



**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.

**Relationship Between
Daughters' Perceptions of Their Mothers and
Mothers' Self-Perceptions**

Estelle Spector

**A Thesis
in
The Department
of
Psychology**

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

May 1989

© Estelle Spector



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 0-315-51335-7

ABSTRACT

Relationship Between Daughters' Perceptions of
Their Mothers and Mothers' Self-Perceptions.

Estelle Spector

This study was designed to examine perceptions between mothers and daughters and to determine the relationship between daughters' perceptions of their mothers and the mothers' self-concept and self-esteem. Subjects were 51 anglophone, middle class mothers between 35 and 47 years, and their two children. This study's main focus was on first born children, including males and females between 10 and 19 years of age. Socioeconomic and working status of mothers were controlled variables. Problematic families were ruled out, based on mothers' assessment of family functioning in the General Scale of the Family Assessment Measure (Skinner, Steinhauer & Santa Barbara, 1984). Mothers were given a multidimensional self-report measure, the Adult Self-Perception Profile (ASPP)(Messer & Harter, 1986), to evaluate their self-concept and self-esteem. Mothers rated the quality of their mother/child relationship in the Dyadic Relationship Scale (DRS) of the Family Assessment Measure (Skinner, Steinhauer & Santa-Barbara, 1984). Children rated the quality of their mother/child relationship in the DRS, and assessed their mothers' competence in the domains of self-concept listed in the ASPP, and their mothers' overall worth. Pearson Correlations measured perceptual relationships between mothers and their first born children. Statistically significant correlations indicated that, in this sample, mothers and daughters, compared with mothers and sons, shared perceptions A) about the mothers' competence in three self-concept domains (Job Competence, Athletic Ability and Humor), B) between mothers'

assessment of competence for Intimate Relations and daughters' evaluation of mothers' overall worth, and C) between mothers' self-esteem and daughters' assessment of mothers' competence for Athletic Ability. Mothers' and daughters' perceptions about the quality of their mutual relationship were significantly correlated but not significantly different from ratings by mothers and sons. There were no statistically significant correlations A) between mothers' self-esteem and childrens' perceptions of their mothers' overall worth, and B) between mothers' self-concept or self-esteem ratings and either daughters' or sons' evaluations of the quality of their mother/child relationship. Directions for future research are discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To my advisor, Dorothy Markiewicz, who gave me the freedom to explore and learn in my own way. Her understanding of the uniqueness of the adult learning process contributed to my personal growth and enabled us to work well together. Her willingness to support my journey required much patience and is greatly appreciated.

To my committee members, Lisa Serbin and Dolores Gold, who were always supportive and available despite their busy schedules. Their clear, succinct comments and sage advice provided a valuable focus when I needed it most.

To my husband and very best friend, Charles, who encouraged me to begin this journey, and who shared with me its high and low points. His proof reading, critical comments and suggestions helped me to express my thoughts more clearly. I am also deeply grateful for his heroic efforts to keep our family running smoothly throughout various, unanticipated crises. His love and unfailing support enabled me to complete this thesis.

To my three children: My daughter, Shira, whose relentless questioning of our own relationship inspired the topic of my thesis. Our very special mother/daughter relationship has given me the energy and impetus to proceed with confidence in this area of research. My son Mitchell, whose practical nature has consistently reminded me of the important fact that I am, first and foremost, a mother. In addition, his technical assistance with my computer equipment is much appreciated. My son Avi, who helped me to decide on the measures for the younger children in my study. His willingness to try out each and every questionnaire and to appraise their relative merits or shortcomings helped make the data

collection an enjoyable process for the children involved in the study.

To my late mother-in-law, Jennie Spector, whose pride in my achievements, sense of humour, unsolicited support with household chores, and loving friendship, will never be forgotten.

To my mentor and friend, Raye Kass, who has been an inspiration to me since our first classroom encounter in undergraduate school. Raye has continued to be available as a teacher, sounding board and good friend. Her moral support, thought provoking questions and critical comments have always pushed me over the next hurdle.

To my friend, Betty Myers, who has always given me her friendship, even when I was too harassed to reciprocate. Her insightful questions and comments contributed to the clarity of the finished product.

To the families who participated so willingly in my research. They made time for an unknown stranger, welcomed me into their homes and gave warmly of themselves. Our informal conversations often provided valuable insights into my research. Without their cooperation, there would be no thesis. I am greatly indebted to each subject who participated in both the pilot study and the final research project.

To the secretaries in the Psychology Department for their technical assistance in the preparation of this thesis. I am particularly grateful to Lauraine Gagnon and Shirley Black for their patient guidance and invaluable expertise, which often exceeded the call of duty.

Last but not least, to the funding agencies whose financial support assisted me in this research project: The Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC Special M.A. Scholarship Award no. 458-86-1540) and Fonds FCAR (Research Grant, Concours: B1, No. du Comité: 08A).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract.....	iii
Acknowledgements.....	v
Table of Contents.....	vii
List of Tables.....	ix
List of Appendices.....	x
Introduction.....	1
Self-Concept and Self-Esteem.....	2
Interpersonal Relationships: Application to Mother/Daughter Dyads.....	5
Social Developmental Processes of Adult Women.....	6
Mother/Daughter Relationships.....	10
Family Process: Social Interaction in a Mother/Daughter Subsystem.....	13
Socioeconomic Status (SES) and Self-Concept and Self-Esteem.....	15
Conclusion and Hypotheses.....	17
Method.....	19
Subjects.....	19
Measures.....	20
Procedure.....	28
Design and Statistical Analysis.....	30
Results.....	32

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONT'D)

	Page
General Demographic Results.....	32
Examination of Hypotheses.....	33
Domains of Most/Less Importance for Mothers in the Domains of Self-Concept (ASPP) and Childrens' Perceptions of Mothers' Competence/Lack of Competence in the Domains of Self-Concept.....	45
Additional Analyses.....	47
Discussion.....	49
References	66
Appendices.....	81

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Table 1

Zero-Order Correlations Between Mothers' Perceptions in 11 Domains of Self-Concept and First Born Daughters' and First Born Sons' Respective Evaluations of Mothers' Competence in those 11 Domains (ASPP).....	36
---	----

Table 2

Zero-Order Correlations Between Mothers' Perceptions in 11 Domains of Self-Concept and First Born Daughters' and First Born Sons' Respective Evaluations of Mothers' Overall Worth.....	37
---	----

Table 3

Zero-Order Correlations Between Mothers' Perception of Global Self-Worth and First Born Daughters' and First Born Sons' Respective Evaluations of Their Mothers' Competence in 11 Domains of Self-Concept and Their Mothers' Overall Worth (ASPP).....	39
--	----

Table 4

Zero-Order Correlations Between Mothers' Self-Concept (ASPP) and First Born Daughters' and First Born Sons' Respective Assessments of the Quality of the Mother/Child Relationship (DRS).....	44
---	----

LIST OF APPENDICES

	Page
Appendix A	
The General Scale.....	81
Appendix B	
Dyadic Relationship Scale Revised Forms.....	90
Appendix B-1	
Dyadic Relationship Scale Extract, Instruction Manual.....	112
Appendix C	
Contents of Dyadic Scale.....	115
Appendix D	
Contents of Domains of Adult Self-Perception Profile (ASPP).....	118
Appendix E	
The Adult Self-Perception Profile (ASPP).....	121
Appendix F	
Childrens' Subjective Rating Form "Competence Ratings for Your Mother".....	129
Appendix G	
Four Factor Index of Social Status Rating Form.....	132
Appendix H	
Letter of Explanation of Research.....	135

LIST OF APPENDICES (CONT'D)

	Page
Appendix I	
Consent Forms	
a) Mothers and Children.....	137
b) Adolescents 18 years and Over.....	138
Appendix J	
SES Information Questionnaire.....	139
Appendix K	
Mothers with High Scores in Social Desirability and Defensiveness Scales.....	141
Appendix L	
Zero-Order Correlations Between Mothers' Perceptions in 11 Domains of Self-Concept, Global Self-Worth (ASPP), and Mothers' Social Desirability Scores (GS).....	143
Appendix M	
Intercorrelations for Mothers' Evaluation of the Quality of Their Relationship with Their First Born Children in the Seven Domains of the Dyadic Relationship Scale (DRS).....	145
Appendix N	
Intercorrelations for First Born Childrens' Evaluation of the Quality of Their Relationship with Their Mothers in the Seven Domains of the Dyadic Relationship Scale (DRS).....	147
Appendix O	
Mothers' Rank Ordered Choices for Domains of Most Importance in the Adult Self-Perception Profile (ASPP).....	149

LIST OF APPENDICES (CONT'D)

Page

Appendix P

Mothers' Rank Ordered Choices for Domains of Least Importance in the Adult Self-Perception Profile (ASPP).....	151
---	------------

Appendix Q

Daughters' Rank Ordered Choices for Mothers' Most Competent Domains in the Adult Self-Perception Profile (ASPP).....	153
---	------------

Appendix R

Daughters' Rank Ordered Choices for Mothers' Least Competent Domains in the Adult Self-Perception Profile (ASPP).....	155
--	------------

Appendix S

Sons' Rank Ordered Choices for Mothers' Most Competent Domains in the Adult Self-Perception Profile (ASPP).....	157
--	------------

Appendix T

Sons' Rank Ordered Choices for Mothers' Least Competent Domains in the Adult Self-Perception Profile (ASPP).....	159
---	------------

Appendix U

Intercorrelations, by Birth Order of Child, Between Childrens' Perceptions of Their Mothers' Competence and Overall Worth (ASPP), and Childrens' Assessment of the quality of their Mother/Child Relationship (DRS).....	161
---	------------

Appendix V

Mean Scores for Mothers in the 12 Domains of the Adult Self-Perception Profile (ASPP).....	163
---	------------

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to a) examine the shared perceptions between mothers and their daughters and b) determine the extent of the relationships, if any, between the daughters' perceptions of their mothers and the mothers' self-concept and self-esteem. Mother/daughter relationships were examined within the context of normal social developmental processes occurring in intact middle class family settings.

Mothers and their daughters are likely to be experiencing transitions and/or emotional upheavals in their respective life cycles which may be reflected in their mutual social interactions. A cognitive orientation, such as described in Social Learning Theory (Bandura, 1977), would predict that their interpretations of such reciprocal social interactions will influence both the mothers' and daughters' self-references, i.e. self-concept and self-esteem. However, the focus of this study is on the mothers' cognitive process as it relates to mother/daughter dyadic interactions.

Family and developmental theorists have described a reciprocal model of influence between parents and children as the basis for understanding the processes of social development in the family (Satir, 1972; Minuchin, 1974, 1987; Thomas & Chess, 1983; Madanes, 1987). Despite this knowledge, most research on parent/child relationships in the family has focused on a model of unilateral influence deriving from the parent (Mishler & Waxler, 1968; Skolnick & Skolnick, 1971; McDonald, 1977; Vezina, 1980; Phillips, 1981; Walker & Thompson, 1982; Sholomskas &

Axelrod, 1986; Madanes, 1987). Several authors (Bengtson & Troll, 1978; Hartup, 1978; Klein, Jorgensen & Miller, 1978; Lerner & Spanier, 1978; Crook, Raskin, & Eliot, 1981) have mentioned that a reciprocal model should not be overlooked, but most research has failed to pursue the issue beyond recognition of its potential. Since there is no distinct body of research literature on this topic, the rationale for the present study is based upon an integration of the psychological research from the following areas: Self-Concept and Self-Esteem, Interpersonal Relationships, Social Developmental Processes of Adult Women, Mother/Daughter Relationships, Family Processes, and Socioeconomic Status.

Self-Concept and Self-Esteem

Self-concept can be conceived of as cognitions about the self which are the metaphorical outcome of an information processing model (Markus, 1977; Lynch, 1981). The tendency in the psychological literature to use self-concept and self-esteem as interchangeable terms has sometimes resulted in confusion. It is important, therefore, to make a clear distinction between the two terms. Self-concept in the present study refers to the specific cognitions one holds about the self in the various roles one assumes, while self-esteem refers to the evaluative aspect of those cognitions, i.e. one's self-worth (Rosenberg, 1979; Stanwyck, 1983).

The concepts relating to the development of self, expressed first by Kelly (1955) and subsequently by Markus (1977) are basically similar. Personal Construct Theory (Kelly, 1955) stated that an individual actively strives for self-understanding through unique interpretations of

ongoing life events. Personal constructs are defined as patterns of thought which are ways of construing the self. They may be altered or revised to provide better comprehension and are uniquely individualistic.

Markus described self-schemata as the formation of a cognitive structure about the self resulting from "any attempt to organize, summarize, or explain one's own personal behavior in a particular situation" (Markus, 1977, P.63). She contended that we selectively attend to those aspects of our social environment which are most salient. The saliency of an experience is dependent upon the context or situational importance of that event in time.

In addition, all schema are considered to be dynamic, continually changing, and updated, as an individual progresses through time. Once formed, schema are assembled in building block fashion and influence the interpretation of incoming information and consequent behavior (Markus, 1980). This would mean that self-schemata regarding domains of self-concept are dynamic and open to alteration and/or change. At the same time the saliency of incoming information (responsible for the change or alteration) is influenced by attitudes and perceptions which are predicated upon prior interpersonal experiences.

Markus differs from Kelly in that she makes the important observation that self-relevant information takes precedence over all other sources of information. Although Markus and Kelly do not differentiate between the sexes, it may be stated that any reciprocal interchange of self-relevant information occurring specifically between mothers and daughters can play an important role in the construction and/or alteration of the mothers' self-concept/self-esteem.

It is difficult to measure such abstractions as self-concept and self-esteem. The attempts to do so have generally taken the form of self-report questionnaires in which individuals answer a variety of questions pertaining to how they perceive themselves. Self-concept/self-esteem is then derived by compilation of an aggregate weighting of the totality of the scores (Fitts, 1965, 1981; Rosenberg, 1965; Coopersmith, 1965, 1981; Offer, 1981; Piers, 1984).

By contrast, other researchers have clearly differentiated, conceptually and operationally, between self-concept and self-esteem (Harter, 1983, 1985; Messer & Harter, 1986). Self-concept has been defined in terms of a multidimensional model composed of independent self-relevant domains. Each domain is perceived as an autonomous component of self-concept and is expected to vary in importance as an individual matures and experiences changes in his/her personal value system. Messer and Harter (1986) have defined 11 adult domains which include cognitions about the physical and psychological aspects of the self. They are as follows: Sociability, Job Competence, Nurturance, Athletic Ability, Appearance, Adequate Provider, Morality, Household Management, Intimate Relations, Intelligence, and Sense of Humor. It is important to note that some of these domains are particularly sensitive to issues relating to women.

Furthermore, Harter perceived Global Self-Worth to be an independent measure of an individual's satisfaction with himself/herself as a person and the quality of his/her present life style (Harter 1983, 1985). Such theory has been operationalized in a recent research measure by Messer and Harter (1986) entitled the Adult Self-Perception Profile.

Since Messer & Harter's (1986) multidimensional model is particularly sensitive to issues that concern women, it was selected to measure self-concept and self-esteem in the present study. Self-Concept and self-esteem are hypothesized to be separate cognitive outcomes of a process of social growth and development. The term self-esteem is used interchangeably with the terms global self-worth and self-worth.

Interpersonal Relationships : Application to Mother/Daughter Dyads

The importance of interpersonal relationships in the development of the self has been emphasized by the authors of Interpersonal Theory (Sullivan, 1953), Social Phenomenological Theory (Laing, 1966, 1969), Personal Construct Theory (Kelly, 1955), Self-Theory (Kohut, 1983, 1986), and Person Centered Theory (Rogers, 1961).

Sullivan postulated that social development throughout the life span, from infancy onwards, occurs due to the influence of other people, so that the central purpose in life is a reciprocal process of relating to others. Early self-knowledge resulting from interpersonal relationships becomes the foundation upon which later constructions about the self are superimposed (Sullivan, 1953). If so, then interpersonal relationships in a mother/daughter dyad, which are primary and crucial to their individual social developmental tasks, can play a role in the continuing formation and/or alteration of the self-concept and self-esteem of both females.

Kohut's developmental theory of Self-Psychology stated that the self-object in significant others acts as a positive mirror image, constitutes an ongoing process throughout the life span, and serves as a basis for emotional health (Tolpin & Kohut, 1980; Kohut, 1983; 1984;

1986). Although Kohut's theory emphasized the influence of the mother on her child, it also stressed that "the psychologically healthy adult continues to need the mirroring of the self by self-objects, and continues to need targets for idealization." (Kohut, 1986, p. 188). Since self-object relations occur at all developmental levels, it is conceivable that mirroring can be a reciprocal process occurring between mothers and their daughters. Thus, in such a mother/daughter relationship, the daughter's mirroring can be an essential component for formulation or alteration of her mother's self-concept and self-esteem.

Social Developmental Processes of Adult Women

There are a number of theoretical approaches which may be used to conceptualize the process of social development in adult women. Historically, theorists and developmental researchers such as Freud (1938), Piaget (1983), Erikson (1985), and Levinson (1978), proposed theoretical models of linearly achieved, orderly, and incremental stages of social development. These models were based on the assumption that all adults, regardless of sex, address particular sets of developmental tasks which are related to stages in the life cycle. Each stage brings its own unique concerns which are augmented by biological and social pressures.

Some have argued, however, that women's development should be considered as a separate entity, because women do not fit well into the mold described by these stage theories which are based almost exclusively upon the life experiences of men (Bardwick 1976, 1980; Barnett & Baruch, 1978; Baruch, Barnett & Rivers, 1983; Bernard, 1975; Fiske, 1980; Gilligan, 1980, 1982, Neugarten & Datan, 1973; Pearlin, 1980; Peck, 1986; and Sangiuliano, 1980).

Consideration of women's development as a separate entity does not simplify matters. Within this grouping of researchers, authors, and theorists, who have focused solely on women's social development, there have been varied themes and descriptions of such developmental processes. The literature contains several different models and it is difficult to obtain one concise and definitive picture of female social development. For example, one approach has focused on timing of events (Neugarten & Datan, 1973; Fiske, 1980; Pearlin, 1980; and Sangiuliano, 1980), another has focused on relationships and attachments (Chodorow, 1974; Miller, 1976; Gilligan, 1980; Bardwick, 1980), while yet another has examined the importance of roles and life circumstances (Bernard, 1975; Barnett & Baruch, 1978; Barnett, Baruch and Rivers, 1983). Some authors have attempted to resolve this diversity by proposing alternative models based upon an integration of the three main approaches above described (Helson, Mitchell & Hart, 1985; Peck, 1986). However, Josselson (1987) has argued that we must accept the fact that women, as a group, are not fundamentally alike, and that there are many different pathways along which women may travel during their course of development.

Despite the diversity of approaches, one common theme has emerged in the literature. Most authors and researchers have agreed that interpersonal relationships form an important, vital, integral, and pivotal part of women's developmental process (Choderow, 1974; Sheehy, 1976; Rubin, 1979; Bardwick, 1980; Rossi, 1980; Sangiuliano, 1980; Gilligan, 1982; Baruch, Barnett & Rivers, 1983; Eichenbaum & Orbach, 1983; Franz & White, 1985; Hancock, 1985; Lykes, 1985; Miller, 1976; Randour, 1987). Furthermore, Ellicott (1985) demonstrated the importance

of relationships in women's social development as a function of family process in family-cycle phases.

As a result of the foregoing, this thesis, while acknowledging the interaction of life circumstances and the timing of events and roles within the context of family process, focuses on interpersonal relationships. The findings of Sangiuliano (1980), Gilligan (1982), and Schlossberg (1984), referred to below, clearly support this approach.

Sangiuliano (1980) acknowledged that relationships constitute the primary path of development chosen by women. However, she considered this path as the root cause of weakness in female development and stated that the primacy of relationships in women's social development is an obstacle to the real work of mastering an identity and a unique sense of self which must occur through the process of separation. According to Sangiuliano, it is the unpredictable events in women's lives, such as personal changes in lifestyle, crises and/or emotional upheavals, which alter the structure of their relationships and provide the crucial impetus for their cognitive growth and social development. The search for identity which occurs in the course of dealing with those unpredictable events is the most important catalyst which leads to salient change points in women's life histories. Thus, Sangiuliano's hypothesis led to the conclusion that an intense conflictual interaction between close members in a family unit could serve as a catalyst for the mother's personal growth.

By contrast, Gilligan values the centrality of all significant relationships, including non-conflictual ones, as the primary path of women's social development. She maintains that the course of women's

development differs initially, but eventually coincides with the developmental path of males (Gilligan, 1982). Each arrives at the same normative destination, but by an entirely different route and with a different agenda. She criticized the assumption presented in the male biased, theoretical models that there is only one normative mode of development, and she advocated recognition of two distinct patterns of development for men and women.

Although Sangiuliano condemns the primacy of relationships in female development, while Gilligan extolls it, both agree on the importance of relationships in the course of female development. Gilligan's work is important because it validates the normality and authenticity of relationships in the course of women's development, while Sangiuliano's work is important because it highlights the existence of salient change points which affect the way a woman views herself in a relationship.

Furthermore, the research findings of Schlossberg (1984) illustrated that there is no single, universal timetable for women's social development. Each woman has a unique developmental pattern dependent upon the transitions she is experiencing at any given time in her life cycle.

The foregoing not only highlights the importance of studying women's development as a distinct entity predicated on interpersonal relationships but, in addition, focuses on the unique events in women's lives which result in salient change points that are the true transitional markers of women's social development.

Mother/Daughter Relationships

Reingold (1969) stated that "The birth of an infant profoundly modifies the lives of the parents. The greatest effect is brought about by the birth of the first born, and the greatest effect is experienced by the mother" (p.782). Reingold described at length the reciprocal process through which the infant becomes a socializer of parents.

Another approach, therefore, to understanding women's unique social development is to examine its origins in the family. Eichenbaum and Orbach (1983) maintained that the difference in the social development of women originates from the primary relationship forged between mothers and daughters. They concluded that mothers and daughters are inextricably bound by the fact that they share the same "gender identity, social role and social expectations" (Eichenbaum & Orbach, 1983; p.37). These factors create distinct attitudes and socialization techniques on the part of mothers in relation to their daughters. Inevitably, this process causes women to feel and act differently from men. Similar views were expressed by Rossi (1980) who described the unique mother/daughter bond as the precursor of women's greater affiliative tendencies.

Such theorizing about the distinct processes which occur between mothers and daughters relates directly to the social development of women. Bardwick (1976) described the process whereby modern mothers and their daughters in a gender related dyad have much in common as reciprocal role models, and reciprocal sources of information. Furthermore, Barnett & Baruch (1978) described how mothers and daughters continuously develop a more mutually dependent relationship, while mothers teach their sons to be independent and autonomous. It seems

likely, therefore, that if both partners in such a mother/daughter dyad tend to experience their social development primarily through the mode of interpersonal relationships it is easier for mothers to nurture daughters than sons, and to feel more emotionally attuned to their daughters than to their sons.

Several studies have shown that parent/child relationships, parenting styles, and family interaction styles, differ by sex of child and of parent (Tomeh & Vasko, 1980; Steinberg, 1981; Swallow, 1981; Offer, Ostrov & Howard, 1982; Copeland & Barenbaum, 1983; Copeland & Grossman, 1984; Grotevant & Cooper, 1985; Hansen & Bozett, 1985; McGuire, 1985; Frank, Hole, Jacobson, Justkowski & Huyck, 1986; Gecas & Schwalbe, 1986). In discussing the role of sex in family relationships, Chodorow (1978) stated that boys and girls initially have much closer, more emotionally intense and less differentiated relationships with their mothers (i.e. the primary caretakers), as compared with their fathers. Furthermore, Chodorow maintained that there is a unique aspect to the mother/daughter relationship which she described from the psychodynamic perspectives of both females, as follows:

Mothers' Perspective: Since mothers and daughters are of the same gender, mothers of infant daughters do not tend to experience those infants as separate from themselves, in the same way as do mothers of infant sons. Although mothers experience a sense of oneness and continuity with their infants of either sex, Chodorow maintains that this sense is stronger and lasts longer with infant daughters. Furthermore, she believes that mothers are more likely to retain and emphasize the narcissistic elements of the mother/daughter relationship and, therefore,

experience their daughters as an extension or double of themselves.

Daughters' Perspective: According to Chodorow, the content of a daughter's attachment to her mother is different than the content of a son's attachment to his mother, and sustains the special intensity, ambivalence and boundary confusion of early mother/infant relationships. Thus, daughters not only need to identify with and be like their mothers, but also continue to "feel" like their mothers.

Chodorow concluded that since both mother and daughter maintain elements of their primary relationship, they continue to feel alike in fundamental ways.

More recently, Frank, Avery & Laman, 1988, in summing up the state of present clinical research, commented that

"the father's influence as a differentiating force in the mother-father-child triad is felt more strongly by sons than by daughters. Presumably, because boys identify with their more distant father at a fairly young age, their family relationships become less intense and more depersonalized. In contrast, girls identify with and find it more difficult to break the intrapsychic and interpersonal ties that bind them to their mothers.....in particular the mother-daughter relationship continues to be especially close "(p.730)

Magrab (1979) stressed, in dramatic terms, the strength of the daughter/mother bond which, according to her, holds women captive until death. A woman's first sense of self is described as an extension of her mother who becomes a lasting life model. It is through the mother that the daughter learns her feminine role behavior and cultural expectations, while at the same time the mother's identity is bound to the daughter's development. Friday (1977) described the intense reciprocity of the mother daughter relationship as one in which what each feels, thinks, and does, inevitably affects the other.

In addition, many mid life mothers may be experiencing transitional

change points in their own lives, which involve the process of striving to validate their established values and strategies. This may conflict with the process of their daughters, especially adolescent daughters, who are likely to be striving towards the creation of new values and strategies (Kimmel & Weiner, 1985). Frank, Avery, and Laman (1988) suggested that the daughter's "unresolved, ambivalent struggle for greater separateness often tinges this relationship with strong emotional conflict" (p.730).

Bengtson and Troll (1978) pointed out that periods of change and/or emotional upheaval render individuals more open to altering their personal views and constructions. Therefore, perceptions resulting from such mother/daughter dyads (especially if the mothers perceive their daughters as extensions or doubles of themselves), can provide an important part of the cognitive structural framework for the mothers' self-concept and/or self-esteem.

The foregoing theories and research clearly suggest that mothers and daughters continuously share a stronger and more unique relationship, compared with mothers and sons.

Family Processes: Social Interaction in a Mother/Daughter Subsystem

Beginning with the earliest theories on family process, sex differences in role orientation have been reported. Parsons (1949, 1952, & 1955) described mothers as the expressive members, and fathers as the instrumental and more emotionally distant members, of the nuclear family.

Social Learning Theory, postulated by Bandura (1969,1977), stated that the individual's interpretation of events, rather than the events themselves, comprised the crucial factor in social learning and social

responses. This conceptualization placed the individual in a mediating position between stimulus and response. The resulting three way reciprocal interplay between person, environment and behavior formed the main thrust of Bandura's model. Subsequently, Robinson & Jacobson (1988) suggested that Bandura's theoretical framework is a distinct way of conceptualizing social development and could be used as a template for understanding dyadic relationships within a family setting. Thus, in relation to family dynamics, the social interaction between two members of a familial dyad can be construed as an integral and influential process in their shared environment. Robinson & Jacobson concluded that the behavior and the perceptions of the behavior of one member of the dyad will influence the behavior and the perceptions of the other. Ahammer had put forth a similar argument, by suggesting that although Social Learning Theory is not a developmental theory, it is well suited for the study of adult development because of its emphasis on "stimulus response functional relationships that are particularly sensitive to detecting behavior change" (Ahammer, 1973; p.255).

Salvadore Minuchin's understanding of family dynamics clearly stressed a reciprocal process in social interactions. "The individual influences his context and is influenced by it in constantly recurring sequences of interaction" (Minuchin, 1974, p. 9). He described the family as a self-contained social system which governs actions and which contains stresses to which members respond and by which they are influenced. "The individual responds to stresses in other parts of the system and he may contribute significantly to stressing other members of the system" (Minuchin, 1974, p.9). Patricia Minuchin agrees with these

views (Minuchin, 1988), as do Ackerman (1958) and Bell and Bell (1983). The latter focused on perceptions of self-competence and self-esteem as the primary determinants of such reciprocal interplay in the family.

If the above descriptions are applied to a mother/daughter subsystem within a family, then it is obvious that the daughter can contribute significantly to stressing the mother. The stress may be related to interpersonal content and may be specifically self-relevant for the mother, especially if it relates to her competence on one or more domains of her self-concept. If so, then this stress might influence the mother's evaluation of competence on those relevant domains of self-concept and/or the mother's assessment of her self-esteem (self-worth). Thus, the mother's self-evaluation may be influenced by such intervening variables as the quality and intensity of that mother/daughter relationship, although tempered by the mother's roles and/or age.

Socioeconomic Status(SES) and Self-Concept and Self-Esteem

Research has demonstrated that social stratification is vital for an accurate analysis of social phenomena (Mills, 1959; Morgan, 1975; Hurst, 1979; Runciman, 1968). Thompson & Lee (1983) concluded that there is a relationship between an adult's socioeconomic status and his/her self-evaluation, even though many earlier studies of adults and children did not support this hypothesis (Gecas, 1979).

Several authors have concluded that a comprehensive evaluation of SES should include the family as a principal unit in the social stratification system (Rossi, Sampson & Bose, 1974, Hollingshead 1975, Mueller & Parcel, 1981). Furthermore, SES has been linked to differences in the quality of familial interactions and parenting styles (Gecas,

1979). This would mean that the quality, content and style of mother/daughter relationships could differ as a function of SES.

It is obvious that social status alone can be a salient index of prestige and success for individuals and for families. Since self-esteem emerges within a social frame of reference (Ziller, Hagey, Smith & Long, 1969; Thompson & Lee, 1983), an individual's inability to attain a socially expected level of prestige will be reflected in his/her self-esteem (Stanwyck, 1983). This means that mothers with a lower SES, who have less social prestige than middle class mothers, could have negative social influences impinging upon their self-esteem.

Some researchers have used only middle class subjects in order to obtain a homogeneous sample and to avoid the confound of constraining external life circumstances associated with lower SES (Reinke, Holmes & Harris, 1985). Accordingly, the present study was limited to middle class families.

An evaluation of SES need not always be based solely upon economic standings. Families are often sensitive to these issues, consider such questioning personally intrusive, and are reluctant to provide an accurate reporting of financial standing. Nock and Rossi (1979) concluded that the most accurate means of evaluating the family unit is to measure social prestige. Accordingly, the measure of SES in this study was a measure of Social Prestige.

Conclusion and Hypotheses

The literature described above suggests the following:

- a.) Self-concept and self-esteem are fluid in nature, and constantly open to change and revision.
- b.) Women's development follows a unique process in comparison to men's developmental process and should be studied as a separate entity.
- c.) Close interpersonal relationships exert an important influence on the mothers' self-concept and self-esteem.
- d.) The mother/daughter relationship is vital to an understanding of the development of mothers' self-concept and self-esteem.
- e.) The process of a daughter's developmental transitions occurring within a family setting, may influence her mother's developmental transitions and subsequently, her mother's self-concept and/or self-esteem.

Based on the above, three questions were formulated, as follows:

- 1.) Would mothers' self-concept and/or self-esteem be related to their daughters' perceptions of their mothers' competence and overall worth?
- 2.) Would mothers and their daughters share similar perceptions about the quality of their mutual relationship?
- 3.) Would mothers' self-concept and/or self-esteem be related to the daughters' perception of the quality of the relationship they share with their mothers?

In order to address these questions, it was necessary to test the hypothesis that mothers and daughters share a close perceptual relationship based on the fact that they are both female. Accordingly,

mother/son dyads were used for comparison and three main hypotheses were put forth. Additional questions which focused on the origin and effect of such shared perceptions, if any, and the potential influence of intervening variables such as the mother's life style, work status, and the ages of her children, were not examined in this study.

The hypotheses are as follows:

1. The self-concept and/or self-esteem of mothers would have a greater association with their daughters' assessments of the mothers' competence and overall worth, as compared with similar assessments of the mothers by their sons.
2. Mutual assessments of the quality of the mother/daughter relationship, made by mothers and their daughters, would share a greater association, as compared with mutual assessments of the mother/son relationship, made by mothers and their sons.
3. The self-concept and/or self-esteem of mothers would have a greater association with their daughters' assessment of the quality of the relationship that they share with their mothers, as compared with a similar assessment made by their sons regarding the quality of their mother/son relationship.

METHOD

Subjects

The subjects were 51 English speaking, white, middle class mothers between 35 and 47 years of age and their two children. The 102 female and/or male siblings ranged in age from 8 to 19 years.

When the children were divided by sex, the sample consisted of 52 girls and 50 boys. All first born children, (27 males and 24 females) were between the ages of 10 and 19 years, while the second born males (23) ranged in age from 8 to 17 years, and the second born females (28) ranged in age from 8 to 18 years.

It was recognized that working substantial hours in salaried employment outside the home might influence the course of self-concept and/or self-esteem development of the mothers in the sample. Therefore, the extent to which mothers were employed outside of traditional homemaking was determined.

For the purposes of this study mothers were grouped into two categories as follows: 1. women who were employed 20 hours per week or more, and 2. women who were employed less than 20 hours per week or were non salaried homemakers in the traditional sense. These categories served as control variables and were distributed fairly evenly across the two groups for mothers of first born daughters (category one: 12 subjects; category two: 12 subjects), as compared with first born sons (category one: 13 subjects; category two: 14 subjects).

All mothers were married and members of an intact, urban, nuclear family. Their husbands and children were living at home.

The middle class families chosen for the study resided in the

following Quebec municipalities: Beaconsfield, Cote St. Luc, Dollard Des Ormeaux, Hampstead, Hudson, Montreal, Montreal West, Pointe Claire, St. Laurent, St. Lazare, Town of Mount Royal, Verdun and Westmount.

Research has demonstrated that the years between 30 and 50 span a time frame which involves a period of marked transitions and adjustment to change for most adult women (Rubin, 1979; Baruch, Barnett & Rivers, 1983; Kimmel & Weiner, 1985). A limited age range of adult women, 35 to 47 years old, was, therefore, chosen to provide sufficient homogeneity in the data of this study and to eliminate the confound of a wide range of age related perceptions regarding change and transitions.

English speaking, urban, middle class, married, white Quebec women are considered likely to share similar social constraints and family life styles. They live in the same cultural milieu and experience similar cultural values and norms. The focus on such women was intended, therefore, to limit the influence of sociocultural variables associated with socioeconomic status, language, and marital status (single, divorced, separated, remarried or widowed women), that might influence the mothers' self-concept and/or self-esteem.

Measures

The materials consisted of a family assessment measure, a measure of self-concept and self-esteem (self-worth), a subjective evaluation form, and a measure of socioeconomic status (SES). All measures were paper and pencil questionnaires. The family assessment measure, and the measure of self-concept and self-esteem, relied on self-reports.

The Family Assessment Measure, consisting of a General Scale and a Dyadic Relationship Scale (Skinner, Steinhauer & Santa-Barbara, 1983,

1984), was designed to measure general family functioning and perceptions of the quality of dyadic relationships within the family unit, respectively.

The measure of self-concept and self-esteem, i.e. The Adult Self-Perception Profile (Messer & Harter, 1986), was designed to allow for a self-evaluation by the mothers of their self-concept and self-esteem across 12 domains.

The subjective evaluation form was specifically designed for this study in order to allow the children to report their assessment of their mothers' competence/success and overall worth across those 12 domains.

The SES measure, Four Factor Index of Social Status (Hollingshead, 1975), was designed to measure social stratification according to household social standings, i.e. social prestige.

Family Assessment Measure

The Family Assessment Measure (FAM) (Skinner, Steinhauer & Sanca-Barbara, 1983, 1984), which includes the General Scale (GS) and the Dyadic Relationship Scale (DRS), was chosen because this measure appears to be the most relevant to the proposed study. FAM is the only instrument which incorporates an assessment of the subject's response style, and measures cognitive perceptions of dyadic relationships, in addition to the assessment of general family functioning. FAM, therefore, was selected rather than other family assessment measures such as Faces 111 (Olson, Joyce, Portner, & Lavee, 1985) or the Family Environment Scale (Moos & Moos, 1981).

FAM is in the experimental stage and the authors report statistically significant intercorrelations among the subscales of both the GS and the

DRS. However, they report substantial internal consistency estimates for the General and the Dyadic scales based upon 475 families (933 adults, 502 children).

Internal consistency for the subscales of the General Scale ranged from .65 to .87 for adults, and from .60 to .87 for children. Reliability overall for the General Scale was .93 for adults, and .94 for children. Investigation of Validity was not reported.

Internal Consistency for the subscales of the Dyadic Relationship Scale ranged from .64 to .82 for adults, and from .59 to .73 for children. Reliability overall for the Dyadic Relationship Scale was .95 for adults and .94 for children. Investigation of Validity was not reported.

External validity and reliability measures, as well as test-retest reliability measures are in progress (communication with Skinner, 1987 & 1988).

The General Scale (GS): The General Scale (GS) focuses on the level of health-pathology in the family from a system's perspective and was designed to measure quantitative indices of family strengths and weakness. The purpose of this instrument for this research was to establish that the sample consisted of families within the normal range of functioning and thereby mitigate the possibility of confounds arising from family pathology. Skinner, Santa-Barbara, and Steinhauer (1981) have concluded that mothers provide the most critical information in rating family functioning for non clinical and pathological families. Therefore, mothers only were chosen as the most appropriate screening agent in this study.

The seven areas of family functioning examined in the GS are Role Performance, Communication, Affective Expression, Involvement, Control, Task Accomplishment, and Values and Norms. Each area is evaluated individually and an overall rating for general family functioning is calculated by computing the average score of the seven areas. In addition, the GS contains measures for Social Desirability and Defensiveness. See Appendix A.

The Dyadic Relationship Scale (DRS): The Dyadic Relationship Scale (DRS) focuses on relationships among specific pairs and was designed to measure general areas of strengths or disturbances in the relationships between those pairs in the family. The use of this scale in the study was to assess the quality of dyadic relationships between mothers and their children. The scale focuses on the areas of Task Accomplishment, Values and Norms, Role Performance, Communication, Affective Expression, Involvement, and Control. See Appendix C. Each area is evaluated individually and an overall rating can be determined by calculating the average score of the seven areas. The Dyadic Relationship Scale does not contain measures for Social Desirability and Defensiveness, as does the General Scale (GS).

The DRS questionnaire form has undergone minor revision in format for the purposes of this study, and has been approved by Dr. Skinner (See Appendix B for revised formats). The recommended age for children using this measure is listed in the instruction manual as at least 10 to 12 years of age. See Appendix B-1. For the purposes of this study, only the responses of the first born children were used for analyses of this measure. These children ranged in age from 10 to 19 years. Normative

data are available for this age range, and the data collected in the present study appear to be comparable.

Measure of Self-Concept and Self-Worth

The Adult Self-Perception Profile (ASPP): The Adult Self-Perception Profile (Messer & Harter, 1986) contains 12 domains. Eleven independent domains (Sociability, Job Competence, Nurturance, Athletic Ability, Appearance, Adequate Provider, Morality, Household Management, Intimate Relations, Intelligence, and Sense of Humor) were designed to measure self-concept. One separate and independent domain was reserved for the measurement of an individual's Global Self-Worth, i.e. self-esteem. This is not calculated as an average derived from an aggregate of scores, or a weighting of the other 11 constituent domains in the measure. See Appendix D.

This profile includes an importance rating scale which allows for the assessment of the importance of success in each of the 11 constituent domains. The design of that scale stems from the authors' theoretical stance that persons do not view themselves as equally competent in all domains, and that the importance placed on achieving success in a particular domain, coupled with the perception of success or failure in that domain, will be the basis of self-evaluation of competence and/or adequacy in that area.

This measure allows subjects to rate the three domains which are most important to their sense of self-worth, and the three domains which are the least important to their sense of self-worth. If an individual achieves a high level of self-assessed competence in the three domains which are rated as the most important to a sense of self-worth, it would

seem likely that he/she would achieve a high self-assessed rating of Global Self-Worth.

The ASPP was chosen, therefore, over other self-perception inventories (Fitts, 1965; Coopersmith, 1981; Offer, 1981; Petersen, Schulenberg, Abramowitz, Offer, & Jarcho, 1984; Piers, 1984), because it is the only measure that a) clearly distinguishes self-concept from self-esteem, b) includes a unique opportunity to assess global self-worth as a separate entity beyond an individual's judgment of competence/adequacy in the various domains, c) adequately recognizes and records a full spectrum of the multidimensionality of self-concept, d) provides the opportunity to assess a profile of perceived competencies across different domains, e) includes subscales relevant to intellectual and occupational performance which are important to women as well as men, and f) is concerned with salient dimensions for adult women, i.e. nurturance, intimate relations, and household management.

The ASPP has been standardized on the basis of 141 adults ranging in age from 30 to 50 years. The majority of the standardization group were part of intact, white, upper middle class families. Internal consistency of the twelve subscales (Cronbach's Alpha) ranged from a low of .73 for Job Competence to a high of .91 for Global Self-Worth. The subscale, Adequate Provider, had good internal consistency only with respect to full time working men and women. A factor analysis of the scales provided strong evidence for 10 specific factors related to the 11 domains of the subscales. No other reliability or validity data are available at the present time. See Appendix E for The Adult Self-Perception Profile (ASPP), (Messer & Harter, 1986).

Subjective Evaluation Form

Childrens' Ratings of Their Mothers: A measure based on the Adult Self-Perception Profile was designed by the examiner to assess the childrens' perceptions of their mothers' competence/success and overall worth across the 12 relevant domains of self-concept and global self-worth in the ASPP.

Each child's assessment of his/her mother's competence/success was measured on a 4 point scale in which a score of 4 indicated that the mother was "most competent", while a score of 1 indicated that the mother was "not very competent". This scale followed the format of the importance rating scales in the Adult Self-Perception Profile. The categories listed in the questionnaire were the same 11 domains of self-concept listed in the Adult Self-Perception Profile.

Each child's assessment of his/her mother's overall worth was achieved with a 9 point scale in which a score of 1 indicated the highest regard, while a score of 9 indicated very low regard. This question was designed to correspond to the mother's perception of her own global self-worth in the Adult Self-Perception Profile.

Children were given the opportunity to state in which 3 of the 11 self-concept domains in the ASPP they perceived their mothers to be the most competent, and in which three domains they perceived their mothers to be the most competent, and in which three domains they perceived their mothers to be the least competent.

The evaluative questionnaire allowed for a comparison, within the mother/child dyad, of the mother's perception of herself in the 12 domains of the ASPP, and each of her children's perceptions of her

competence/success and overall worth in the same 12 domains of the ASPP. It was entitled "Competence Rating for your Mother" and appended to the last page of the children's dyadic relationship scale. Two separate questionnaires were presented, therefore, as a single unit, to each child. See Appendix F.

Socioeconomic Status (SES)

Several authors have concluded that an accurate evaluation of SES, which is guided by the most up to date and conclusive measures, should include the family as a principal unit in the social stratification system (Rossi, Sampson & Bose, 1974; Hollingshead, 1975; Mueller & Parcel, 1981).

Nock & Rossi (1979) published a measure of SES entitled "The Home Prestige Score". They concluded that the most accurate means of evaluating the family unit was to measure social prestige by taking into account its members' ages, sex, marital status, number of children, occupations and education. Since such variables as age, sex, marital status, and number of children were controlled for in the present study, it was necessary to find a measure of SES which correlated with Nock & Rossi's Home Prestige Scores and which would account for the remaining variables of spouses' occupations and education.

The Four Factor Index of Social Status (1975) correlates with the Home Prestige Scores, $r = .927$. The coefficient of determination is $r^2 = .860$. The Occupational Factor has been keyed to the occupational titles used by the United States Census in 1970, with minor revisions. The Four Factor Index of Social Status in this sample was computed by summing the scores for each spouse's occupation and education and by

dividing the total by 2. Computed scores can range from a high of 66 to a low of 8. This range remains constant whether the computed score is based on the occupation of one or two members of a household. Constancy of range, despite the occupational listing of only one member of a household, is particularly important for this study, since some of the mothers in the sample were homemakers with no listed occupation. Families included in this research were expected to fall within the two top strata, scoring either 40-54 or 55-66. See Appendix G for SES rating form.

Procedure

Fifty three families were interviewed. Two families were subsequently removed from the study because they did not meet the screening criteria. Fifty one families participated in the study.

A letter of explanation, together with an appropriate consent form informing subjects of their rights, was presented to all 51 adults, as well as to all adolescents 18 years and over, prior to the commencement of the interview process. See Appendices II and I.

Upon entering the study, each family unit was assigned an identifying code number, which was maintained throughout the study, to protect the subjects' anonymity.

All subjects were interviewed in their homes in order to collect data in a naturalistic environment. However, information pertaining to demographic variables and socioeconomic status was requested by telephone prior to home visits. This prior solicitation of information regarding subjects' marital status, ages, birth dates, work status and occupation of spouses served to facilitate the interview process and to ascertain

whether the solicited subjects fit all the criteria for participation in this study. See Appendix J for the SES questionnaire.

The participating members of each family (the mother and her two children) were interviewed in separate rooms so as to maintain privacy. Instructions for each respective measure were given in accordance with the guidelines in the research manuals. Presentation of the questionnaires began with the mother and proceeded in descending order from the eldest to the youngest child. The examiner remained in the same room as the youngest child, reading the questions aloud, and offering verbal explanations when necessary, while being available for questions from other participants.

Children generally had no difficulty understanding the dyadic scale. However, some of the youngest children initially expressed difficulty understanding some words, such as "crises" and "affairs", and Question 35. Standard explanations were given when such difficulties arose. An example is as follows:

"Question 35 states that 'There's a big difference between what my mother expects of me and how she behaves.' Let's pretend that your mother is the kind of mother who expects you to hang up your coat when you come home from school, and she lets you know very clearly that this is what she expects you to do. Now let's pretend that you come home from school and you don't hang up your coat. You just drop it on the floor near the closet and walk away. If your mother calls you back and says 'I want you to hang up your coat', then you can mark that you disagree or strongly disagree with the statement in Question 35. This means that there is no difference between what your mother expects of you (to hang up your coat) and how she behaves (she makes you hang up your coat).

However, let's pretend that you drop your coat on the floor and your mother just picks it up and hangs it up by herself. She doesn't call you back to hang up your coat, even though you have always been told that this is what you are supposed to do when you come home from school. You can then mark that you agree with or strongly agree with the statement in Question 35. This means that there is a big difference between what your mother expects of you (to hang up your own coat) and the way she behaves (she hangs it up for you)."

Following the above explanation, the children appeared to have no difficulty generalizing this statement to their mother's behavior and were able to answer Question 35.

Pilot data suggested that all of the questionnaires could be completed in 45 minutes. Most home visits required no more than one hour.

All mothers and their children were administered similar, age appropriate, pencil and paper, self-report questionnaires in a counterbalanced order.

Mothers: Every mother received three appropriately labelled questionnaires packaged in the following units: one FAM General Scale, two FAM Dyadic Relationship Scales (one for each child), and one Adult Self-Perception Profile.

Children: Each child received two appropriately labelled questionnaires packaged as one unit: one FAM Dyadic Relationship Scale, with an attached Competence Rating questionnaire for rating his/her mother.

Design and Statistical Analysis

The main hypotheses involved comparison of correlations between ratings of first born daughters and their mothers, as compared with correlations between ratings of first born sons and their mothers.

Division of the childrens' sample by birth order, with the exclusion of second born childrens' data, avoided the confound of using the responses of related siblings in the same analysis, i.e. within and between cells for analysis of variance, and within groups for correlations.

In addition, all mothers in the sample shared a relationship with

two children, who were either same sex siblings (25 families) or opposite sex siblings (26 families). In order to clearly examine the relationships between mothers and daughters, as compared with mothers and sons, it was necessary to select subgroups from the total sample in which mothers had two children of the same sex. This methodology avoided the confound arising from the potential influence of an opposite sex child in the family unit upon the mother's perceptions of self-concept and self-worth.

Therefore, the sample of 102 children was divided by birth order of the children and by the sex of sibling composition within the family units. This allowed for four groups of subjects: 1. first born daughters who had sibling sisters (f/ff), 2. first born sons who had sibling brothers (m/mm), 3. first born daughters who had sibling brothers (f/mf), and 4. first born sons who had sibling sisters (m/mf).

These respective divisions of the mothers' and childrens' responses, while eliminating statistical confounds, severely restricted the subject to variable ratio essential for appropriate use of multivariate statistics. Pearson Correlations were employed to analyze the strength of relationships between mothers and their children. Univariate Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) were employed for the analyses of the childrens' responses.

RESULTS

The results will be reported in four sections:

1. General Demographic Results
2. Examination of Hypotheses
3. Domains of Most/Least Importance for Mothers in the Domains of Self-Concept (ASPP) and Childrens' Perceptions of Mothers' Competence/
Lack of Competence in the Domains of Self-Concept (ASPP)
4. Additional Analyses

General Demographic Results

Socioeconomic Status (SES)

The Prestige Ratings for the participating families were expected to fall within the two top strata, reaching a level of either 40-54, or 55-66. One family was rated 19, 26 families were rated between 40-54, while 25 families were rated between 55-66. The family which rated 19 was removed from the study.

Assessment of Family Functioning (FAM)

General Scale (GS): The assessment of family functioning was based on a global score for each family, calculated as an average score of the seven domains of the General Scale. Ideally, scores for a "well functioning family" are expected to fall within the range of 40 to 50. As the scores rise above 50, some difficulty is expected to be found within the family on one or several domains. Serious family problems and/or pathology are indicated when scores are above 60. Scores in this sample ranged from a low of 30.14 to a high of 64. Consequently, the one

family whose score exceeded 60 was not included in the study.

Measures of Social Desirability and Defensiveness

The General Scale (GS) for mothers included a measure of Social Desirability and of Defensiveness. Scores ranged from 25 to 79 for Social Desirability, and from 31 to 81 for Defensiveness. See Appendix K for a description of those families whose scores were high on Social Desirability and Defensiveness. Eleven mothers had high scores for Social Desirability. Four of those same mothers had high scores for Defensiveness. However, all 11 mothers gave their families superior ratings for family functioning on the general scale, i.e. their family scores were below 40. Skinner et al (1984) reported that low scores (below 40) on the General Scale are generally associated with high scores for social desirability. Such low scoring families are not considered to be "pathological" in terms of general functioning. Furthermore, Social Desirability was not significantly correlated with any of the 11 domains of Self-Concept or the one domain of Global Self-Worth in the Adult Self-Perception Profile. See Appendix L. It was not considered necessary, therefore, to exclude those families who scored high on Social Desirability and/or Defensiveness from the study.

Examination of Hypotheses

Hypothesis One

Hypothesis one states that the self-concept and/or self-esteem of mothers would have a greater association with their daughters' assessments of the mothers' competence and overall worth, as compared with similar assessments of the mothers by their sons.

Pearson Correlations were employed to examine responses of 51 mothers and the responses of their first born children. Two groups were formed using sex of the first born child as the grouping factor, i.e., mothers with first born daughters, and mothers with first born sons. The analysis of responses proceeded as follows:

Self-Concept: A. The 11 domains of self-concept in the ASPP, as rated by mothers, and their first born daughters' and first born sons' assessments of the mothers' competence on those 11 domains, were examined for correlations.

B. The 11 domains of self-concept in the ASPP, as rated by mothers, and their first born daughters' and first born sons' evaluations of the mothers' overall worth, were examined for correlations.

Self-Worth: A. The mothers' perception of global self-worth in the ASPP, and the first born daughters' and first born sons' assessments of their mothers' competence on each of the 11 domains of the ASPP, were examined for correlations.

B. The mothers' perception of global self-worth in the ASPP, and the first born daughters' and first born sons' evaluations of their mothers' overall worth, were examined for correlations.

Follow up analyses were performed, with Dunn's Test (Bonferroni T) and Fisher's r Transformations. Dunn's Test (Bonferroni T) was employed to maintain an appropriate Type 1 error rate by using an experimentwise alpha level of .0045, when the 11 self-concept domains in the ASPP were examined, and an experimentwise alpha level of .0041, when 12 domains (including mothers' overall worth) in the ASPP were examined (Howell,

1982). Fisher's r Transformations were utilized to test for statistically significant differences between the independent correlations obtained for self-concept and self-worth in the two groups (Howell, 1982).

Results: Correlations Between Mothers and First Born Daughters (n=24)

Self-Concept: A. There was a significant correlation between mothers' perceptions of self-concept, and the first born daughters' assessment of their mothers' competence, in four domains of the ASPP: Job Competence $r = .5554$, $p < .005$, Athletic Ability $r = .8473$, $p < .000$, Intelligence $r = -.4451$, $p < .025$, and Humor $r = .6266$, $p < .001$. After application of the Bonferroni T procedure, Job Competence, Athletic Ability and Humor remained statistically significant at the .05 level of significance. Statistical significance for Intelligence was not maintained. See Table 1.

B. There were significant correlations between mothers' perceptions of self-concept, and first born daughters' evaluation of their mothers' overall worth in two domains of the ASPP: Nurturance $r = -.4239$, $p < .039$, and Intimate Relations $r = -.6450$, $p < .001$. However, after the application of the Bonferroni T procedure, only Intimate Relations remained statistically significant at the .05 level of significance. See Table 2

Self-Worth: A. Mothers' perception of global self-worth, and first born daughters' assessment of their mothers' competence for the domains of Athletic Ability $r = .5954$, $p < .002$ and Household Management $r = .4123$, $p < .045$ were significantly correlated. Only Athletic Ability maintained statistical significance after the application of the

Table 1

Zero-Order Correlations Between Mothers' Perceptions in 11 Domains of Self-Concept and First Born Daughters' and First Born Sons' Respective Evaluations of Mothers' Competence in Those 11 Domains (ASPP).

Self-Concept Domains	Mothers' Self-Concept and Daughters' Assessment of Mothers' Competence (n = 24)	Mothers' Self-Concept and Sons' Assessment of Mothers' Competence (n = 27)
Sociability	.10	.19
Job Competence	.56** ⁺	.18
Nurturance	.27	.14
Athletic Ability ^R	.84*** ⁺	.42*
Appearance	.23	.17
Adequate Provider	.37	-.25
Morality	.15	.17
Household Management	.26	.43*
Intimate Relations	-.09	.13
Intelligence	.46*	-.05
Humor ^R	.63*** ⁺	-.14

*** = $p < .001$

** = $p < .01$

* = $p < .05$

Note: a) Coefficients with ⁺ indicate significance at .05 level according to Bonferroni's criteria.

b) R indicates significant differences between two groups of independent correlations, according to Fisher's r Transformations.

Table 2

Zero-Order Correlations Between Mothers' Perceptions in 11 Domains of Self-Concept and First Born Daughters' and First Born Sons' Respective Evaluations of Mothers' Overall Worth.

Self-Concept Domains	Mothers' Self-Concept and Daughters' Evaluation of Mothers' Overall Worth [~] (n = 24)	Mothers' Self-Concept and Sons' Evaluation of Mothers' Overall Worth [~] (n = 27)
Sociability	-.30	.07
Job Competence	-.05	.35
Nurturance	-.42*	-.17
Athletic Ability	-.11	.34
Appearance	-.10	.04
Adequate Provider	-.19	-.20
Morality	-.08	-.24
Household Management	-.19	.12
Intimate Relations ^R	-.65*** ⁺	.14
Intelligence	-.25	.00
Humor	-.38	.04

*** = $p < .001$

** = $p < .01$

* = $p < .05$

- Note: a) Coefficients with ⁺ indicate significance at .05 level according to Bonferroni's criteria.
 b) R indicates significant differences between two groups of independent correlations, according to Fisher's r Transformations.
 c) ~ Lower scores for Overall Worth indicate more positive ratings.

Bonferroni T procedure. See Table 3.

B. There was no correlation between daughters' evaluation of mothers' overall worth and mothers' assessment of their global self-worth $r = -.1801$, $p < .40$. See Table 3.

Results: Correlations Between Mothers and First Born Sons (n = 27)

Self-Concept: A. There were significant correlations between mothers' perceptions of self-concept, and their first born sons' assessments of their mothers' competence for the domains of Household Management $r = .4253$, $p < .027$ and Athletic Ability $r = .4263$, $p < .026$. Statistical significance was not maintained after the application of the Bonferroni T procedure. See Table 1.

B. There were no significant correlations between mothers' perceptions of self-concept, and first born sons' evaluation of their mothers' overall worth. See table 2.

Self-Worth: A. Mother's perception of global self-worth, and first born sons' assessment of their mothers' competence for Intimate Relations were negatively correlated, $r = -.4381$, $p < .022$. Statistical significance was not maintained after the application of the Bonferroni T procedure. See Table 3.

B. There was no correlation between first born sons' evaluation of mothers' overall worth and their mothers' assessment of global self-worth $r = -.1412$, $p < .48$. See Table 3.

Table 3

Zero-Order Correlations Between Mothers' Perception of Global Self-Worth and First Born Daughters' and First Born Sons' Respective Evaluations of Their Mothers' Competence in 11 Domains of Self-Concept in the ASPP and Their Mothers' Overall Worth.

Variables	Mothers' Global Self-Worth and Daughters' Perceptions of Mothers' Competence and Overall Worth (n = 24)	Mothers' Global Self-Worth and Sons' Perceptions of Mothers' Competence and Overall Worth (n = 27)
Sociability	-.09	.07
Job Competence	.12	.04
Nurturance	.22	-.29
Athletic Ability ^R	.60** ⁺	.03
Appearance	.04	.14
Adequate Provider	-.12	-.01
Morality	.32	-.25
Household Management	.41*	-.04
Intimate Relations	-.08	-.44*
Intelligence	-.06	-.11
Sense of Humor	.09	-.21
Overall Worth	-.18	-.14

*** = $p < .001$

** = $p < .01$

* = $p < .05$

Note: a) Coefficients with ⁺ indicate significance at .05 level according to Bonferroni's criteria.
 b) R indicates significant differences between two groups of independent correlations, according to Fisher's r Transformations.
 c) ~ Lower scores for Overall Worth indicate more positive ratings.

Results: Fisher's r Transformations for Significant Differences Between Groups

Fisher's r Transformations revealed that there were statistically significant differences between the two pairs of independent correlations (mothers/daughters and mothers/sons):

A) In the domains of Athletic Ability ($z_{\text{obt.}} = 2.65$, $p < .008$), and Humor ($z_{\text{obt.}} = 2.00$, $p < .046$), as listed in Table 1.

B) In the domain of Intimate Relations ($z_{\text{obt.}} = 2.10$, $p < .026$), as listed in Table 2.

C) In the domain of Athletic Ability ($z_{\text{obt.}} = 2.15$, $p < .031$), as listed in Table 3.

Hypothesis Two

Hypothesis two states that mutual assessments of the quality of the mother/daughter relationship, made by mothers and their daughters, would share a greater association, as compared with the mutual assessments of the mother/son relationship, made by mothers and their sons.

Pearson Correlations were employed to examine the responses of all 51 mothers and their first born children. Sex of the first born child was the grouping factor. Two groups of responses were formed, mothers with first born daughters, and mothers with first born sons. Correlations between the mothers' perception of the quality of the relationship they share with their first born children and the first born childrens' perception of the quality of the relationship they share with their mothers, were examined.

Since there were high intercorrelations among the seven domains of

the Dyadic Relationship Scale (DRS) for mothers and for children, one global score was computed for mothers, and one global score was computed for children. The global scores were computed in each case by taking the average of the seven domains (Task Accomplishment, Values and Norms, Role Performance, Communication, Affective Expression, Involvement and Control). Correlations were then examined between the two global scores. Follow up analyses utilized Fisher's r Transformations to test for statistically significant differences between those independent correlations (Howell, 1982). See Appendix M for intercorrelations in mothers' ratings. See Appendix N for intercorrelations in children's ratings.

Results: Correlations for Mothers with First Born Daughters (n = 24)

There was a significant correlation between mothers' perception, and first born daughters' perception, concerning the quality of the relationship they share $r = .408, p < .047$.

Results: Correlations for Mothers with First Born Sons (n = 27)

There was no significant correlation between mothers' perception, and first born sons' perception, concerning the quality of the relationship they share $r = .06, p < .76$.

Results: Fisher's r Transformations for Significant Differences Between Groups

However, when Fisher's r Transformation was employed to test for a significant difference between the above independent correlations for

mothers and daughters ($r = .408$) and for mothers and sons ($r = .060$), the results indicated that the difference between the two correlation scores was not statistically significant ($z_{\text{obt.}} = 1.27$).

Hypothesis Three

Hypothesis three states that the self-concept and/or self-esteem of mothers would have a greater association with their daughters' (compared with their sons') assessment of the quality of the relationship that they share with their mothers.

Pearson Correlations were employed to examine responses of 51 mothers and the responses of their first born children. Two groups were formed, using sex of the first born child as the grouping factor, i.e. mothers with first born daughters, and mothers with first born sons. The analysis of responses proceeded as follows:

Self-Concept: Mothers' perceptions in the 11 domains of self-concept in the ASPP, and their first born daughters' and first born sons' respective global scores in the DRS (assessment of the quality of their relationship with their mothers), were examined for correlations.

Self-Worth: Mothers' perception of global self-worth in the ASPP, and their first born daughters' and first born sons' respective global scores in the DRS (assessment of the quality of their relationship with their mothers), were examined for correlations.

Dunn's Test (Bonferroni T) was performed to maintain an appropriate Type 1 error rate by using an experimentwise alpha level of .0045 when 11 self-concept domains in the ASPP were examined (Howell, 1982). Fisher's r Transformations were used to check for statistically significant

differences between the two pairs of independent correlations for mothers and daughters, and mothers and sons (Howell, 1982).

Results: Mothers and Daughters

Correlations between Mothers' Self-Concept (ASPP) and First Born Daughters' Assessment in the (DRS) (n=24): First born daughters' assessment of the quality of their relationship with their mothers in the DRS was significantly correlated with their mothers' perception of self in the domain of Intimate Relations $r = -.4643$, $p < .022$. Statistical significance was not maintained after the application of the Bonferroni T procedure. See Table 4.

Correlations between Mothers' Self-Worth (ASPP) and First Born Daughters' Assessment in the (DRS) (n = 24): There was no significant correlation between mothers' perception of global self-worth and first born daughters' assessment of the quality of their relationship with their mothers in the DRS $r = -.1708$, $p < .425$. See Table 4.

Results: Mothers and Sons

Correlations between Mothers' Self-Concept (ASPP) and First Born Sons' Assessment in the (DRS) (n=27): First born sons' assessment of the quality of their relationship with their mothers in the DRS was significantly correlated with their mothers' perceptions of self-concept on three domains in the ASPP: Sociability $r = .4091$, $p < .034$, Intimate Relations $r = .3797$, $p < .051$, and Humor $r = .4710$, $p < .013$. Statistical significance was not maintained after the application of the Bonferroni T procedure. See Table 4.

Table 4

Zero-Order Correlations Between Mothers' Self-Concept (ASPP) and First Born Daughters' and First Born Sons' Respective Assessments of the Quality of the Mother/Child Relationship (DRS).

Variables	Mothers' Self-Concept, Global Self-Worth (ASPP) and Daughters' Global Score (DRS) (n = 24)	Mothers' Self-Concept, Global Self-Worth (ASPP) and Sons' Global Score (DRS) (n = 27)
Sociability	-.34	.40*
Job Competence	-.05	.08
Nurturance	-.23	-.13
Athletic Ability	.07	.18
Appearance	.05	.21
Adequate Provider	.05	.13
Morality	.10	-.08
Household Management	-.08	-.03
Intimate Relations	-.46*	.38*
Intelligence	-.26	.13
Humor	-.23	.47**
Global Self-Worth	-.17	.17

*** = $p < .001$

** = $p < .01$

* = $p < .05$

Note: a) Coefficients with + indicate significance at .05 level according to Bonferroni's criteria.
 b) R indicates significant differences between two groups of independent correlations, according to Fisher's r Transformation.
 c) ~ Lower scores for Overall Worth indicate more positive ratings.

Correlations between Mothers' Self-Worth (ASPP) and First Born Sons'

Assessment in the (DRS): There was no significant correlation between mothers' perception of global self-worth and first born sons' assessment of the quality of their relationship with their mothers in the DRS $r = .1764$ $p < .379$. See Table 4.

Results: Fisher's r Transformations for Significant Differences Between Groups

Fisher's r Transformations revealed that there was no significant difference between the two pairs of independent correlations, i. e. between mothers/daughters and mothers/sons, in all of the domains listed in Table 4.

Domains of Most/Least Importance for Mothers in the Domains of Self-Concept (ASPP) and Childrens' Perceptions of Mothers' Competence/Lack of Competence in the Domains of Self-Concept (ASPP)

Results: Mothers

The mothers' choices involved rank order nomination of the three domains which they believed to be the most important to their sense of self-worth, and the two or three domains which they perceived to be the least important to their sense of self-worth.

Domains of Most Importance

The three domains most important to mothers' sense of self worth, were, in rank order, Morality, Nurturance and Intelligence.

Domains of Least Importance

The majority of the mothers chose 2 rather than 3 domains which were of least importance to their sense of self-worth. Those two domains were, in rank order, Athletic Ability and Household Management. See Appendix O and Appendix P for a summary of the choices, in rank order, on all domains, as rated by the mothers.

Results: Children

The childrens' choices involved rank order nomination of the three domains on which they believed their mothers to be most competent, and the two or three domains on which they perceived their mothers to be the least competent. Their responses were grouped by sex of children (N = 102, f = 52, m = 50).

Domains of Most Competence

Girls (n = 52) chose, in rank order, Nurturance, Household Management, and Intimate Relations as their mothers' domains of most competence. Boys (n = 50) chose, in rank order, Nurturance, Intimate Relations, and Provider.

Domains of Least Competence

Girls (n = 52) rated their mothers least competent, in rank order, on Athletic Ability and Appearance. Boys (n = 50) rated their mothers least competent, in rank order, on Athletic Ability and Sense of Humor. See Appendices Q to T for domains of mothers' most/least competence, in rank order, as rated by their daughters and sons.

4. Additional Analyses:

A. ANOVA:

Childrens' Perceptions of Mothers' Competence and Overall Worth (ASPP).

The childrens' perceptions of their mothers' competence in the 11 domains of self-concept in the ASPP, and the childrens' ratings of their mothers' overall worth were analyzed as a function of the sex of the first born children only. Sex of first born child, in relation to sex of sibling composition in the family unit, was the grouping factor. The childrens' responses were divided into four groups and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was employed.

Results of ANOVA

Perceptions of First Born Daughters, as Compared with First Born Sons, Grouped by Sex of Sibling Composition in the Family Unit (f/ff = 13, m/mm = 12, f/mf = 11, m/mf = 15)

Mothers' Competence: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) indicated that there were significant differences between first born childrens' assessment of mothers' competence for the domain of Intelligence only, $F(3,47) = 6.219$, $p < .001$. Follow up with Oneway ANOVA and Tukey-HSD procedure at the .05 significance level, indicated that first born sons, whose siblings were male, rated their mothers significantly lower on Intelligence, as compared with first born children of either sex, whose siblings were of the opposite sex $F(3,47) = 6.218$, $p < .001$.

Overall Worth: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) indicated that there were no significant differences in the way that first born sons and first born daughters rated their mothers' overall worth $F(3,47) = .863$, $p < .467$.

B: Correlations

Mothers' Perception of Quality of Relationship with First Born Children (DRS), and Mothers' Perception of Global Self-Worth (ASPP).

Pearson Correlations were employed to examine the relationship between the mothers' perception of the quality of their relationship with their first born daughters, and the mothers' rating of their own Global Self-Worth ($n = 24$). The same correlations were employed for mothers' of first born sons ($n = 27$). Fisher's r Transformations were used to test for statistically significant differences between the independent correlations (Howell, 1982).

Results of Correlations

Mothers' Perception of Quality of Relationship with First Born Children (DRS), and Mothers' Perception of Global Self-Worth (ASPP).

There were no significant correlations between mothers' Global Self-Worth and mothers' perceptions of the quality of their relationship with either first born daughters or first born sons. Fisher's r Transformations did not reveal a significant difference between the two groups.

DISCUSSION

Summary of Results

Three hypotheses were examined in response to the following questions: 1. Would mothers' self-concept and/or self-esteem be related to their daughters' perceptions of their mothers' competence and overall worth? 2. Would mothers and their daughters agree about the quality of their mutual relationship? 3. Would mothers' self-concept and/or self-esteem be related to their daughters' perception of the quality of the relationship they share with their mothers?

A) Hypothesis One.

The results are generally consistent with Hypothesis One in the following manner: 1. The Self-Concept ratings of mothers, in this sample, do share a greater association with their first born daughters' assessments of a) their mothers' competence and b) their mothers' overall worth, as compared with similar assessments of the mothers made by their first born sons. 2. The Global Self-Worth (self-esteem) rating of mothers, in this sample, does share a greater association with their first born daughters' assessments of their mothers' competence, as compared with similar assessments of the mothers made by their first born sons.

However, there is no evidence that the Global Self-Worth of the mothers, in this sample, was associated with either their first born daughters' or first born sons' evaluations of their mothers' overall worth. The results for this hypothesis are discussed more fully under the heading Implications of Results.

B) Hypothesis Two and Three.

The results do not offer statistically significant support for the remaining two hypotheses, as follows:

1. Hypothesis Two: Despite some partial support for this hypothesis, it cannot be stated unequivocally that the mutual assessments of the quality of the mother/daughter relationship, by mothers and their first born daughters, share a greater association than the mutual assessments of the mother/son relationship, by mothers and their first born sons. More particularly, there is a moderate and statistically significant correlation between the mutual assessments of the quality of the mother/daughter relationship. There is no significant correlation between the mutual assessments of the quality of the mother/son relationship. However, appropriate analyses to test for a significant difference between the two groups (mother/daughter and mother/son) do not allow for a statement of a statistically significant difference between the two sets of scores.
2. Hypothesis Three: The self-concept and self-esteem ratings of mothers do not have a significant association with either their first born daughters' or first born sons' assessments of the quality of their mother/child relationship.

C) Additional Analyses.

The results for the two Additional Analyses indicate that:

- A) First born sons, with male siblings, rate their mothers lower on intelligence than first born children of either sex, whose siblings are of the opposite sex.

B) There is no difference in the way that either first born daughters or first born sons rate their mothers' overall worth.

C) There is no significant correlation between mothers' rating of their Global Self-Worth (self-esteem) and mothers' perception of the quality of their relationship with either their first born daughters or their first born sons.

Limitations of the Study

A) The Use of a Restricted Sample in Analyses.

It is important to emphasize that the purpose of using only a portion of the collected responses for analyses in this study was to avoid statistical confounds related to the use of non independent data from related siblings. It was necessary, therefore, to use the data from either first or second born children only, or to choose, at random, the responses of either the first or second born child within each family across the sample.

Initially, sibling ratings of mothers were analyzed as a function of birth order, regardless of sex of sibling. There is statistically significant evidence that first and second born children in this sample rate their mothers in the same way when assessing their mothers' competence in specific self-concept domains (Athletic Ability and Appearance), and the quality of the mother/child relationship. See Appendix U. These findings appear to be congruent with those of Ernst & Angst (1983), who concluded that when socioeconomic status is controlled and when siblings from the same family are compared, birth order-behavior differences disappear. However, they acknowledged that in terms of

parent/child relationships, there is some evidence that first born, compared to later born children, describe themselves as more strongly identified with their parents (Ernst & Angst, 1983). On that basis, data from first born children only was chosen for analyses in the present study.

However, the utilization of data from only one half of the respondents in the sample of children resulted in another statistical problem. The overestimation of significance for correlations with small n's and a large number of variables (Hartman, 1988), threatened to undermine the strength of the conclusions reached in this study. Therefore, where possible, variables were reduced (Dyadic Relationship Scale). Furthermore, conservative post hoc analyses, i.e. Bonferroni T Procedure, were employed as a final measure of significance. Although the use of the Bonferroni procedure resulted in the rejection of some of the significant data achieved initially, the correlations which remained significant could be viewed with more confidence.

B) Selection of subjects.

It is acknowledged that the "snowball" selection process employed in this study to procure subjects was not a random process. However, the final sample was heterogeneous in many ways. The ethnicity, religion, working status, job description, level and quality of education, and geographic location of the subjects varied considerably. Notwithstanding, this sample is not considered generalizable beyond the white, anglophone, middle class milieu from which it was drawn.

Implications of Results

The results of Hypothesis One demonstrate that mothers in this sample share statistically significant and similar perceptions with their first born daughters for mothers' competence in the domain of Job Competence, Athletic Ability and Humor. The initial correlation between mothers and first born sons for mothers' competence in the domain of Household Management is not maintained after the application of Bonferroni T procedure.

The foregoing implies that, in this sample, mothers and first born daughters are relatively more attuned, compared with mothers and sons. Furthermore, these significant results raise some interesting questions. Does the possibility of shared perceptions between mothers and first born daughters about the mothers' Job Competence, imply that those daughters have a better understanding of their mothers' capacity to incorporate a more extensive repertoire of roles beyond homemaking? Could that better understanding result from the possibility that mothers spend more time in conversation with those daughters, sharing their job related experiences? Is humor a gender related issue? Do mothers use humor more successfully in relating to daughters than in relating to sons? (An affirmative answer is implied from the sons' rating of mothers' humor as a principal domain of least competence).

Mothers' self-concept ratings for the domain of Intimate Relations are significantly negatively correlated with their first born daughters' perception of their mothers' overall worth. However, due to the weighting of the numerical values assigned to the measure of mothers' overall worth (see footnote of Table 2), a lower rating for mothers' overall worth by

their daughters implies a higher regard for the mothers' overall worth. It is likely that mothers who give themselves a high rating for Intimate Relations perceive themselves as having close, intimate relationships with at least some of their family members.

If daughters (compared with sons) are closer to their mothers from early infancy, it follows that they will continue to enjoy closer, more rewarding relationships with their mothers and will display a higher regard for their mothers' overall worth. By contrast, the main developmental concerns of sons are generally centered on separateness, independence and autonomy, resulting in relatively less intimacy with their mothers. Such prototypically successful male behavior is generally encouraged by mothers.

There is a significant positive correlation for the self-concept of mothers in the domain of Athletic Ability and their first born daughters' perception of their mothers' competence in that domain. Mothers rate Athletic Ability low in importance on their list of domains related to their sense of self-worth. Yet, it is the only domain in which mothers' self-worth is significantly correlated with daughters' perception of mothers' competence. Furthermore, daughters give low ratings for their mothers' athletic ability. Is it possible that this domain might be more important than mothers are willing to acknowledge? Or is this domain more salient to daughters than it is to mothers?

Messer & Harter (1986) found that all groups of adult women examined in their study rated Athletic Ability and Appearance as their lowest scores. They concluded that adult women in our society have poor physical concepts. It might be that the attitude of the mothers in the present sample, regarding their athletic ability, is similar to that of the women

in the larger sample studied by Messer & Harter (Messer & Harter, 1986).

There is no relationship between the mothers' perception of global self-worth and their first born daughters' perception of their mothers' overall worth. The same results occurred between the perceptions of mothers and their first born sons. This finding raises questions about what concepts mothers employ in rating their self-worth. The data in the present study suggests that childrens' perception of their mothers' overall worth is not central to the cognitive process by which mothers rate their own self-worth. This could explain the ability of mothers in this sample to rate themselves high on self esteem, despite their first born sons' low rating for their mothers' intelligence.

Additional analyses also indicate that there is no statistically significant variability in the data for first born sons' or first born daughters' ratings of their mothers' overall worth. In fact, most ratings are highly positive. Such homogeneity in the data may indicate that the children in this study generally find it difficult and socially unacceptable to publicly criticize their mothers' overall worth. Children of both sexes may be more inclined to pass judgement on their mothers' individual domains of self-concept because they do not perceive negative evaluations in any of these domains as an overall condemnation of their mothers.

Finally, the childrens' questionnaire for rating their mothers' overall worth was specifically designed for this study. It consisted of one question answered by the children on a nine point Likert Scale. That solitary question may not have been an adequate match for the six questions pertaining to global self-worth answered by the mothers in the ASPP. Therefore, at present, the following issue is not yet resolved: if a more

adequate means of measuring childrens' perception of their mothers' overall worth is designed for future research, will significant correlations between mothers' perception of their own global self-worth and childrens' perception of their mothers' overall worth occur?

The initial results for Hypothesis Two indicate that daughters and mothers share statistically significant and similar perceptions about the quality of their mutual relationship, while sons and mothers do not. Post hoc analysis reveals that there is not a statistically significant difference between the two groups. However, this is still considered to be an important finding because statistically significant results anticipated with a larger number of subjects would then confirm the fundamental theory underlying this study that mothers and daughters continuously share a stronger and more unique relationship, as compared with mothers and sons.

Additional analyses reveal that first born sons in this sample whose siblings are male, rate their mothers significantly lower on intelligence than first born children of either sex whose siblings are of the opposite sex. Such sons also tend to rate their mothers lower on intelligence than first born daughters, whose siblings are female, but not significantly so. Furthermore, first born sons rate their mothers as competent in household management but highly incompetent in their ability to use humor (a sign of intelligent thinking). All of the above findings suggest that first born sons, in this sample, have a very narrow, constricted and stereotypical view of their mothers whom they appear to perceive as a rather dull, unintelligent, domestic maid. Is it possible that the sex ratio in such families where there are three males to one female, fosters such narrow minded views of women?

**Implications for Domains of Most/Least Importance and Most/Least Competence
for Mothers in the Domains of Self-Concept (ASPP)**

The results of these questionnaires regarding mothers' self-concept domains, as rated by mothers and by their children were simply rank ordered and compared with one another.

Domains of Most Importance/Most Competence: The three domains chosen by the 51 mothers in the sample, considered to be the most important to their sense of self-worth, are, in rank order, Morality, Nurturance and Intelligence. When the childrens' responses about their mothers' competence on the domains are divided into two groups by sex of children, and rank ordered, the choices are as follows: Boys rate Nurturance and Intimate Relations, as their top choices, while girls rate Nurturance and Household Management, highest.

The selection of Nurturance as the mothers' most competent domain by both boys and girls, is the same as the mothers' second highest rating for domain of most importance. However, none of the childrens' remaining choices (Intimate Relations and Household Management) match their mothers' remaining choices (Morality and Intelligence).

It appears that the children prefer concrete and practical examples of maternal competence which are directly related to the stereotypical image of "mother". Mothers, on the other hand, select more abstract and less tangible domains to be among their most important choices.

In retrospect, the wording of the children's questionnaire, "How would you rate your mother's competence/success in the following areas?" may have led children to narrow their field of vision and to focus on the adult

women in this study solely in the traditional role of mothers.

Conversely, the general wording of the mothers' questionnaire which excludes any reference to motherhood "How important is it to you to be" may have influenced the mothers to take a broader frame of reference and to focus on a more comprehensive image of themselves as adults. Thus, it could be that mothers consider the concrete and practical domains of Household Management and Intimate Relations as axiomatic qualifications for the role of mother. Their choice of relatively abstract domains (Morality and Intelligence) as important descriptors for their sense of self-worth, is broader in scope and encompasses a more comprehensive image of woman which extends beyond the traditional role of mother.

It is possible that these middle class mothers, as mature thinking, adult women, tend to see themselves as being more diversified than their children perceive them to be. It could be that children perceive and interact with their mothers in a more limited capacity. Although these children may be fully aware that their mothers assume additional roles, they may not usually be present when their mothers act out their "other" responsibilities beyond the traditional role of motherhood. This factor may have prejudiced the ability of the children in this study, especially sons, to appreciate their mothers' competence on the less concrete, more abstract, and less stereotypical domains (Intelligence and Morality).

Domains of Least Importance/Least Competence: The two domains chosen by the 51 mothers in the sample, considered to be the least important to their sense of self-worth, are, in rank order, Athletic Ability and Household Management. There is unanimous agreement, by daughters and sons in this sample, that Athletic Ability is a domain in which their mothers are least

competent. In addition, Athletic Ability is the domain chosen by the mothers as the least important to their sense of self-worth.

Athletic Ability scores range from 1 to 4, with 4 being the highest possible rating. This domain has the lowest mean score (Mean = 2.309) among all 11 domains of self-concept, as rated by the mothers. See Appendix V. In fact, most mothers rate their competence in Athletic Ability at 2 (Mode = 2.000). As stated, the prevalent low regard expressed by mothers for their athletic ability might be expected for any sample of adult women (Messer & Harter, 1986). However, it is possible that the strong opinion held by children in this study, concerning their mothers' incompetence for Athletic Ability, influenced the mothers' attitude about the relative importance of that domain. The mothers' rating of Athletic Ability as the domain of least importance may have been the result of a compensatory mechanism analogous to "sour grapes". Physical fitness has assumed an important role in contemporary society. It may be that the mothers in this study compensate for the negative impact of the childrens' perception of their mothers' athletic skills, by relegating Athletic Ability to a lowly status. This compensatory mechanism might have enabled the mothers in this study to maintain their high sense of self-worth, despite their childrens' negative rating for Athletic Ability. Since the present study is not designed to determine cause and effect of mutual perceptions, the issue of a compensatory mechanism employed by mothers concerning their poor athletic ability, cannot go beyond the realm of speculation.

The mothers rank Household Management as the second least important domain. This can be explained by the fact that Household Management is

considered to be a prime function of women homemakers and is not a domain in which success or competence inspires strong feelings of self-worth.

When the sample of childrens' responses (as to the domains in which their mothers are least competent), is divided by sex, boys select Sense of Humor as their second choice, while girls choose Appearance. The second choice of girls in the sample (Appearance) is a salient, stereotypical, and concrete variable upon which they can focus easily. Boys negative focus on their mothers' sense of humor, which is not often associated with the traditional role of mothers, may indicate that humor is a gender related issue. Perhaps, humor is a relatively positive means of communication for mothers and daughters but not for mothers and sons.

Directions For Future Research

Although the intent of the study is exploratory in nature, there is sufficient evidence in the outcome of the statistical analyses to warrant further investigation of the hypotheses. It is conceivable that many of the initial findings which did not maintain statistical significance might have done so with the appropriate sample size.

Primarily, the significant results for the first hypothesis suggest that for this sample, mothers' and first born daughters' perceptions may be more closely related than those of mothers and first born sons. If these results can be replicated in the context of a larger study, they may afford a greater understanding of, A) the impact of women's close interpersonal relationships on their self-concept and self-esteem, and B) the unique course of womens' social development as it relates to social interactions in a family unit. Such knowledge could be beneficial in the

planning and application of educational and therapeutic techniques for troubled women, families and/or children.

However, before such outcomes become viable, it is important to replicate this study with a larger number of subjects and to explore the following possibilities:

1. The Combined Influence of the Sex of Siblings.

The serendipitous finding that sex of sibling composition within the family unit appears to be an important factor in determining mothers' and childrens' shared perceptions, is most interesting. It may be that the particular combination of the sex of both siblings has a greater correlation with mothers' self-perceptions than anticipated.

Furthermore, an analysis of variance demonstrates that first born sons, whose siblings are male, rate their mothers significantly lower on intelligence than either first born daughters, or first born sons whose siblings are of the opposite sex. This suggests that the predominance of males in a four member family unit (ratio 3 males: 1 female) is conducive to stereotypical judgments about the relative inferiority of female intelligence. It is noteworthy that the mean score for mothers of two sons is relatively low in the domain of Intelligence (Mean = 2.271).

Thus, it may be possible that the relative proportion of males and females, including parents and children, in a four member family, dictates not only the mothers' self-perceptions, but also the quality of the relationship between mothers and their children. These issues could be the basis for future research.

2. Age of Children.

One area which was not examined in this study, but which could give

rise to future research, concerns the additional factor of age of children:

A) Similar Age Grouping of Siblings in the Family Unit.

Is it possible that the closer siblings are in age, the more likely they are to evaluate their mothers in the same way ? It might be that the combination of sex and age of siblings has a greater relationship with mothers' self-perceptions, than sex of siblings only.

B) Adolescent Individuation.

Skinner (1984) reported that mothers rated familial cohesion and adaptability at its lowest during the stage at which adolescents were present. Other researchers (Bengston & Troll, 1978, Noller and Callan 1988) discussed the fact that adolescents tend to view family process in a manner different from that of their parents. Blos (1967) described a turbulent period of separation-individuation as the "Second Individuation Process of Adolescence", which he considered the central achievement in adolescent life. Rothchild (1979) described heightened conflict at mid adolescence between a girl and her family as a major vehicle for disengagement and autonomy. Steinberg (1981) found increasing conflicts between pubescent adolescent sons and their mothers.

The importance of reciprocal interpersonal relationships is the common theme of most theories of adolescent development (Sullivan, 1953; Benedek, 1979; Steinberg, 1981; Gilligan, 1982; Macoby & Martin, 1983; White, Speisman & Costos, 1983; Youniss, 1983; Grotevant & Cooper, 1985; Kimmel & Weiner, 1985). It is evident that this period is marked by frequent transitions. Adolescents are intensely involved in the process of striving towards the creation of new values and strategies which may be oppositional to parental values. Such conflicts, occurring within the confines of a

mother/child relationship could influence the mothers' self-perceptions.

Therefore, a direction which future research might take would be to investigate the relationship between mothers' self-perceptions and the age of their adolescent children, in addition to sex.

3. Compensatory Mechanisms to Maintain Self-Esteem.

The possibility that mothers in this study utilized a compensatory mechanism to maintain their high sense of self-worth, (despite their children's negative rating of their competence for athletic ability), was previously raised in this Discussion. This issue presents interesting questions which can be the focus for future research: A) Do women maintain their self-esteem by relegating failed or relatively weaker achievements in salient areas to lesser importance? B) Are the negative perceptions of children (regardless of sex) so powerful, that their mothers compensate by relegating the area in which the negative perceptions are focused to one of little importance?

4. Sense of Humor as an Important Mode of Communication for Male Children.

The issue of why male children, in this sample choose to focus on sense of humor as a domain in which their mothers have little competence might warrant future research. Could it be that sense of humor is a gender related issue? It might be that the low estimate of mothers' competence in this domain by their sons is related to an inability of those mothers to understand and adapt to a uniquely male oriented mode of expression which does not employ the same use of humor. It may be that daughters like their mothers' style of humor, while sons do not.

5. Mothers Working Outside the Home.

It may be that mothers' self-concept and/or self-esteem are influenced

by their particular life styles. Many mothers experience diverse roles simultaneously, all of which might influence how these women view themselves. For example, the influence of underlings, colleagues, superiors and/or the role expectations of mothers working substantial hours outside the home may counterbalance or add to the influences of the unique mother/daughter relationship.

Baker (1985) found that career women have a more positive self-concept than women in general. Baruch, Barnett & Rivers (1985) concluded that the importance of each role for women's well being decreases in direct proportion to the number of roles assumed. Each additional role provides another potential source for experiencing "mastery" (defined as a high or nearly complete degree of proficiency in the execution of a skill) and pleasure, which can then provide an increment in one's own sense of self-worth. Thus, additional roles may render a woman less vulnerable to the cognitive effects which result from her lack of success in one particular role. "With fewer roles, one has fewer supports for the psyche, and a weakness in any one can be devastating" (Baruch, Barnett & Rivers, 1985, p.187). The women in the Baruch et al study who scored lowest on a sense of mastery were those with the fewest roles. It was concluded, therefore, that the additional role of working outside the home could act as a buffer against stress and an escape from tension. Salaried work outside the home, therefore, can protect women against the most deleterious effects of the difficulties they may experience in other areas of their lives (Baruch, Barnett & Rivers, 1985). Conversely, the fewer roles women assume, the more vulnerable they can be to the quality of the mother/daughter bond. If that relationship is problematic, then non salaried traditional homemakers

are more likely to be critical of themselves than salaried women who are working substantial hours outside the home.

Although it is recognized that the working status of mothers is an important component in terms of mothers' perceptions of self-concept and self-worth, the small number of mothers in this study did not allow for its inclusion in the statistical analyses. Instead, work status was controlled for, initially, by dividing the sample equally among mothers employed 20 hours per week or more outside the home, and mothers employed less than 20 hours per week outside the home or who were non salaried homemakers in the traditional sense. In fact, when subgroups of mothers of first born children were chosen for the various analyses, this equal division of work status continued to apply.

Future research, involving a larger sample of subjects, should focus on salaried employment outside the home as an independent variable in the analyses. Such employment could prove to be related to the mothers' evaluation of self-concept and/or self-worth.

References

- Ackerman, N.W. (1958). The psychodynamics of family life: Diagnosis and treatment of family relationships. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Ahammer, I.M. (1973). Social-Learning theory as a framework for the study of adult personality development. In P.B. Baltes and K.W. Schaie (Eds.), Life-Span developmental psychology. Pg. 253-284. New York: Academic Press.
- Baker, M. (1985). Career women and self-concept. International Journal of Women's Studies, 8 (3), 214-217.
- Bandura, A. (1969). Social-Learning theory of identificatory processes. In D.A. Goslin (Ed.), Handbook of socialization theory and research. Pg. 213-262. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Social learning theory. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Bardwick, J.M. (1976). In transition. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Bardwick, J.M. (1980). The seasons of a woman's life. In D.G. McGuigan (Ed.), Women's lives: New theory, research and policy, pg. 35-57. Michigan: The University of Michigan Centre for Continuing Education of Women.
- Barnett, R.C. & Baruch, G.K. (1978). The competent woman: Perspectives on development. New York: Irvington Publishers, Inc.
- Baruch, G., Barnett, R., & Rivers, C. (1983). Lifeprints. New York: Signet.

- Bell, D.C. & Bell L.G. (1983). Parental validation and support in the development of adolescent daughters. In H.D. Grotevant and C.R. Cooper (Eds.), Adolescent development in the family: New directions for child development, 22. New York: Jossey-Bass.
- Benedek, E.P. (1979). Dilemmas in research on female adolescent development. In M. Sugar (Ed.), Female adolescent development, pg. 3-19. New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Bengtson, V.L. & Troll, L. (1978). Youth and their parents: Feedback and intergenerational influence in socialization. In R.M. Lerner and G.B. Spanier, Child Influences on Marital and Family Interaction, pg. 215-240. New York: Academic Press.
- Bernard, J. (1975). Women, wives, mothers: Values and options. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.
- Bloss, P. (1962). On adolescence: A psychoanalytic interpretation. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe.
- Blos, P. (1967). The second individuation process of adolescence. In S. Eissler, A. Freud, H. Hartmann, and M. Kris (Eds.), The psychoanalytic study of the child, 22, 162-186. New York: International Universities Press Inc.
- Chodorow, N. (1974). Family structure and feminine personality. In M.Z. Rosaldo and L. Lamphere (Eds.), Woman, culture and society, pg. 43-67. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Chodorow, N. (1978). The reproduction of mothering: Psychoanalysis and the sociology of gender. Berkley: University of California Press.
- Coopersmith, S. (1967). The antecedents of self-esteem. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman and Company.

- Coopersmith, S. (1981). Self-Esteem inventories (SEI). Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press Inc.
- Copeland, A.P. & Barenbaum, N.B. (1983, August). Some correlates of child-rearing attitudes. Paper presented at the 91st annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Anaheim, Ca. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 235907).
- Copeland, A.P. & Grossman, F.K. (1984, October). Gender effects in parenting. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council on Family Relations, San Francisco, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 235 907).
- Crook, T., Raskin, A., & Eliot, J. (1981). Parent-child relationships and adult depression. Child Development, 52, 950-957.
- Eichenbaum, L. & Orbach, S. (1983). Understanding Women. New York: Basic Books.
- Ellicott, A.M. (1985). Psychosocial changes as a function of family-cycle phase. Human Development. 28 (5), 270-274.
- Erikson, E.H. (1985). Childhood and society. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Ernst, C. & Angst, J. (1983). Birth Order. New York: Springer Verlag.
- Fiske, M. (1980). Changing hierarchies of commitment in adulthood. In N.J. Smelser and E.H. Erikson (Eds.), Themes of work and love in adulthood, pg.238-264. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Fitts, W.H. (1965). Tennessee self-concept scale. California: Western Psychological Services.

- Fitts, W.H. (1981). Issues regarding self-concept change. In M.D. Lynch, A.A. Norem-Hebeisen, and K.J. Gergen, Self-Concept: Advances in Theory and Research, pg. 261-272. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Ballinger Publishing Co.
- Frank, S., Avery, C.B. & Laman, M.S. (1988). Young adults' perceptions of their relationships with their parents: Individual differences in connectedness, competence, and emotional autonomy. Developmental Psychology, 24 (5), 729-737.
- Frank, S., Hole, C.B., Jacobson, S., Justkowski, R., & Huyck, M. (1986). Psychological predictors of parents' sense of confidence and control and self-versus child-focused gratifications. Developmental Psychology, 22 (3), 348-355.
- Franz, C.E. & White, K.M. (1985). Individuation and attachment in personality development: Extending Erikson's Theory. Journal of Personality. 53 (2), 224-255.
- Freud, S. (1938). The basic writings of Sigmund Freud. New York: The Modern Library.
- Friday, N. (1977). My mother/my self: The daughter's search for identity. New York: Dell Publishing Co.Inc.
- Gecas, V. (1979). The influence of social class on socialization. In W.R. Burr, R. Hill, F.I. Nye & I.L. Reiss (Eds.), Contemporary theories about the family: Research-based theories, 1, 365-404. New York: The Free Press.
- Gecas, V. & Schwalbe, M.L. (1986). Parental behavior and adolescent self-esteem. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48, 37-46.

- Gilligan, C. (1980). Restoring the missing text of women's development to life cycle theories. In D.G. McGuigan (Ed.), Women's lives: New theory, research and policy, pg.17-33. Michigan: The University of Michigan Centre for Continuing Education of Women.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Grotevant, H.D., & Cooper, C.R. (1985). Patterns of interaction in family relationships and the development of identity exploration in adolescence. Child Development, 56, 415-428.
- Hancock, E. (1985). Age or experience? Human Development. 28 (5), 274-280.
- Hanson, S.M. & Bozett, F.W. (1985, November). Fatherhood: Developmental and contextual perspectives. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council on Family Relations, Dallas, TX. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 269 711).
- Harter, S. (1983). Developmental perspectives on the self-system. In E.M. Hetherington (Ed.), Handbook of child psychology (Vol. 4): Socialization, personality, and social development. New York: Wiley.
- Harter, S. (1985). Competence as a dimension of self-evaluation: Toward a comprehensive model of self-worth. In R. Leahy (Ed.), The development of the self. New York: Academic Press.

- Hartman, D.P. (1988). Measurement and Analysis. In M.H. Bornstein and M.E. Lamb (Eds.), Developmental psychology: An advanced textbook. 2nd Edition. Hillsdale, N. J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers.
- Hartup, W.W. (1978). Perspectives on child and family interaction: Past, present, and future. In R.M. Lerner and G.B. Spanier (Eds.), Child influences on marital and family interaction, pg. 23-45. New York: Academic Press.
- Hauser, R.M. & Featherman, D.L. (1977). The process of stratification: Trends and analyses. New York: Academic Press.
- Helson, R., Mitchell, V. & Hart, B. (1985). Lives of women who became autonomous. Journal of Personality, 53 (2), 257-285.
- Howell, D.C. (1982). Statistical methods for psychology. Boston, Mass.: Duxbury Press.
- Hollingshead, A.B. (1975). Four factor index of social status. New Haven: Department of Sociology, Yale University.
- Hurst, C.H. (1979). The anatomy of social inequality. St. Louis: Mosby.
- Johnson, B.W., Redfield, D.L., Miller, R.L., & Simpson, R.E. (1983). The Coopersmith self-esteem inventory: A construct validation study. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 43, 907-913.
- Josselson, R. (1987). Finding herself: Pathways to identity development in women. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Kelly, G.A. (1955). The psychology of personal constructs: A theory of personality, 1. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.
- Kimmel, D.C. & Weiner, I.B. (1985). Adolescence: A developmental transition. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Klein, D.M., Jorgensen, S.R., & Miller, B.C. (1978). Research methods and developmental reciprocity in families. In R.M. Lerner and G.B. Spanier (Eds.). Child influences on marital and family interaction, pg. 107-135. New York: Academic Press.
- Kohut, H. (1983). The analysis of the self: A systematic approach to the psychoanalytic treatment of narcissistic personality disorders. The psychoanalytic study of the child. Monograph No. 4. New York: International Universities Press, Inc.
- Kohut, H. (1984). Self-selfobject relationships reconsidered. In A. Goldberg and P.E. Stepansky (Eds.), How does analysis cure?, pg.49-63. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Kohut, H. (1986). The restoration of the self. Connecticut: International Universities Press, Inc.
- Kokenes, B. (1978). A factor analytic study of the Coopersmith self-esteem inventory. Adolescence, Vol. XIII (49), 149-155.
- Laing, R.D., Phillipson, H., & Lee, A.R. (1966). Interpersonal perception: A theory and a method of research. New York: Springer.
- Laing, R.D. (1969). The self and others. New York: Penguin Books.
- Lerner, R.M. & Spanier, G.B. (1978). A dynamic interactional view of child and family development. In R.M. Lerner and G.B. Spanier (Eds.), Child influences on marital and family interaction, pg. 1-22. New York: Academic Press.
- Levinson, D.J. (1978). The seasons of a man's life. New York: Ballantine Books.

- Lykes, M.B. (1985). Gender and individualistic vs. collectivist bases for notions about the self. Journal of Personality, 53 (2), 356-383.
- Lynch, M.D. (1981). Self-Concept development in childhood. In M.D. Lynch, A.A. Norem-Hebeisen, and K.J. Gergen (Eds.), Self-Concept: Advances in theory and research, pg. 119-132. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Ballinger Publishing Company.
- Macoby, E.E. & Martin, J.A. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-Child interaction. In P.H. Mussen (Ed.), Handbook of child psychology, 4 (4), Socialization, personality, and social development, (pp. 1-102). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Madanes, C. (1987). Advances in strategic family therapy. In J.K. Zeig (Ed.), The evolution of psychotherapy, pg. 47-55. New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Magrab, P.R. (1979). Mothers and daughters. In C.B. Kopp (Ed.), Becoming female: Perspectives on development. pg. 113-129. New York: Plenum Press.
- Markus, H. (1977). Self-Schemata and processing information about the self. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35 (2), 63-78.
- Markus, H. (1980). The self in thought and memory. In D.M. Wegner & R.R. Vallacher (Eds.), The self in social psychology, pg. 102-130. New York: Oxford University Press.
- McDonald, G. (1977). Parental identification by the adolescent: A social power approach. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 39, 705-719.

- McGuire, J. (1985, September). Mother-daughter and father-son relationships. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Developmental Psychological Section, British Psychological Society, Belfast, Northern Ireland. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 264 008).
- Messer, B. & Harter, S. (1986). Manual for the adult self-perception profile. Denver, Col.: University of Denver.
- Meuller, C.W. & Parcel, T.L. (1981). Measures of socioeconomic status: Alternatives and recommendations. Child Development, 52, 13-30.
- Michael, J.J., Plass, A., & Lee, Y.B. (1973). A comparison of the self-report and the observed report in the measurement of the self-concept: Implications for construct validity. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 33, 433-439.
- Miller, J.B. (1976). Toward a new psychology of women. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Mills, C.W. (1959). The power elite. New York: Oxford.
- Minuchin, P. (1988). Relationships within the family: A systems perspective on development. In R.A. Hinde and J.S. Hinde (Eds.), Relationships within families. Pg.7-26. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Minuchin, S. (1974). Families and family therapy. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Minuchin, S. (1987). My Many Voices. In J. K. Zeig (Ed.), The evolution of psychotherapy, pg. 5-14. New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Mishler, E.G. & Waxler, N.E. (1968). Interaction in families: An experimental study of family processes and schizophrenia. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

- Moos, R. & Moos, B. (1981). Family environment scale manual. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Morgan, W.R. (1975). Bales role theory: An attribution theory interpretation. Sociometry, 38, 429-444.
- Neugarten, B.L. & Danan, N. (1973). Sociological Perspectives on the life cycle. In P.B. Baltes and K.W. Schaie (Eds.), Life-Span developmental psychology. pg.53-69. New York: Academic Press.
- Nock, S.L. & Rossi, P.H. (1979). Household types and social standing. Social Forces, 57, 1325-1345.
- Noller, P. & Callan, V.J. (1988). Understanding parent-adolescent interactions: Perceptions of family members and outsiders. Developmental Psychology, 24 (5), 707-714.
- Offer, D., Ostrov, E., & Howard, K.I. (1981). The adolescent. New York: Basic Books.
- Offer, D., Ostrov, E., & Howard, K.I. (1982). Family perceptions of adolescent self-image. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 11 (4), 281-291.
- Olson, D.H., Portner, J., & Lavee, Y. (1985). Faces III. University of Minnesota, Minnesota: Family Social Science.
- Parsons, T. (1949). The social structure of the family. In R.N. Anshen (Ed.), The family: Its function and destiny. pg.241-274. New York: Harper.
- Parsons, T. (1952). Age and sex in the social structure of the United States. American Sociological Review, 7 (5), 278-231.

- Parsons, T. (1955). The family in urban-industrial america. In T. Parsons and R.F. Bales (Eds.), Socialization and interaction process. pg. 241-274. New York: Free Press.
- Pearlin, L.I. (1980). Life strains and psychological distress among adults. In N.J. Smelser and E.H. Erikson (Eds.), Themes of work and love in adulthood. Pg. 174-192. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Peck, T.A. (1986). Women's self-definition in adulthood: From a different model? Psychology of Women Quarterly, 10, 274-284.
- Peterson, A.C., Schulenberg, J.E., Abramowitz, R.H., Offer, D., & Jarcho, H. D. (1984). A self-image questionnaire for young adolescents (SIQYA): Reliability and validity studies. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 13 (2), 93-111.
- Piaget, J. (1983). Piaget's theory. In P.H. Mussen and W. Kessen (Eds.), Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 1, History, theory, and methods. New York: Wiley.
- Piers, E.V. (1984). Piers-Harris children's self-concept scale, revised manual. Los Angeles: Western Psychological Services.
- Randour, M.L. (1987). Women's psyche, women's spirit: The reality of relationships. New York: Columbia University.
- Reingold, H.L. (1969). The social and socializing infant. In D.A. Goslin, (Ed.), Handbook of socialization theory and research. Pg. 779-790. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company.
- Reinke, B.J., Holmes, D.S., & Harris, R.L. (1985). The timing of psychosocial changes in women's lives: The years 25 to 45. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48 (5), 1353-1364.

- Reynolds, A.G. & Flagg, P.W. (1983). Cognitive psychology, 2. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Robinson, E.A. & Jacobson, N. S. (1988). Social learning theory and psychopathology: A Kantian model in behaviorism? In T. Jacob (Ed.), Family interaction and psychopathology. Pg.117-162. New York: Plenum Press.
- Rogers, C.R. (1961). On becoming a person. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). Society and the adolescent self-image. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Rosenberg, M. (1979). Conceiving the self. New York: Basic Books.
- Rossi, A.S. (1980). Life-Span theories and women's lives. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society. 6 (1), 4-32.
- Rossi, P., Sampson, W., Bose, C., Jasso, G., & Passel J. (1974). Measuring household social standing. Social Science Research, 3, 169-190.
- Rothchild, E. (1979). Female power: Lines to development of autonomy in adolescent girls. In M. Shugar (Ed.), Female Adolescent Development, pg. 274-714. New York: Brunner/Mazel, Publishers.
- Rubin, L.B. (1979). Women of a certain age: the midlife search for self. New York: Harper & Row.
- Runciman, W.G. (1968). Class, status and power. In J.A. Jackson (Ed.), Social stratification. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Sangiuliano, J. (1980). In her time. New York: Morrow Quill.
- Satir, V. (1972). Peoplemaking. Palo Alto, California: Science and Behavior Books.

- Schlossberg, N.K. (1984). Counselling adults in transition. New York: Springer Publishing Co.
- Sheey, G. (1976). Passages: Predictable crises of adult life. New York: Bantam Books.
- Sholomskas, D. & Axelrod, R. (1986). The influence of mother-daughter relationships on women's sense of self and current role choices. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 10, 171-182.
- Skinner, H.A., Santa-Barbara J., & Steinhauer, P.D. (1981, June). The family assessment measure: Development of a self-report instrument. Symposium presented at the Canadian Psychological Association annual meeting, Toronto, Canada.
- Skinner, H.A., Steinhauer, P.D., Santa-Barbara, J. (1983). The family assessment measure. Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health, 2 (2), 91-105.
- Skinner, H.A., Steinhauer, P.D., Santa-Barbara, J. (1984). The family assessment measure: Administration and interpretation guide. Toronto, Ontario: Addiction Research Foundation.
- Skinner, H.A. (1988). Self-Report instruments for family assessment. In T. Jacob (Ed.), Family interaction and psychopathology: Theories, methods and findings. Plenum: New York.
- Skolnik, A.S. & Skolnick, M. (1971). Family in transition: Rethinking marriage, sexuality, child rearing, and family organization. Boston: Little, Brown & Company.
- Stanwyck, D.J. (1983). Self-esteem through the life span. Family and Community Health, 6, 11-28.

- Steinberg, L.D. (1981). Transformations in family relations at puberty. Developmental Psychology, 17, (6), 833-840.
- Steinhauer, P.D., Santa-Barbara, J., & Skinner, H. A. (1984). The process model of family functioning. Canadian Journal of Psychiatry, 29 (2), 89-97.
- Sullivan, H.S. (1953). The interpersonal theory of psychiatry. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Swallow, C. (1981). How mothers and fathers rear their daughters and sons. PTA Today, 9 (5), 10-13.
- Thomas, A. & Chess, S. (1983). Temperament and parent-child interaction. In W.M. Damon (Ed.), Social and personality development: Essays on the growth of the child, pg. 84-94. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.
- Thompson, N.L. & Lee, J.M. (1983). Socioeconomic status and socialization. In R. Wild (Ed.), The family in the modern world, Australian perspectives: Vol. 18, Studies in society, pg. 137-151. Boston: George Allen & Unwin.
- Tolpin, M. & Kohut, H. (1980). Disorders of the self: The psychopathology of the first years of life. In S.I. Greenspan & G.H. Pollock (Eds.), The course of life: Psychoanalytic contributions toward understanding personality development. Vol. 1, Infancy & Early Childhood, Pg. 425-442. Rockville, Maryland: NIMH.
- Tomeh, A.K. & Vasko, C. (1980, March). Reference group interaction and sex role orientation: A comparative analysis by sex and mother's achieved role. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Ohio Council on Family Relations, Westerville, Ohio. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED196 795)

- Vezina, J. (1980). Grandmothers, mothers, and daughters: Intergenerational Attitude Transference among rural women. Nebraska: Chadron State College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 243630)
- Walker, A.J. & Thompson, L. (1982, October). Two generations of mothers and daughters: Role status and interdependence. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council on Family Relations. Washington, D.C. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. Ed 229 671).
- White, K.M., Speisman, J.C., & Costos, D. (1983). Young adults and their parents: Individuation to mutuality. In H.D. Grotevant and C.R. Cooper (Eds.), Adolescent development in the family, pg. 61-76. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Wyllie, R.C. (1961). The self-concept: A critical survey of pertinent research literature. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Youniss, J. (1983). Social construction of adolescence by adolescents and parents. In H.D. Grotevant and C.R. Cooper(Eds.), Adolescent development in the family, pg. 93-109. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ziller, R.C., Hagey, J., Smith, M.D.C., & Long, B.H. (1969). Self-Esteem: A self-social construct. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 33 (1), 84-95.

Appendix A

The General Scale

BOOKLET A

YOUR FAMILY

GENERAL INFORMATION

DATE.....

YOUR FAMILY POSITION

FAMILY NUMBER.....

AGE.....years

SEX M F

1. MOTHER.....

2. CHILD

3. WIFE

DIRECTIONS

ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES YOU WILL FIND 50 STATEMENTS ABOUT YOUR FAMILY AS A WHOLE.

PLEASE READ EACH STATEMENT CAREFULLY AND DECIDE HOW WELL THE STATEMENT DESCRIBES YOUR FAMILY.

THEN CIRCLE YOUR RESPONSE ON THE LINE DIRECTLY BELOW THE STATEMENT.

CIRCLE ONLY ONE LETTER (RESPONSE) FOR EACH STATEMENT.

ANSWER EVERY STATEMENT, EVEN IF YOU ARE NOT COMPLETELY SURE OF YOUR ANSWER.

STRONGLY AGREE: IF YOU STRONGLY AGREE WITH THE STATEMENT, THEN CIRCLE THE LETTER "A".
 AGREE: IF YOU AGREE WITH THE STATEMENT, THEN CIRCLE THE LETTER "B".
 DISAGREE: IF YOU DISAGREE WITH THE STATEMENT, THEN CIRCLE THE LETTER "C".
 STRONGLY DISAGREE: IF YOU STRONGLY DISAGREE WITH THE STATEMENT, THEN CIRCLE THE LETTER "D".

EXAMPLE: I like the climate in Montreal.

A B C D

(THE PERSON STRONGLY DISAGREES WITH THAT STATEMENT)

Pizza is a food that I like to eat.

A B C D

(THE PERSON AGREES WITH THAT STATEMENT)

INSTRUCTIONS

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS BY CIRCLING THE APPROPRIATE LETTER (A, B, C, OR D) ON THE LINE BENEATH EACH QUESTION.

STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
A	B	C	D

QUESTIONS

1. We spend too much time arguing about what our problems are.

A B C D

2. Family duties are shared.

A B C D

3. When I ask someone to explain what they mean, I get a straight answer.

A B C D

4. When someone in our family is upset, we don't know if they are angry, sad, scared or what.

A B C D

5. We are as well adjusted as any family could possibly be.

A B C D

6. You don't get a chance to be an individual in our family.

A B C D

7. When I ask why we have certain rules, I don't get a good answer.

A B C D

P.2 (CONT'D)

STRONGLY AGREE
AAGREE
BDISAGREE
CSTRONGLY DISAGREE
D

8. We have the same views on what is right and wrong.

A B C D

9. I don't see how any family could get along better than ours.

A B C D

10. Some days we are more easily annoyed than on others.

A B C D

11. When problems come up, we try different ways of solving them.

A B C D

12. My family expects me to do more than my share.

A B C D

13. We argue about who said what in our family.

A B C D

14. We tell each other about things that bother us.

A B C D

15. My family could be happier than it is.

A B C D

16. We feel loved in our family.

A B C D

P.3 (CONT'D)

STRONGLY AGREE
AAGREE
BDISAGREE
CSTRONGLY DISAGREE
D

17. When you do something wrong in our family, you don't know what to expect.

A B C D

8. It's hard to tell what the rules are in our family.

A B C D

19. I don't think any family could possibly be happier than mine.

A B C D

20. Sometimes we are unfair to each other.

A B C D

21. We never let things pile up until they are more than we can handle.

A B C D

22. We agree about who should do what in our family.

A B C D

23. I never know what's going on in our family.

A B C D

24. I can let my family know what is bothering me.

A B C D

25. We never get angry in our family.

P.5 (CONT'D)

STRONGLY AGREE
A

B
AGREE
B

C
DISAGREE
C

STRONGLY DISAGREE
D

35. Sometimes we avoid each other.

A B C D

36. We feel close to each other.

A B C D

37. Punishments are fair in our family.

A B C D

38. The rules in our family don't make sense.

A B C D

39. Some things about my family don't entirely please me.

A B C D

40. We never get upset with each other.

A B C D

41. We deal with our problems even when they're serious.

A B C D

42. One family member always tries to be the centre of attention.

A B C D

43. My family lets me have my say, even if they disagree.

A B C D

P.6 (CONT'D)

STRONGLY AGREE
AAGREE
BDISAGREE
CSTRONGLY DISAGREE
D

44. When our family gets upset we take too long to get over it.

A B C D

45. We always admit our mistakes without trying to hide anything.

A B C D

46. We don't really trust each other.

A B C D

47. We hardly ever do what is expected of us without being told.

A B C D

48. We are free to say what we think in our family.

A B C D

49. My family is not a perfect success.

A B C D

50. We have never let down another family member in any way.

A B C D

Appendix B

The Dyadic Relationship Scale

Revised Forms (3)

BOOKLET B - 3AD

DYAD

(MY MOTHER & I)

DATE.....	FAMILY MEMBER BEING CONSIDERED
FAMILY NUMBER.....	MOTHER'S NUMBER.....
AGE..... yrs	MOTHER'S AGE.....
BIRTH ORDER.....	BIRTH ORDER.....

DIRECTIONS

On the following pages you will find 42 statements about the relationship between you and your mother. Please read the statement and decide how well the statement describes your relationship with this family member.

Circle your response on the line beneath the statement.

Circle only one letter (response) for each statement.

Answer every statement, even if you are not completely sure of your answer.

STRONGLY AGREE: If you strongly agree with the statement then circle the letter "A".
 AGREE: If you agree with the statement then circle the letter "B".
 DISAGREE: If you disagree with the statement then circle the letter "C".
 STRONGLY DISAGREE: If you strongly disagree with the statement then circle the letter "D".

EXAMPLE;

I like to eat ice cream.

A B C D

(The person strongly agrees with the statement)

I think television is always boring.

A B C D

(The person disagrees with the statement)

INSTRUCTIONS

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS BY CIRCLING THE APPROPRIATE LETTER (A, B, C, OR D) ON THE LINE BENEATH EACH QUESTION.

STRONGLY AGREE
A

AGREE
B

DISAGREE
C

STRONGLY DISAGREE
D

QUESTIONS

1. My mother and I never see family problems the same way.

A B C D

2. My mother accepts what I expect of her in the family.

A B C D

3. I know what my mother means when she says something.

A B C D

4. I can tell when my mother is upset.

A B C D

5. My mother and I aren't close to each other.

A B C D

6. My mother is reasonable when I make a mistake.

A B C D

7. My mother and I have the same views about right and wrong.

A B C D

8. My mother can never accept my answer to a problem.

A B C D

P.2 (CONT'D)

STRONGLY AGREE
AAGREE
BDISAGREE
CSTRONGLY DISAGREE
D

9. My mother takes her share of family responsibilities.

A B C D

10. My mother takes what I say the wrong way.

A B C D

11. When I'm upset, my mother usually knows why.

A B C D

12. When I'm upset, I know that my mother really cares.

A B C D

13. Even when I admit I'm wrong, my mother doesn't forgive me.

A B C D

14. My mother and I argue about how we spend our spare time.

A B C D

15. When I have a problem, my mother helps me with it.

A B C D

16. My mother complains that I expect too much of her.

A B C D

17. If my mother is angry with me, I hear about it from someone else.

A B C D

P.3 (CONT'D)

STRONGLY AGREE
AAGREE
BDISAGREE
CSTRONGLY DISAGREE
D

18. My mother lets me know how she feels about me.

A B C D

19. My mother still loves me even when I argue with her.

A B C D

20. I never know how my mother will react when I make a mistake.

A B C D

21. My mother is all wrong about the importance of religion.

A B C D

22. When there's a problem between us, my mother finds a new way of working it out.

A B C D

23. My mother often ruins things for me.

A B C D

24. My mother is available when I want to talk to her.

A B C D

25. When my mother gets angry with me, she stays upset for days.

A B C D

26. My mother gets too involved in my affairs.

A B C D

P.4 (CONT'D)

STRONGLY AGREE
AAGREE
BDISAGREE
CSTRONGLY DISAGREE
D

27. My mother gives me a chance to explain when I make a mistake.

A B C D

28. My mother is right about the importance of education.

A B C D

29. When problems come up between us, my mother is all talk and no action.

A B C D

30. My mother expects too much of me.

A B C D

31. Even if my mother disagrees, she still listens to my point of view.

A B C D

32. My mother takes it out on me when she has had a bad day.

A B C D

33. My mother really trusts me.

A B C D

34. My mother is always on my back.

A B C D

35. There's a big difference between what my mother expects of me and how she behaves.

A B C D

P.5 (CONT'D)

STRONGLY AGREE
AAGREE
BDISAGREE
CSTRONGLY DISAGREE
D

36. I can count on my mother to help me in a crisis.

A B C D

37. My mother and I have the same views about who should do what in our family.

A B C D

38. I often don't know whether to believe what my mother says.

A B C D

39. When my mother is upset, she tries to get me to take sides.

A B C D

40. My mother worries too much about me.

A B C D

41. I don't need to remind my mother to do her share.

A B C D

42. My mother is right about the importance of being successful.

A B C D

BOOKLET B - 1

DYAD
(MOTHER & SON)

DATE.....	FAMILY MEMBER BEING CONSIDERED
FAMILY NUMBER.....	SON'S NUMBER.....
AGE..... yrs	SON'S AGE.....
BIRTH ORDER.....	BIRTH ORDER.....

DIRECTIONS

On the following pages you will find 42 statements about the relationship between you and your son. Please read the statement and decide how well the statement describes your relationship with this family member.

Circle your response on the line beneath the statement.

Circle only one letter (response) for each statement.

Answer every statement, even if you are not completely sure of your answer.

STRONGLY AGREE: If you strongly agree with the statement then circle the letter "A".
 AGREE: If you agree with the statement then circle the letter "B".
 DISAGREE: If you disagree with the statement then circle the letter "C".
 STRONGLY DISAGREE: If you strongly disagree with the statement then circle the letter "D".

EXAMPLE;

I like to eat ice cream.

A B C D

(The person strongly agrees with the statement)

I think television is always boring.

A B C D

(The person disagrees with the statement)

INSTRUCTIONS

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS BY CIRCLING THE APPROPRIATE LETTER (A, B, C, OR D) ON THE LINE BENEATH EACH QUESTION.

STRONGLY AGREE
A

AGREE
B

DISAGREE
C

STRONGLY DISAGREE
D

QUESTIONS

1. My son and I never see family problems the same way.

A B C D

2. My son accepts what I expect of him in the family.

A B C D

3. I know what my son means when he says something.

A B C D

4. I can tell when my son is upset.

A B C D

5. My son and I aren't close to each other.

A B C D

6. My son is reasonable when I make a mistake.

A B C D

7. My son and I have the same views about right and wrong.

A B C D

8. My son can never accept my answer to a problem.

A B C D

P.2 (CONT'D)

STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
A	B	C	D

9. My son takes his share of family responsibilities.

A	B	C	D
---	---	---	---

10. My son takes what I say the wrong way.

A	B	C	D
---	---	---	---

11. When I'm upset, my son usually knows why.

A	B	C	D
---	---	---	---

12. When I'm upset, I know that my son really cares.

A	B	C	D
---	---	---	---

13. Even when I admit I'm wrong, my son doesn't forgive me.

A	B	C	D
---	---	---	---

14. My son and I argue about how we spend our spare time.

A	B	C	D
---	---	---	---

15. When I have a problem, my son helps me with it.

A	B	C	D
---	---	---	---

16. My son complains that I expect too much of him.

A	B	C	D
---	---	---	---

17. If my son is angry with me, I hear about it from someone else.

A	B	C	D
---	---	---	---

P.3 (CONT'D)

STRONGLY AGREE
AAGREE
BDISAGREE
CSTRONGLY DISAGREE
D

18. My son lets me know how he feels about me.

A B C D

19. My son still loves me even when I argue with him.

A B C D

20. I never know how my son will react when I make a mistake.

A B C D

21. My son is all wrong about the importance of religion.

A B C D

22. When there's a problem between us, my son finds a new way of working it out.

A B C D

23. My son often ruins things for me.

A B C D

24. My son is available when I want to talk to him.

A B C D

25. When my son gets angry with me, he stays upset for days.

A B C D

26. My son gets too involved in my affairs.

A B C D

P.4 (CONT'D)

STRONGLY AGREE A	AGREE B	DISAGREE C	STRONGLY DISAGREE D
---------------------	------------	---------------	------------------------

27. My son gives me a chance to explain when I make a mistake.

A	B	C	D
---	---	---	---

28. My son is right about the importance of education.

A	B	C	D
---	---	---	---

29. When problems come up between us, my son is all talk and no action.

A	B	C	D
---	---	---	---

30. My son expects too much of me.

A	B	C	D
---	---	---	---

31. Even if my son disagrees, he still listens to my point of view.

A	B	C	D
---	---	---	---

32. My son takes it out on me when he has had a bad day.

A	B	C	D
---	---	---	---

33. My son really trusts me.

A	B	C	D
---	---	---	---

34. My son is always on my back.

A	B	C	D
---	---	---	---

35. There's a big difference between what my son expects of me and how he behaves.

A	B	C	D
---	---	---	---

P.5 (CONT'D)

STRONGLY AGREE
AAGREE
BDISAGREE
CSTRONGLY DISAGREE
D

36. I can count on my son to help me in a crisis.

A B C D

37. My son and I have the same views about who should do what in our family.

A B C D

38. I often don't know whether to believe what my son says.

A B C D

39. When my son is upset, he tries to get me to take sides.

A B C D

40. My son worries too much about me.

A B C D

41. I don't need to remind my son to do his share.

A B C D

42. My son is right about the importance of being successful.

A B C D

BOOKLET B - 2

DYAD

(MOTHER & DAUGHTER)



DATE.....	FAMILY MEMBER BEING CONSIDERED
FAMILY NUMBER.....	DAUGHTER'S NUMBER.....
AGE..... yrs	DAUGHTER'S AGE.....
BIRTH ORDER.....	BIRTH ORDER.....

DIRECTIONS

On the following pages you will find 42 statements about the relationship between you and your daughter. please read the statement and decide how well the statement describes your relationship with this family member.

Circle your response on the line beneath the statement.

Circle only one letter (response) for each statement.

Answer every statement, even if you are not completely sure of your answer.

STRONGLY AGREE: If you strongly agree with the statement then circle the letter "A".
 AGREE: If you agree with the statement then circle the letter "B".
 DISAGREE: If you disagree with the statement then circle the letter "C".
 STRONGLY DISAGREE: If you strongly disagree with the statement then circle the letter "D".

EXAMPLE;

I like to eat ice cream.

A B C D

(The person strongly agrees with the statement)

I think television is always boring.

A B C D

(The person disagrees with the statement)

INSTRUCTIONS

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS BY CIRCLING THE APPROPRIATE LETTER (A, B, C, OR D) ON THE LINE BENEATH EACH QUESTION.

STRONGLY AGREE

A

AGREE

B

DISAGREE

C

STRONGLY DISAGREE

D

QUESTIONS

1. My daughter and I never see family problems the same way.

A

B

C

D

2. My daughter accepts what I expect of her in the family.

A

B

C

D

3. I know what my daughter means when she says something.

A

B

C

D

4. I can tell when my daughter is upset.

A

B

C

D

5. My daughter and I aren't close to each other.

A

B

C

D

6. My daughter is reasonable when I make a mistake.

A

B

C

D

7. My daughter and I have the same views about right and wrong.

A

B

C

D

8. My daughter can never accept my answer to a problem.

A

B

C

D

P.2 (CONT'D)

STRONGLY AGREE
AAGREE
BDISAGREE
CSTRONGLY DISAGREE
D

9. My daughter takes her share of family responsibilities.

A B C D

10. My daughter takes what I say the wrong way.

A B C D

11. When I'm upset, my daughter usually knows why.

A B C D

12. When I'm upset, I know that my daughter really cares.

A B C D

13. Even when I admit I'm wrong, my daughter doesn't forgive me.

A B C D

14. My daughter and I argue about how we spend our spare time.

A B C D

15. When I have a problem, my daughter helps me with it.

A B C D

16. My daughter complains that I expect too much of her.

A B C D

17. If my daughter is angry with me, I hear about it from someone else.

A B C D

P.3 (CONT'D)

STRONGLY AGREE
AAGREE
BDISAGREE
CSTRONGLY DISAGREE
D

18. My daughter lets me know how she feels about me.

A B C D

19. My daughter still loves me even when I argue with her.

A B C D

20. I never know how my daughter will react when I make a mistake.

A B C D

21. My daughter is all wrong about the importance of religion.

A B C D

22. When there's a problem between us, my daughter finds a new way of working it out.

A B C D

23. My daughter often ruins things for me.

A B C D

24. My daughter is available when I want to talk to her.

A B C D

25. When my daughter gets angry with me, she stays upset for days.

A B C D

26. My daughter gets too involved in my affairs.

A B C D

P.4 (CONT'D)

STRONGLY AGREE
AAGREE
BDISAGREE
CSTRONGLY DISAGREE
D

27. My daughter gives me a chance to explain when I make a mistake.

A B C D

28. My daughter is right about the importance of education.

A B C D

29. When problems come up between us, my daughter is all talk and no action.

A B C D

30. My daughter expects too much of me.

A B C D

31. Even if my daughter disagrees, she still listens to my point of view.

A B C D

32. My daughter takes it out on me when she has had a bad day.

A B C D

33. My daughter really trusts me.

A B C D

34. My daughter is always on my back.

A B C D

35. There's a big difference between what my daughter expects of me and how she behaves.

A B C D

P.5 (CONT'D)

STRONGLY AGREE
AAGREE
BDISAGREE
CSTRONGLY DISAGREE
D

36. I can count on my daughter to help me in a crisis.

A B C D

37. My daughter and I have the same views about who should do what in our family.

A B C D

38. I often don't know whether to believe what my daughter says.

A B C D

39. When my daughter is upset, she tries to get me to take sides.

A B C D

40. My daughter worries too much about me.

A B C D

41. I don't need to remind my daughter to do her share.

A B C D

42. My daughter is right about the importance of being successful.

A B C D

Appendix B-1

Dyadic Relations Scale
Extract, Instruction Manual

The Family Assessment Measure:
ADMINISTRATION AND INTERPRETATION GUIDE

Harvey A. Skinner PhD
Addiction Research Foundation
and
University of Toronto

Paul D. Steinhauer MD,FRCP
Hospital for Sick Children
and
University of Toronto

AND

Jack Santa-Barbara PhD
Applied Research Consulting House

April 1984

For Further Information Please Contact:

Dr. Harvey A. Skinner
Addiction Research Foundation
33 Russell Street
Toronto, Ontario
Canada M5S 2S1
telephone 416-595-6297

- 3 -

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING FAM

1. Every family member 10 to 12 years of age or over should have up to three FAM question booklets: (1) General Scale (green), (2) Dyadic Relationship Scale (blue), (3) Self Rating Scale (yellow), with correspondingly colored answer sheets.

2. The answer sheets are composed of two parts: The top sheet numbered 1. a b c d, 2. a b c d, etc. and the bottom scorer's sheet numbered 1. 0 1 2 3, 2. 0 1 2 3, etc. Make sure each family member receives a complete "set" for each scale they will complete. Carbon paper is not required as the paper has been specially treated for copying. Marks made on the top sheet will transfer through to the scorer's sheet below. Clients should use either a ball-point pen or pencil (press hard) making a large "X" through each letter they choose.

SCORING FAM

When a family member answers the first question on the General Scale, for example, they may make an "X" through the letter "b", indicating that they "agree" with the statement referring to the amount of time spent arguing about problems in their family. This mark will be transferred through to the scorer's sheet attached below and will appear over the number "2", under question 1. When the client comes to answer question number 11, which also falls in the subscale referring to Task Accomplishment, they may mark the letter "d" indicating strong

Appendix C

Contents of Dyadic Scale

Based upon the "Family Process Model"

Appendix C

Contents of the Dyadic Scale*

The contents of the Dyadic Scale are the same as the contents of the FAM General Scale. Both are based upon the seven constructs of the Family Process Model. However, the Dyadic Scale focuses on relationships between specific pairs in the family and provides an overall rating of functioning for each construct of the Process Model.

Task Accomplishment:

Measures task or problem identification, exploration of alternative solutions, implementation of selected approaches, and evaluation of effects between members of the dyad.

Role Performance:

Measures allocation or assignment of specified activities, agreement or willingness of members to assume the assigned roles, and the actual enactment or carrying out of prescribed behaviors within the dyad.

Communication:

Measures exchange of information essential to task accomplishment and ongoing role definition, ability and openness of each person within the dyad to receive communication, and the achievement of mutual understanding between themselves.

Affective Expression:

Measures content, intensity, and timing of feelings involved between members of the dyad.

Affective Involvement:

Measures the degree and quality of each member's interest in the other, the ability of each member to meet the emotional and security needs of the other member, and the flexibility to provide the support for the other member's autonomy of thought and function within the dyad.

Control:

Measures the process by which each member influences the other. Measures predictability versus inconsistency, constructive versus destructive, and responsible versus irresponsible management style of members within the dyad.

Appendix C (Cont'd)

Values and Norms:

Measures whether family rules, as expressed within the dyad, are perceived of as explicit or implicit, the latitude or scope allowed for the members of the dyad to determine their own attitudes and behavior and whether family norms, as expressed within the dyad, are consistent with the broader cultural context.

*Skinner, H, Steinhauer, P.D., & Santa-Barbara, J. (1983). The family assessment measure. Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health. (2), 2. 91-105.

Appendix D

Contents of Domains of
Adult Self-Perception Profile (ASPP)

Appendix D

Contents of Domains of
Adult Self-Perception Profile (ASPP)

Content of each Domain *

Sociability. Refers to one's behavior in the presence of others. It is tapped by items which suggest that one is fun to be with, that one likes to meet new people, and that one is at ease with others.

Job Competence. Taps perceptions of competence in one's major occupation, job, or work. Items in the Adult Profile refer to feeling productive, competent, and proud of one's work.

Nurturance. Involves the process of caring for others. It is tapped by items which refer to fostering the growth of others and caring for children as a contribution to the future.

Athletic Abilities. Pertains to the concept of abilities related to sports. Items tap one's sense of competence in sports, one's willingness to participate in and to try new physical activities.

Physical Appearance. Refers to the way one looks and is tapped by items such as feeling attractive, being happy with the way one looks, and being satisfied with one's face and hair.

Adequate Provider. Is defined as supplying the means of support for oneself and one's significant others. Items refer to meeting one's own material needs, as well as adequately meeting the needs of important persons in one's life.

Morality. One's behavior based on standards of conduct, of what is right and wrong. Morality refers to living up to one's moral standards and feeling that one's behavior is ethical.

Household Management. Refers to guiding or handling activities in the household. It is tapped by items such as being organized at household tasks, being efficient, and generally keeping the household running smoothly.

Intimate Relations. Implies close, meaningful interactions or relationships with one's mate, lover, and/or very special friend. It is described in the items as seeking out close, intimate relationships and feeling free to communicate openly in a close relationship.

Intelligence. Is defined as the ability to learn and know. Items refer to feeling smart, understanding things, and feeling intellectually capable.

Appendix D (Cont'd)

Sense of Humor. Pertains to the ability to see the amusing side of things. It is tapped by items which suggest that one has the ability to laugh at oneself and ironies of life, as well as finding it easy to joke or kid around with friends and colleagues.

Global Self-Worth. One's global perceptions of worth, independent of any particular domain of competence/adequacy. It is tapped by items such as liking the way one is leading one's life, being pleased with oneself, and liking the kind of person one is.

* Messer, B. & Harter, S. (1986). The Manual For The Adult Self-Perception Profile.

Appendix E

The Adult Self-Perception Profile (ASPP)

BOOKLET C - 1

"WHAT I AM LIKE"

(MOTHERS)

Appendix A

WHAT I AM LIKE

These are statements which allow people to describe themselves. There are no right or wrong answers since people differ markedly. Please read the entire sentence across. First decide which one of the two parts of each statement best describes you; then go to that side of the statement and check whether that is just sort of true for you or really true for you. You will just check ONE of the four boxes for each statement.

	Really True for Me	Sort of True for Me			Sort of True for Me	Really True for Me
1.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults like the way they are leading their lives	BUT	Other adults don't like the way they are leading their lives.	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults feel that they are enjoyable to be with	BUT	Other adults often question whether they are enjoyable to be with.	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults are not satisfied with the way they do their work	BUT	Other adults are satisfied the way they do their work.	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults see caring or nurturing others as a contribution to the future	BUT	Other adults do not gain a sense of contribution to the future through nurturing others.	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	In games and sports some adults usually watch instead of play	BUT	Other adults usually play rather than just watch.	<input type="checkbox"/>
6.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults are happy with the way they look	BUT	Other adults are not happy with the way they look.	<input type="checkbox"/>
7.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults feel they are not adequately supporting themselves and those who are important to them	BUT	Other adults feel they are providing adequate support for themselves and others.	<input type="checkbox"/>
8.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults live up to their own moral standards	BUT	Other adults have trouble living up to their moral standards.	<input type="checkbox"/>
9.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults are very happy being the way they are	BUT	Other adults would like to be different.	<input type="checkbox"/>
10.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults are not very organized in completing household tasks	BUT	Other adults are organized in completing household tasks.	<input type="checkbox"/>
11.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults have the ability to develop intimate relationships	BUT	Other adults do not find it easy to develop intimate relationships.	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Really True for Me	Sort of True for Me			Sort of True for Me	Really True for Me
12.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	When some adults don't understand something, it makes them feel stupid	BUT	Other adults don't necessarily feel stupid when they don't understand	<input type="checkbox"/>
13.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults can really laugh at themselves	BUT	Other adults have a hard time laughing at themselves.	<input type="checkbox"/>
14.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults feel uncomfortable when they have to meet new people	BUT	Other adults like to meet new people	<input type="checkbox"/>
15.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults feel they are very good at their work	BUT	Other adults worry about whether they can do their work	<input type="checkbox"/>
16.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults do not enjoy fostering the growth of others	BUT	Other adults enjoy fostering the growth of others	<input type="checkbox"/>
17.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults sometimes question whether they are a worthwhile person	BUT	Other adults feel that they are a worthwhile person	<input type="checkbox"/>
18.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults think they could do well at just about any new physical activity they haven't tried before	BUT	Other adults are afraid they might not do well at physical activities they haven't ever tried	<input type="checkbox"/>
19.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults think that they are not very attractive or good looking	BUT	Other adults think that they are attractive or good looking.	<input type="checkbox"/>
20.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults are satisfied with how they provide for the important people in their lives	BUT	Other adults are dissatisfied with how they provide for these people	<input type="checkbox"/>
21.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults would like to be a better person morally	BUT	Other adults think that they are quite moral	<input type="checkbox"/>
22.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults can keep their household running smoothly	BUT	Other adults have trouble keeping their household running smoothly.	<input type="checkbox"/>
23.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults find it hard to establish intimate relationships	BUT	Other adults do not have difficulty establishing intimate relationships.	<input type="checkbox"/>
24.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults feel that they are intelligent	BUT	Other adults question whether they are very intelligent.	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Really True for Me	Sort of True for Me			Sort of True for Me	Really True for Me
23.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults are disappointed with themselves	BUT	Other adults are quite pleased with themselves.	<input type="checkbox"/>
24.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults find it hard to act in a joking or kidding manner with friends or colleagues	BUT	Other adults find it very easy to joke or kid around with friends and colleagues.	<input type="checkbox"/>
27.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults feel at ease with other people	BUT	Other adults are quite shy.	<input type="checkbox"/>
28.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults are not very productive in their work	BUT	Other adults are very productive in their work.	<input type="checkbox"/>
29.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults feel they are good at nurturing others	BUT	Other adults are not very nurturant.	<input type="checkbox"/>
30.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults do not feel that they are very good when it comes to sports	BUT	Other adults feel they do very well at all kinds of sports.	<input type="checkbox"/>
31.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults like their physical appearance the way it is	BUT	Other adults do not like their physical appearance.	<input type="checkbox"/>
32.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults feel they cannot provide for the material necessities of life	BUT	Other adults feel they do adequately provide for the material necessities of life.	<input type="checkbox"/>
33.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults are dissatisfied with themselves	BUT	Other adults are satisfied with themselves.	<input type="checkbox"/>
34.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults usually do what they know is morally right	BUT	Other adults often don't do what they know is morally right.	<input type="checkbox"/>
35.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults are not very efficient in managing activities at home	BUT	Other adults are efficient in managing activities at home.	<input type="checkbox"/>
36.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some people seek out close relationships	BUT	Other persons shy away from close relationships.	<input type="checkbox"/>
37.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults do not feel that they are very intellectually capable	BUT	Other adults feel that they are intellectually capable.	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Really True for Me	Sort of True for Me			Sort of True for Me	Really True for Me
38.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults feel they have a good sense of humor	BUT	Other adults wish their sense of humor was better	<input type="checkbox"/>
39.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults are not very sociable	BUT	Other adults are sociable.	<input type="checkbox"/>
40.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults are proud of their work	BUT	Other adults are not very proud of what they do	<input type="checkbox"/>
41.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults like the kind of person they are	BUT	Other adults would like to be someone else	<input type="checkbox"/>
42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults do not enjoy nurturing others	BUT	Other adults enjoy being nurturant.	<input type="checkbox"/>
43.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults feel they are better than others their age at sports	BUT	Other adults don't feel they can play as well	<input type="checkbox"/>
44.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults are unsatisfied with something about their face or hair	BUT	Other adults like their face and hair the way they are.	<input type="checkbox"/>
45.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults feel that they provide adequately for the needs of those who are important to them	BUT	Other adults feel they do not provide adequately for these needs	<input type="checkbox"/>
46.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults often question the morality of their behavior	BUT	Other adults feel that their behavior is usually moral.	<input type="checkbox"/>
47.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults use their time efficiently at household activities	BUT	Other adults do not use their time efficiently	<input type="checkbox"/>
48.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults in close relationships have a hard time communicating openly	BUT	Other adults in close relationships feel that it is easy to communicate openly	<input type="checkbox"/>
49.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults feel like they are just as smart as other adults	BUT	Other adults wonder if they are as smart.	<input type="checkbox"/>
50.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some adults feel that they are often too serious about their life	BUT	Other adults are able to find humor in their life.	<input type="checkbox"/>

BOOKLET C - 2

"IMPORTANCE RATINGS"

(MOTHERS)

HOW IMPORTANT IS IT TO YOU?	IMPORTANCE RATINGS			
	VERY IMPORTANT	PRETTY IMPORTANT	ONLY SORT OF IMPORTANT	NOT VERY IMPORTANT
1. To be sociable/at ease with others	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. To be good at your work (how did you define work: ___ job ___ homemaking)	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. To care for others	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. To be good at physical activities	_____	_____	_____	_____
5. To be good looking	_____	_____	_____	_____
6. To be an adequate provider	_____	_____	_____	_____
7. To be moral	_____	_____	_____	_____
8. To be good at household management	_____	_____	_____	_____
9. To have intimate relationships	_____	_____	_____	_____
10. To be intelligent	_____	_____	_____	_____
11. To have a sense of humor	_____	_____	_____	_____

On the lines below list the 3 areas from above which are most important to you and list the 2-3 areas which are least important to you:

Most Important

Least Important

Appendix F

Childrens' Subjective Rating Form,
"Competence Ratings for Your Mother"

COMPETENCE RATING
FOR YOUR MOTHER

A) HOW WOULD YOU RATE YOUR MOTHER'S COMPETENCE /SUCCESS IN THE FOLLOWING AREAS ?

	VERY COMPETENT	PRETTY COMPETENT	ONLY SORT OF COMPETENT	NOT VERY COMPETENT
1. SOCIAL EASE WITH OTHERS	-----	-----	-----	-----
2. CARING FOR OTHERS	-----	-----	-----	-----
3. ATHLETIC ABILITIES	-----	-----	-----	-----
4. PHYSICAL APPEARANCE	-----	-----	-----	-----
5. JOB COMPETENCE	-----	-----	-----	-----
6. ADEQUATE PROVIDER	-----	-----	-----	-----
7. CONDUCT/MORALITY	-----	-----	-----	-----
8. HOUSEHOLD MANAGEMENT	-----	-----	-----	-----
9. CLOSE RELATIONSHIPS	-----	-----	-----	-----
10. INTELLIGENCE	-----	-----	-----	-----
11. SENSE OF HUMOR	-----	-----	-----	-----

B) On the lines below list the 3 areas from above in which your mother is the most competent and list 2-3 areas in which she is least competent.

Most competent

Least competent

COMPETENCE RATING FOR YOUR MOTHER (CONT'D)

C) Please rate your perception of your mother's overall worth as a person on a scale of 1 to 9.

(1 means you think very highly of her, while 9 means that you do not think highly of her at all.)

---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
High regard				Low regard				

Appendix G

Four Factor Index of Social Status

Rating Form

SES RATINGS

HUSBAND

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Scale Score</u>	<u>Factor Weight</u>	<u>Score x Weight</u>
---------------	--------------------	----------------------	-----------------------

occupation		5	
------------	--	---	--

education		3	
-----------	--	---	--

Total Score

WIFE

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Scale Score</u>	<u>Factor Weight</u>	<u>Score x Weight</u>
---------------	--------------------	----------------------	-----------------------

occupation		5	
------------	--	---	--

education		3	
-----------	--	---	--

Total Score

FAMILY SES =

Appendix H

Letter of Explanation of Research

EXPLANATION OF RESEARCH PROJECT

BACKGROUND

My primary research interest concerns how people in families view themselves. I will be focusing on mothers and their children. I will not be asking about marital relationships, in-laws, or other relatives. The study focuses on family life in general.

Each person will receive an envelope containing separate booklets which have the same general questions. They ask about your family, parent/child relationships, and how you view yourself as a person. The questions are all straightforward, and have been adjusted for your particular age group.

QUESTIONNAIRES AND CONFIDENTIALITY

I will be taking great care to protect the privacy and confidentiality of each and every person who agrees to participate. This means that no family members will be given access to any other family members' questionnaires. For example, I will not discuss teenager's or children's answers with mothers, nor will I tell teenagers or children what their mothers have answered. I will be the only person who will have access to your names, and these will not be used in analyzing and reporting the results.

PROCEDURE

I will be asking each one of you to sit in a separate room while answering the questions.

Each booklet takes approximately 10 -15 min. to answer. The total time involved will be approximately 45 min to 1 hour. I will be around in case you need help.

After you have been given your envelope with the question booklets inside, please wait for me to read the instructions for the first booklet to you (individually) before you begin.

Please stop at the end of each booklet and wait for me to read the instructions for the next booklet before you continue. I will come as soon as you call my name. (Esther)

Please answer the question booklets in the order that they are given.

Your comments and suggestions after you have finished will be most welcome.

You may withdraw from the study at any time.

Esther Spector (688-8789)

Appendix I

Consent Forms

a) Mothers and Children

b) Adolescents 18 Years and Over

CONSENT FORM
[mothers & children]

I have read the accompanying information sheet describing this project and understand its goals and methods. I agree that I as well as my son(s)/daughter(s) will participate in this study.

I understand that all information will remain confidential, and that I have the right to withdraw from the study at any time.

Signature:

Name (please print).....

Children's Names & Ages (please print).....

.....

.....

.....

If you would like a copy of any published results of this study please indicate by signing your name and providing your address and phone number.

Signature.....

Address.....

.....

.....Postal Code.....

Phone No.....

CONSENT FORM

I have read the accompanying information sheet describing this project and understand its goals and methods. I agree to participate in this study.

I understand that all information will remain confidential, and that I have the right to withdraw from the study at any time.

Signature.....

Name (please print).....

If you would like a copy of any published results of this study, please indicate by signing your name and providing your address and telephone number.

Signature.....

Address.....

.....

.....Postal Code.....

Phone No.....

Appendix J

SES Information Questionnaire

SES Information QuestionnaireMother's General Information Sheet

Subject #.....

Family Name..... First Name.....

Marital Status: Married....Divorced.....Separated....Widowed...Other...

FATHER:

Who lives in the home? Father of Child? Yes..... No.....

Age:

Education: Elementary 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Secondary 8 9 10 11 12

C.E.G.E.P. 1 2 3

University 1 2 3 4

Post Grad. 1 2 3 4 5

Job Description.....

.....
.....
.....

Father's Prestige Score ()

MOTHER:

Who lives in the home? Mother of Child? Yes..... No.....

Age:.... Birth Date.....Birth Order

Education: Elementary 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Secondary 8 9 10 11 12

C.E.G.E.P. 1 2 3

University 1 2 3 4

Post Grad. 1 2 3 4 5

Job Description:.....

.....
Working Hrs/Wk:.....
.....

Mother's Prestige Score ()

Ethnicity:

Appendix K

Mothers with High Scores in
Social Desirability and
Defensiveness Scales

Appendix K

Mothers with High Scores in Social Desirability and Defensiveness Scales

Family ID	Social Desirability Scores *	Defensiveness Scores +
# 72	60	50
# 56	60	39
# 18	60	35
# 41	63	62
# 81	63	54
# 79	63	50
# 78	68	58
# 58	68	77
# 65	71	73
# 17	73	81
# 71	79	54

* Normal Range = (25 - 57)

+ Normal Range = (31 - 58)

Appendix L

Zero-Order Correlations Between Mothers' Perceptions
In 11 Domains of Self-Concept, Global Self-Worth (ASPP)
and Mothers' Social Desirability Scores (GS).

Appendix L

Zero-Order Correlations Between Mothers' Perceptions
In 11 Domains of Self-Concept, Global Self-Worth (ASPP)
and Mothers' Social Desirability Scores (GS).

Variables	Mothers' Social Desirability Scores (GS) and Mothers' Ratings for 11 Domains of Self-Concept, Global Self-Worth (ASPP) (n = 51)
Sociability	.33
Job Competence	.00
Nurturance	-.06
Athletic Ability	.12
Appearance	.22
Adequate Provider	.23
Morality	.26
Household Management	.24
Intimate Relations	.29 *
Intelligence	-.00
Sense of Humor	.13
Global Self-Worth	.18
*** = $P < .001$	
** = $P < .01$	
* = $P < .05$	

Note: Coefficients with a + indicate significance at the .05 level according to Bonferroni's criteria.

Appendix M

Intercorrelations for Mothers' Evaluation of the
Quality of Their Relationship with Their First Born
Children in the Seven Domains of the Dyadic
Relationship Scale (DRS)

Appendix M

Intercorrelations for Mothers' Evaluation of the Quality of Their Relationship with Their First Born Children in the Seven Domains of the Dyadic Relationship Scale (DRS)).

Variables	Values and Norms	Control	Involvement	Affective Expression	Communication	Role Performance	Task Accomplishment
Values and Norms	1.000	.46***	.36**	.37**	.69***	.48***	.55***
Control		1.000	.47***	.35**	.52***	.77***	.73***
Involvement			1.000	.38**	.61**	.61***	.54***
Affective Expression				1.000	.55***	.34**	.38***
Communication					1.000	.67***	.61***
Role Performance						1.000	.71***
Task Accomplishment							1.000

*** = $p < .001$
 ** = $p < .01$
 * = $p < .05$

Appendix N

Intercorrelations for First Born Childrens' Evaluation of the
Quality of Their Relationship with Their Mothers in the Seven
Domains of the Dyadic Relationship Scale (DRS)

Appendix N

Intercorrelations for First Born Childrens' Evaluation of the Quality of Their Relationship with Their Mothers in the Seven Domains of the Dyadic Relationship Scale (DRS)).

Variables	Values and Norms	Control	Involvement	Affective Expression	Communication	Role Performance	Task Accomplishment
Values and Norms	1.000	.74***	.67***	.60***	.59***	.57***	.65***
Control		1.000	.61***	.62***	.73***	.75***	.64***
Involvement			1.000	.66***	.60***	.67***	.70***
Affective Expression				1.000	.56***	.62***	.63***
Communication					1.000	.47***	.65***
Role Performance						1.000	.49***
Task Accomplishment							1.000

*** = $p < .001$
 ** = $p < .01$
 * = $p < .05$

Appendix 0

Mothers' Rank Ordered Choices
For Domains of Most Importance in the
Adult Self-Perception Profile (ASPP)

Appendix O

Mothers' Rank Ordered Choices

For Domains of Most Importance in the
Adult Self-Perception Profile (ASPP)

First Choice

Domain (n = 8/11)	Frequency of Choices (n = 51)
Morality	12
Nurturance	11
Job Competence	10
Intimate Relations	8
Sociability	5
Provider, Humor	2 (for each domain)
Intelligence	1

Second Choice

Domain (n = 10/11)	Frequency of Choices (n = 51)
Nurturance	21
Morality	7
Job Competence,	6 (for each domain)
Intimate Relations Provider	4
Intelligence, Humor	2 (for each domain)
Appearance, Sociability,	1 (for each domain)
Athletic Ability	

Third Choice

Domain (n = 11)	Frequency of Choices (n = 51)
Intelligence	9
Intimate Relations	8
Job Competence	7
Humor, Morality, Nurturance	5 (for each domain)
Sociability, Provider	4 (for each domain)
Household Management	2
Athletic Ability, Appearance	1 (for each domain)

Appendix P

Mothers' Rank Ordered Choices
For Domains of Least Importance in the
Adult Self-Perception Profile (ASPP)

Appendix P

Mothers' Rank Ordered Choices

For Domains of Least Importance in the

Adult Self-Perception Profile (ASPP)

First Choice

Domain (n = 8/11)	Frequency of Choices (n = 51)
Athletic Ability	22
Appearance	16
Household Management	4
Humor	3
Sociability	2
Morality, Intimate Relations, Intelligence	1 (for each domain)
No Choice	1

Second Choice

Domain (n = 10/11)	Frequency of Choices (n = 51)
Athletic Ability, Household Management	12 (for each domain)
Appearance	9
Provider	7
Humor	3
Sociability, Nurturance, Morality	1 (for each domain)
Intimate Relations, Intelligence	1 (for each domain)
No Choice	3

Third Choice

Domain (n = 8/11)	Frequency of Choices (n = 51)
Household Management, Intelligence	5 (for each domain)
Athletic Ability, Appearance	4 (for each domain)
Sociability	2
Provider, Intimate Relations, Humor	1 (for each domain)
No Choice	28

Appendix Q

Daughters' Rank Ordered Choices
For Mothers' Most Competent Domains in the
Adult Self-Perception Profile (ASPP)

Appendix Q

Daughters' Rank Ordered Choices
For Mothers' Most Competent Domains in the
Adult Self-Perception Profile (ASPP)

First Choice

Domain (n = 10/11)	Frequency of Choices (n = 52)
Nurturance	25
Sociability	6
Job Competence, Morality, Intimate Relations	4 (for each domain)
Athletic Ability	3
Household Management, Humor	2 (for each domain)
Provider	1 (for each domain)

Second Choice

Domain (n = 10/11)	Frequency of Choices (n = 52)
Nurturance	10
Household Management, Intelligence	8 (for each domain)
Intimate Relations	8 (for each domain)
Job Competence	7
Sociability	4
Athletic Ability, Morality, Provider	2 (for each domain)
	1

Third Choice

Domain (n = 11)	Frequency of Choices (n = 52)
Household Management	9
Humor	7
Morality, Intimate Relations	6 (for each domain)
Sociability, Nurturance, Intelligence	5 (for each domain)
Job Competence	4
Appearance, Provider	2 (for each domain)
Athletic Ability	1

Appendix R

Daughters' Rank Ordered Choices
For Mothers' Least Competent Domains in the
Adult Self-Perception Profile (ASPP)

Appendix R

**Daughters' Rank Ordered Choices
For Mothers' Least Competent Domains in the
Adult Self-Perception Profile (ASPP)**

First Choice

Domain (n = 8/11)	Frequency of Choices (n = 52)
Athletic Ability	30
Humor	8
Job Competence, Appearance	2 (for each domain)
Provider, Household Management	2 (for each domain)
Sociability, Intelligence	1 (for each domain)
No Choice	4

Second Choice

Domain (n = 10/11)	Frequency of Choices (n = 52)
Appearance	11
Humor	10
Athletic Ability	6
Provider	5
Household Management	3
Sociability, Job Competence	2 (for each domain)
Morality, Intimate Relations, Intelligence	1 (for each domain)
No Choice	10

Third Choice

Domain (n = 10/11)	Frequency of Choices (n = 52)
Provider, Humor	5
Sociability, Job Competence	3 (for each domain)
Morality, Intimate Relations	3 (for each domain)
Nurturance, Appearance	1 (for each domain)
Household Management, Intelligence	1 (for each domain)
No Choice	26

Appendix S

Sons' Rank Ordered Choices
For Mothers' Most Competent Domains in the
Adult Self-Perception Profile (ASPP)

Appendix S

Sons' Rank Ordered Choices

For Mothers Most Competent Domains in the
Adult Self-Perception Profile (ASPP)

First Choice

Domain (n = 8/11)

Frequency of
Choices (n = 50)

Nurturance	18
Household Management	10
Job Competence	5
Sociability, Morality	4 (for each domain)
Intimate Relations,	2 (for each domain)
Intelligence, Humor	
Athletic Ability,	1 (for each domain)
Provider, Appearance	

Second Choice

Domain (n = 10/11)

Frequency of
Choices (n = 50)

Intimate Relations	10
Job Competence, Household	6 (for each domain)
Management	
Provider	5
Nurturance, Athletic Ability	4 (for each domain)
Morality, Intelligence	4 (for each domain)
Sociability	3
Appearance, Humor	2 (for each domain)

Third Choice

Domain (n = 10/11)

Frequency of
Choices (n = 50)

Nurturance	8
Provider, Household Management	6 (for each domain)
Sociability, Job Competence,	5 (for each domain)
Morality	
Intimate Relations, Intelligence	4 (for each domain)
Humor	3
Appearance	2
Athletic Ability	1
No Choice	1

Appendix T

Sons' Rank Ordered Choices
For Mothers' Least Competent Domains in the
Adult Self-Perception Profile

Appendix T

Sons' Rank Ordered Choices

For Mothers Least Competent Domains in the

Adult Self-Perception Profile

First Choice

Domain (n = 8/11)	Frequency of Choices (n = 50)
Athletic Ability	27
Intelligence	8
Sociability	4
Provider	3
Appearance, Household Management	2 (for each domain)
Intimate Relations, Intelligence	2 (for each domain)

Second Choice

Domain (n = 9/11)	Frequency of Choices (n = 50)
Humor	12
Athletic Ability	8
Job Competence, Provider	5 (for each domain)
Appearance	4
Sociability, Household Management	3 (for each domain)
Intelligence	3 (for each domain)
Morality	1
No Choice	6

Third Choice

Domain (n = 9/11)	Frequency of Choices (n = 50)
Appearance, Humor	6 (for each domain)
Athletic Ability	4
Sociability, Intelligence	3 (for each domain)
Job Competence, Intimate Relations	2 (for each domain)
Provider, Morality	1 (for each domain)
No Choice	22

Appendix U

Intercorrelations, by Birth Order of Child,
Between Childrens' Perceptions of their Mothers' Competence
and Overall Worth (ASPP), and Childrens' Assessment
of the Quality of their Mother/Child Relationship (DRS).

Appendix U

Intercorrelations, by Birth Order of Child, Between Childrens'
Perceptions of their Mothers' Competence and Overall Worth (ASPP),
and Childrens' Assessment of the Quality of their Mother/
Child Relationship (DRS).

Self-Concept Domains	First and Second Born Children (n = 51)
Sociability	-.14
Job Competence	.20
Nurturance	.20
Athletic Ability	.55*** ⁺
Appearance	.48*** ⁺
Adequate Provider	.08
Morality	-.01
Household Management	.20
Intimate Relations	-.14
Intelligence	.09
Sense of Humor	.18
Overall Worth	-.06
Quality of Relationship	.45*** ⁺

*** = $p < .001$

** = $p < .01$

* = $p < .05$

Note: Coefficients with ⁺ indicate significance at .05 level according to Bonferroni's criteria

Appendix V

Mean Scores for Mothers in the
12 Domains of the Adult
Self-Perception Profile (ASPP)

Appendix V

Mean Scores for Mothers in the 12 Domains of the Adult

Self-Perception Profile (ASPP) (n = 51).

Self-Concept Domains	Mothers' Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Sociability	3.00	(.586)
Job Competence	3.23	(.453)
Nurturance	3.47	(.519)
Athletic Ability	2.31	(.766)
Appearance	2.80	(.642)
Adequate Provider	3.26	(.569)
Morality	3.48	(.461)
Household Management	3.17	(.749)
Intimate Relations	3.07	(.699)
Intelligence	2.84	(.718)
Sense of Humor	3.13	(.635)
Global Self-Worth	3.10	(.625)