| 6. Il te regarde sévèrement et s'en va.  | 1      | 2                 | 3           | 4                     | 5       | 6                   | 7        |
| 7. Il te dit que tu peux ne pas faire ton travail, mais de ne pas venir le voir si tu as besoin d'aide.                                  | 1      | 2                 | 3           | 4                     | 5       | 6                   | 7        |
| 8. Il t'explique que ton futur dépends d'un travail d'école bien fait.   | 1      | 2                 | 3           | 4                     | 5       | 6                   | 7        |
| 9. Il te dit que ta conduite l'inquiète, parce qu'il croit que tu peux faire mieux.  | 1      | 2                 | 3           | 4                     | 5       | 6                   | 7        |

APPENDIX F

WISC-R

## WISC-R

VOCABULAIRE  
arrêt après 5 fautes consécutives

1.	Couteau	
2.	Parapluie	
3.	Horloge	
4.	Chapeau	
5.	Bicycle	
6.	Clou	
7.	Alphabet	
8.	Ane	
9.	Voleur	
10.	Unir	
11.	Brave	
12.	Diamant	
13.	Gager	
14.	Ennui	
15.	Isoler	
16.	Absurdité	
17.	Prévenir	
18.	Contagieux	
19.	Fable	
20.	Hasardeux	
21.	Emigrer	
22.	Strophe	
23.	Mante	
24.	Espionnage	
25.	Clocher	
26.	Rivalité	
27.	Amendement	
28.	Contraire	
29.	Affliction	
30.	Oblitérer	
31.	Imminent	
32.	Dilatoire	
TOTAL		<input type="text"/>

APPENDIX G

WAIS-R

WAIS-R  
VOCABULAIRE

1. Lit	
2. Bateau	
3. Dollars	
4. Hiver	
5. Déjeuner	
6. Réparer	
7. Tissus	
8. Assembler	
9. Enorme	
10. Eviter	
11. Phrase	
12. Consommer	
13. Régulariser	
14. Terminer	
15. Commencer	
16. Domestique	
17. Paisible	
18. Réfléchir	
19. Désigner	
20. Réticent	
21. Obstruer	
22. Sanctuaire	
23. Compassion	
24. Evasif	
25. Remords	
26. Périmètre	
27. Engendrer	
28. Incomparable	
29. Courage	
30. Tangible	
31. Plagier	
32. Sinistre	
33. Embêter	
34. Audacieux	
35. Erudit	
	TOTAL

APPENDIX H

Marlowe Crowne Social Desirability Scale  
(Inventaire des réactions personnelles)

## INVENTAIRE DES REACTIONS PERSONNELLES

Voici quelques phrases portant sur des attitudes et des opinions personnelles. Lisez chaque phrase et décidez si elle exprime quelque chose qui est vrai ou faux de vous-même.

VRAI    FAUX

- |     |     |  |
|-----|-----|--|
| ___ | ___ | 1. Je n'hésite jamais à offrir mon aide à une personne en difficulté.  |
| ___ | ___ | 2. Parfois, je trouve ça difficile de continuer mon travail si on ne m'encourage pas.                        |
| ___ | ___ | 3. Je n'ai jamais détesté quelqu'un.   |
| ___ | ___ | 4. J'ai déjà eu peur de ne pas pouvoir réussir dans la vie.  |
| ___ | ___ | 5. Des fois, ça m'irrite quand les choses ne se passent pas comme je le voudrais.                            |
| ___ | ___ | 6. Je prends toujours soin de ma tenue vestimentaire.  |
| ___ | ___ | 7. Je me conduis aussi bien à table à la maison qu'au restaurant.  |
| ___ | ___ | 8. S'il m'était possible d'entrer au cinéma sans payer et sans être vu(e), je le ferais probablement.        |
| ___ | ___ | 9. Il m'est arrivé quelques fois d'abandonner un ouvrage parce que je ne me pensais pas assez bon.           |
| ___ | ___ | 10. J'aime bien commérer de temps en temps.  |
| ___ | ___ | 11. J'ai déjà eu envie de m'en prendre à des personnes d'autorité même si je savais qu'elles avaient raison. |
| ___ | ___ | 12. Peu importe avec qui je suis, je sais toujours bien écouter.   |
| ___ | ___ | 13. Je me souviens d'avoir fait semblant d'être malade pour éviter quelque chose.                            |
| ___ | ___ | 14. J'ai déjà profité de la bonne volonté de quelqu'un.  |
| ___ | ___ | 15. J'ai toujours été prêt(e) à reconnaître mes erreurs.   |
| ___ | ___ | 16. J'essaie toujours de mettre en pratique ce que je dis.   |

VRAI FAUX

- |     |     |  |
|-----|-----|--|
| ___ | ___ | 17. Je peux m'entendre avec tout le monde, même avec les gens prétentieux et désagréables.             |
| ___ | ___ | 18. Je suis parfois porté(e) à prendre ma revanche sur quelqu'un plutôt que de pardonner et d'oublier. |
| ___ | ___ | 19. Je ne suis pas gêné(e) de reconnaître mon ignorance sur certains sujets.                           |
| ___ | ___ | 20. Je suis toujours poli(e), même envers les gens qui ne le sont pas.                                 |
| ___ | ___ | 21. J'ai parfois insisté fortement pour que les choses se fassent à ma manière.                        |
| ___ | ___ | 22. J'ai déjà eu le goût de détruire des choses.   |
| ___ | ___ | 23. Je ne pourrais pas supporter l'idée de laisser quelqu'un se faire punir à ma place.                |
| ___ | ___ | 24. Ça ne me dérange pas de rendre un service à quelqu'un qui m'en a déjà rendu un.                    |
| ___ | ___ | 25. Je ne suis pas agacé(e) quand on exprime des opinions très différentes des miennes.                |
| ___ | ___ | 26. Il m'est déjà arrivé d'être jaloux(se) de la chance des autres.                                    |
| ___ | ___ | 27. J'ai très rarement eu envie de chicaner quelqu'un.   |
| ___ | ___ | 28. Parfois, ça m'achale quand on me demande des faveurs.  |
| ___ | ___ | 29. Je ne me suis jamais senti(e) puni(e) sans raison.   |
| ___ | ___ | 30. Je suis parfois porté(e) à croire que les gens malchanceux n'ont que ce qu'ils méritent.           |
| ___ | ___ | 31. Je n'ai jamais volontairement dit quelque chose pour faire de la peine à quelqu'un.                |
| ___ | ___ | 32. Je ne fais jamais un grand voyage sans vérifier la sécurité de mon automobile.                     |