FAMILY PERCEPTIONS OF PARENT-CHILD RELATIONS IN RELATIONSHIP TO THE ASSERTIVENESS OF COLLEGE STUDENTS

A Thesis

by

PATRICIA BUCKNER NEILSON

Submitted to the Graduate School
Appalachian State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
MASTER OF ARTS

July 1985

Major Department: Psychology

FAMILY PERCEPTIONS OF PARENT-CHILD RELATIONS IN RELATIONSHIP TO THE ASSERTIVENESS OF COLLEGE STUDENTS

A Thesis

by

Patricia Buckner Neilson

July 1985

APPROVED BY:

Joyce G. Crouch
Joyce G. Crouch
Chairperson, Thesis Committee

Susan D. Moss
Susan D. Moss
Member, Thesis Committee

H G Schneider
Henry G. Schneider
Member, Thesis Committee

Joyce G. Crouch
Joyce G. Crouch
Chairperson, Department of Psychology

Joyce V. Lawrence
Joyce V. Lawrence
Dean of Graduate Studies and Research

FAMILY PERCEPTIONS OF PARENT-CHILD RELATIONS
IN RELATIONSHIP TO THE ASSERTIVENESS
OF COLLEGE STUDENTS. (July 1985)

Patricia Buckner Neilson, B. A., Mars Hill College
M. A., Appalachian State University
Thesis Chairperson: Joyce G. Crouch

The present study investigated the relationship between assertiveness and college males' and females' perceived relationships with their parents. Subjects consisted of a random sample of 199 Appalachian State University undergraduate students: 100 women and 99 men. They ranged in aged from 18 to 28. The number of subjects from each classification was 56 freshmen, 46 sophomores, 54 juniors, and 43 seniors.

A stratified sample of 300 subjects was asked to complete the following questionnaires in return for which their names would be placed in a drawing for a prize: Rathus Assertiveness Schedule, Clarke Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire, Parent-Adolescent Communication Inventory, and Personal Data Form. One hundred ninety-nine subjects returned completed packets to the investigator through campus mail.

One-way analysis of variance, product moment correlation, and stepwise multiple regression were used to ascertain sex differences. The analysis of variance revealed no sex differences in assertiveness of the college males and females; however, males perceived mothers and fathers to be more strict than did females, and females perceived fathers to be more indulgent than did males. Assertiveness and parent-subject communication were negatively correlated for both groups (significant for females). The regression analysis produced different equations for females and males, with father's indulgence and parent-subject communication contributing significantly to the multiple R (.36) for females and father's aggression toward subject for males (multiple R = .30).

The most significant findings suggest that the father's aggression increases assertiveness in males and the father's indulgence increases assertiveness in females. When the results were assessed, several questions were raised, including the validity and reliability of the Rathus Assertiveness Schedule plus the possibility that assertiveness is confused with aggressiveness by laypeople. The investigator concluded that the term assertiveness should be replaced by one which would evoke less negative evaluations.

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my Chairperson, Dr. Joyce G. Crouch, who was a source of encouragement and support during its preparation; to my other committee members, Dr. Susan D. Moss (a dear friend whom I respect tremendously) and Dr. Henry G. Schneider, whose critical insights were quite helpful; and to my patient husband, Tom.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

The family has been viewed as having a pervasive influence upon the characteristics and adjustment of children. Such interaction characteristics as maternal protection, hostility, restriction, and acceleration have been studied by the Fels Group (Kagan & Moss, 1962); paternal nurturance, competence, limit setting, and aggression by Lamb (1976); and the importance of the sibling influence and interaction by Sutton-Smith and Rosenberg (1970). Additionally, research utilizing direct observation (Baumrind, 1965) has indicated the importance of family influence upon the characteristics and adjustment of children.

Parent-child relations are of major importance in the development of an individual's personality, as parents have a great deal of power in all areas of their children's lives. They possess and control the material and emotional supports needed by their children. As the controllers of these supplies, and with their greater physical strength, parents are in the position to punish or reward their children at will, whether physically or through emotional deprivation. Hoffman (1960) suggested

that "probably in no other relationship does a person in our society have such complete power over another" (p. 130).

A number of research reviews have also testified to the significant influence of parental characteristics on young male and female children's behavior (Becker & Krug, 1965; Frankiel, 1959; Schaefer & Bell, 1958; Sears, Maccoby, & Levin, 1957). These studies, through the use of questionnaires and trained observers, have indicated that some significant portion of the variance of child behavior is related to parental management and rearing practices. Other systematic studies of male and female children's reports of parental behavior have appeared in the literature (Schaefer, 1965b; Siegelman, 1965) and sophisticated factor-analytic models have been presented. The appearance of these studies has directed further attention to the idea that children's behavior is related to children's perceptions of their parents.

Schaefer (1965a) administered the Children's Reports of Parental Behavior Inventory (CRPBI) to seventh grade boys and girls. From the results, he concluded that children's perceptions of their parents were probably more related to their adjustment than was the actual behavior of the parents. A tremendous volume of research on children's perceptions of parental behavior was reviewed by Stogdill's (1937) survey of studies between

1894 and 1936. The results generally demonstrated that children's perceptions of their parents were more important than parental behavior.

Because the direct assessment of parent-child relations has been difficult, paper-and-pencil questionnaires designed to assess children's perceptions of their parents have been substituted for direct observations (Brown, Morrison, & Couch, 1947; Hawkes, Burchinal, & Gardner, 1956; Williams, 1958; Schaefer, 1961). Of these measures, only a few have been constructed to tap adults' retrospective perceptions of their parents.

Specific child characteristics have been related to parent-child relationships. Many of these characteristics have been assessed through questionnaire studies. The child characteristics of dependency, passivity, withdrawal, intellectual achievement, conformity, and sex-role interests have been related to the maternal relationship (Kagan & Moss, 1962). Other child characteristics such as social adjustment, assertiveness, aggressiveness, self-esteem, and competence have been related to the paternal relationship (Lamb, 1976).

The familial backgrounds of assertive and nonassertive individuals is one of the areas of research which has received little attention. Generally, assertive individuals request their legitimate rights in such a way that the rights of others are not violated, and nonassertive

individuals allow their rights to be violated (Jakubowski & Spector, 1973). It is noteworthy that the present definition of assertive behavior is frequently confused with aggressiveness by the general public (Tucker, Weaver, & Redden, 1983).

College men and women are of particular interest in the study of family backgrounds of assertiveness. Psychologists have considered parents as the major influence on the developing child (Lynn, 1966; Rogers, 1972), with girls viewed as more strongly influenced by parents than boys (Kagan, 1964; Lynn, 1966; Sutton-Smith & Rosenberg, 1970). Researchers have also indicated that females are closer to both siblings and parents than is the case with males (Sutton-Smith & Rosenberg, 1970).

Other research has indicated that women's conceptions of their sex roles are changing with the advent of the feminist movement and that cross pressures experienced during the college years are likely to create anxiety regarding assertiveness (Cicirelli, 1980). On the one hand, pressure for academic and vocational achievement evokes assertiveness, while on the other, pressure to fulfill more traditional feminine goals of marriage and family calls for traditional compliant behavior. Moreover, a number of studies, particularly those utilizing college students, have shown that females are more likely to experience assertiveness problems than males (e.g.,

Rodriquez, Nietze, & Berzins, 1980). The findings, on the whole, suggest that women have an assertiveness deficit.

While much emphasis has been placed on children's perceptions of parental behavior, little attention has been given to adults' retrospective perceptions of their parents' behavior. Since parents have been considered to have the greatest influence on their children's lives, the present study will be concerned with the relationship between level of assertiveness and retrospective evaluations of subjects' perceptions.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Parental influence plays a major role in the personality development of children. Research suggests that the mother's influence produces certain characteristics in children while the father's produces other qualities. Parental influence and personality development may also vary according to the sex of the child. In the following literature review parental influence upon children's personality development, particularly in the area of assertiveness will be presented. Additionally, instruments devised to assess parent-child relations, communication patterns, and assertiveness will be reviewed.

The Role and Influence of the Mother

Because psychoanalytic theory, especially Freud's (1951), emphasized the critical nature of the mother-child relationship, the role of the mother has been most thoroughly scrutinized as a determinant of child behavior. In the Fels Institute study Kagan and Moss (1962), combining the theoretical concepts of psychoanalytic and social learning theory, investigated the relationship between the mother's child rearing behavior and the child's behavior from infancy to adulthood. They proposed that

the mother introduces goals and values and, by so doing, acts as a mediator of her culture. The mother also acts as a model, and the ways in which she is perceived by the child may determine many of the behavioral choices the child will ultimately make (Kagan & Moss, 1962). Since this study provides so much information relevant to the relationship of maternal behavior to the behavior of offspring at several age levels, this study will be reviewed in the following paragraphs.

As part of the Fels Program, observations and interviews with the mothers of children occurred during the first 12 to 14 years (Kagan & Moss, 1962). The sources of data consisted primarily of home visits and interviews. Four types of maternal practices were evaluated: maternal protection, restriction, hostility, and acceleration of the child's developmental progress. These variables were defined and rated on a seven point scale. The maternal ratings, made simultaneously with the child's ratings, were repeated separately for the first three developmental periods of 0 to 3, 3 to 6, and 6 to 10 years of age. The maternal ratings for age 10 to 14 were omitted because of inadequate information (Kagan & Moss, 1962).

This research found that maternal protection, restriction, hostility, and acceleration were important influences in the development of the female. In particular, maternal restriction was important. The Fels Group

specifically found that maternal restriction during age 0 to 3 was a good predictor of the girl's passivity as an adult. Another finding indicated maternal protection and hostility toward girls during age 0 to 3 were the best correlates of adult withdrawal; correlates were positive for protection and negative for hostility. Maternal hostility toward the daughter during the first three years, together with acceleration during age 6 to 10, were associated with adult intellectual mastery in the woman. Those mothers who were critical of their daughters during the first three years and exerted acceleratory pressures on them were intellectually competitive role models. The investigators suggested that this combination of maternal traits and practices, and their timing in the girl's development, were both critical in the development of intellectual mastery in the girl (Kagan & Moss, 1962).

Another result indicated the adoption of masculine activities in adult women was highly associated with maternal hostility during the first three years. The authors suggested that since the critical mothers accelerated their daughters and pushed them toward independence, it might be expected that these girls would not adopt traditional feminine interests (Kagan & Moss, 1962).

Other findings indicated anxiety over social interaction in adult women was associated with maternal protection during the first three years. Protection of

daughters during the later periods was unrelated to adult social anxiety. Hostility toward girls for the first three years, on the other hand, predicted low social anxiety in adult women. These findings agreed with previous findings indicating that mothers who were critical during age 0 to 3 had daughters who were mastery oriented, independent, and competitive with peers (Kagan & Moss, 1962).

Research in this study also indicated the mother has a tremendous influence upon the son's personality development. The Fels Group found that maternal protection, restriction, hostility, and acceleration were also important influences upon the son's development (Kagan & Moss, 1962).

The major results indicated maternal protectiveness was a slightly better predictor of passivity for boys; whereas, restriction was a better predictor for girls. Other related findings indicated maternal protection of sons during age 0 to 3 was a slightly better predictor of passivity in boys age 6 to 10 than protection for ages 3 to 6 and 6 to 10. Protection of boys during age 0 to 3 was one of the best predictors of child and adult intellectual achievement. Thus the pattern most likely to be related to the boy's involvement in intellectual achievement was early maternal protection, followed by encouragement and acceleration of mastery behaviors. In

summary, the best correlates of adult intellectual mastery were low hostility and high protectiveness during the age 0 to 3. Kagan and Moss (1962) called this phenomenon the "sleeper effect," implying that the mother's early interactions with the child may be more indicative of the child's future behavior than contemporaneous assessments of the mother's behavior. They suggested that behavior, unlike most physical phenomena, has a long-time course, and the critical antecedents of a response may have occurred many years prior to its occurrence (Kagan & Moss, 1962).

Other findings indicated protectiveness during age 0 to 3 predicted conformity during ages 6 to 10 and 10 to 14 for both sexes. This suggested that the mother who rewarded the child's early dependency may have provided the conditions for effective socialization of rebellious tendencies. It appeared that the earlier this maternal treatment occurred, the more effective the socialization (Kagan & Moss, 1962).

To summarize, Kagan and Moss (1962) suggested that maternal protection, restriction, hostility, and acceleration were important influences on the development of characteristics in the girl and boy. The investigators evaluated the results in terms of their importance. The most striking finding was that maternal protection of boys during the first three years was associated with a

theoretically consistent set of behaviors during the years 6 to 14. This cluster included a passive reaction to frustration, emotional dependence on adults, conformity to adult demands, striving for excellence in intellectual achievements, fear of physical harm, and minimal adoption of traditional masculine interests. If a mother's tendency to protect her sons during the first three years is followed by another consistent behavior pattern, then it is conceivable that some aspect of later maternal behavior--or the young male adult's memory of that behavior--would be related to his assertiveness.

The second implication of the data involved the differential patterning of maternal treatment of the sexes. Kagan and Moss (1962) suggested that mothers who valued intellectual competence for themselves and their children protected their sons but were more critical of their daughters. If the mother treated her son and daughter differently, then it seems likely that this behavior would produce an assertive daughter with a son who was noticeably less assertive.

The third provocative finding involved the "sleeper effect." In several instances the mother's behavior during the first three years was the best predictor of school age or adult behavior. Evaluations of similar maternal practices during ages 3 to 6 and 6 to 10 were often unrelated to the adult's behavior. Since the mother's

behavior during the first three years appears to be so crucial, it would seem likely that this would influence the assertiveness of the school age child as well as the adult.

The Role and Influence of the Father

While the role of the mother continues to be considered as an important influence upon child behavior, recent investigators (Lamb, 1976; Hoffman, 1960; Baumrind, 1971) have examined the role of the father in child development. In a review of the literature on the father's influence, which included a summary of his own investigations, Lamb (1976) has suggested several reasons for this interest in the father's role. First, contemporary social development theorists have increasingly stressed the role of the mother in the socialization of the child and are now beginning to acknowledge the importance of the father's role. The second reason for the ascendant interest in fathers and other family members relates to the disintegration of the family in contemporary American society. Third, researchers have been gathering extensive evidence suggesting that the infant is actually capable of playing a far more active role and that its sensory competence should not be underestimated. This fact, too, has led social scientists to question whether the infant's social world may not be far more complex than previous theorizing has assumed. This suggests that infants

form affective relationships with fathers as well as mothers (Lamb, 1976).

Lamb (1976) viewed the father as the representative within the family of the values and standards of the society. He suggested that without the father's mediation, values would not be transmitted effectively. Lamb (1976) also differentiated between the roles of the mother and father. He reported that the most prominent characteristics of the father-child interaction were play and discipline while caretaking was the most outstanding in the mother-child interaction.

In his review of the literature, Lamb (1976) stressed that the quality of the early father-child attachment and subsequent relationship is important in the development of the child's personality. Inadequate fathering has been associated with a high level of anxiety and maladjustment in children (Lamb, 1976). The paternally deprived child's insecurity in interpersonal relationships can contribute to feelings of anxiety and low self-esteem. In addition, the paternally deprived child may experience much anxiety because of an overly intense relationship with the mother. Lamb (1976) reported that children who had personality problems such as shyness, oversensitivity, and poor self-concept frequently had insensitive and dictatorial fathers. Additionally, an affectionate father-child relationship appeared to

facilitate the sex-role development of children. Consistent father absence before the ages of four to five seemed to have a retarding effect on the development of masculine behavior in male children.

The father's interest and consistent participation appear to contribute strongly to the development of the child's self-confidence and self-esteem. Lamb (1976) in a study of college students' relationships with their fathers reported that male and female students' self-esteem was positively related to paternal love and negatively related to paternal rejection and neglect. Self-confidence and self-esteem are characteristics inherent in assertiveness. The father who is loving would more than likely aid in the development of assertiveness; whereas, the rejecting, neglectful father would hinder the development of this behavior.

Lamb (1976) also focused upon the father's influence upon the sex role development of the daughter in his review of the literature. He found that when the father is not involved in the family, his daughter is likely to have problems in her sex-role and personality development. Hoffman (1960) found that girls from mother-dominant homes had difficulty relating to males and were disliked by boys. Lamb reported that when a girl is continuously frustrated in her interactions with her father, she may develop a negative attitude toward close relationships with men and

marriage. He also found that women interested in marriage appeared to have close relationships with both parents and to be comfortable in their self-concepts. More of the women interested in careers came from homes in which the father had died or in which there was inadequate parent-child communication. Lamb concluded that in most cases at least a moderate level of paternal involvement in decision making plus paternal warmth and nurturance seemed important in the girl's feminine development.

Another investigation reported by Lamb (1976) suggested that the father plays a particularly important role in the girl's personality adjustment. College females' perceptions of their relationships with their fathers during childhood were assessed. Subjects who perceived their fathers as being nurturant and positively interested in them obtained high scores on the Adjective Check List Personal Adjustment Scale. In contrast, subjects who perceived their fathers as having been rejecting scored very low on the personal adjustment measure. Findings from other investigators have also pointed to the influence of positive paternal involvement in the girl's interpersonal adjustment (Baumrind, 1971).

Lamb (1976) reported an analysis of data from the Berkeley Longitudinal Study which highlighted the importance of both the father-daughter and father-mother

relationships in the quality of the female's personality functioning. For instance, the females who were the best adjusted as adults grew up in homes with two positively involved parents. Their mothers were described as affectionate, personable, and resourceful and their fathers as warm, competent, and firm. Poorly adjusted females were likely to have been reared in homes where either one or both parents were very inadequate. Thus adequate parenting improved the quality of the daughter's personality functioning and contributed to her self-worth and subsequent assertiveness.

Research has indicated that the father has a tremendous influence upon his son's personality development. Paternal influence upon the boy has been studied extensively by Lamb (1976). He stressed the father's influence upon the son's sex-role development, aggressiveness, leadership ability, and social maturity.

In terms of masculine development, Lamb (1976) suggested that what seemed to inhibit the boy's masculinity was not the father's participation in some traditionally feminine activities in the home but the father's passivity in family interactions and decision-making and/or a relative parental role reversal. A high level of perceived decision making by the father was associated with strongly masculine behavior. Lamb (1976) suggested masculine development is facilitated when the father is a competent

masculine model and allows and encourages the boy to be dominant. Such paternal behavior is important in the development of sex-role adoption.

Lamb (1976) found that boys who had undemonstrative, frustrating, and critical fathers rejected their fathers as models. In contrast, when the father-son relationship was nonstressful (e.g., the father was warm, affectionate, and supportive), the masculinity of toy preferences positively correlated with the father's masculinity. It appeared that masculine development was facilitated when the father was both masculine and nurturant. Lamb (1976) reported that one of the best established findings is that the masculinity of sons and the femininity of daughters are greatest when fathers are nurturant and participate extensively in child rearing.

Lamb (1976) proposed that boys often learn to be aggressive and masculine by modeling themselves after their fathers, the disciplinary situation being particularly relevant. Other factors may be operating to produce a relationship between paternal limit setting and the boy's aggressive behavior. Boys may be aggressive as a function of the frustration engendered by severe paternal punitiveness. When fathers played significant parts in setting limits, the boy's attachment to his father and his masculine development were facilitated only if there was an already established affectionate father-son

relationship. If the father was not nurturant, and was punitive, the boy was likely to display a low level of father imitation. It seems likely then that a highly punitive father who is not nurturant produces an aggressive son, but a father who reasonably sets limits plus shows warmth and understanding produces an assertive son.

Lamb (1976) hypothesized that the development of leadership, responsibility, and social maturity in adolescent males is closely associated with a father-son relationship that not only is nurturant but also includes a strong component of paternal limit setting. Lamb (1976) suggested that the nonnurturant father is an inadequate model and his consistent presence appears to be a detriment to the boy's personality functioning. Furthermore, the boy with a nonnurturant father may be better off if his father is not available. However, Lamb (1976) added that father absence can be detrimental to the social adjustment of children. For example, a study of lower class fifth grade boys revealed that boys who became father absent before the age of two were more handicapped in several dimensions of personality development than boys were who became father absent at a later age. For instance, these boys were found to be less trusting and less industrious and to have more feelings of inferiority than boys who became father absent between the ages of three to five (Lamb, 1976).

To summarize, Lamb (1976) found that fathers who were affectionate but firm decision makers facilitated their children's sex role development, self-esteem, and self-confidence. Children who were shy, overly sensitive, and had a low self-esteem frequently had fathers who were dictatorial, rejecting, and neglectful.

In the personality development of females, fathers who were involved in family decision making as well as nurturant produced well-adjusted, feminine daughters. Females who had difficulty relating to males and had a negative attitude toward marriage usually had fathers who were not involved and were also rejecting (Lamb, 1976).

Paternal influence on the male's personality development indicated that fathers who were competent masculine models as well as nurturant, affectionate, and supportive facilitated their sons' masculine development. Boys who rejected their fathers as models and were aggressive often had fathers who were undemonstrative, critical, less nurturant, and excessively punitive (Lamb, 1976).

Assertiveness

As suggested in the preceding sections, assertiveness is an important variable to consider in the study of parental influence upon children. However, there are few studies that have specifically related parental influence to children's assertiveness. Additionally, there appears

to be confusion among the general public concerning what the term actually means.

Salter (1949) was one of the first investigators to note the semantic difficulty with the term assertiveness. He suggested that only a small proportion of the United States' population actually differentiates between assertiveness and aggressiveness. Alberti (1976) quoted Salter's opinion of the term assertion: "The word assertion is an impertinent kind of word. It's a will-you-please-jump-in-the-lake-mister kind of word" (p. 34). Salter felt this was the reason the word had caught on and become popular. Salter (1949) added, "It is a today word that allows the individual to reject society, to reject his or her environment. It also gives people an excuse to express negative feelings" (p. 34). He suggested that it is important to express feelings, but there seems to be an excessive emphasis on the expression of "nasty feelings."

The need for a more precise definition of the concept of assertiveness has been proposed. Several investigators have offered definitions and explanations. In an important book on assertiveness entitled Your Perfect Right, Alberti and Emmons (1970) proposed the following definition of assertiveness:

> Behavior which enables a person to act in his (her) own best interests, to stand up for himself (herself) without undue anxiety, to express his

> (her) honest feelings comfortably, or to exercise his (her) own rights without denying the rights of others. (p. 3)

In his review of the assertiveness literature, Alberti (1976) broke the term assertiveness down into several components. He suggested there were verbal and nonverbal components of assertive behavior. Nonverbal behavior is categorized as loudness of voice, fluency of spoken words, eye contact, facial expression, body expression, and distance from the person with whom one is interacting; thus assertiveness may be viewed in terms of verbal and nonverbal components of behavior.

Alberti (1976) also proposed that assertiveness consists of a number of paralanguage behaviors such as tone of voice and inflection. He indicated that these behaviors are learned, and their purpose is to communicate an individual's wants, needs, and opinions to others in a socially acceptable manner. In his opinion, assertiveness is not conceptualized as a general unitary personality trait. More specifically, assertiveness involves expressing a variety of behaviors (e.g., refusing requests or giving compliments) verbally, nonverbally, and through paralanguage to a number of people. Assertiveness occurs within a situation (private or public) that is embedded within a cultural context. An individual's behavior and therefore what is assertive and socially acceptable is affected by all of the above factors. Change in any one

of the factors influences whether a given set of verbal, nonverbal, and paralanguage behaviors is judged to be assertive or nonassertive (Alberti, 1976). From his work, Alberti proposed the following definition of assertive behavior:

> Assertive behavior is that complex of behaviors emitted by a person in an interpersonal context, which expresses that person's feelings, attitudes, wishes, opinions, and rights. Such behavior may include the expression of such emotions as anger, fear, caring, hope, joy, despair, indignance, embarrassment, but in any event is expressed in a manner which does not violate the rights of others. (p. 367)

Recent studies have suggested that lay people have confused assertiveness with aggressiveness. Baer (1976), an assertiveness trainer, indicated that a central tenet of assertiveness training is that assertive behaviors be differentiated from aggressive behaviors. He proposed definitions for aggressiveness and assertiveness from his experience as a trainer.

> Aggression is an act against others that minimizes their worth as people, where you enhance yourself at the expense of another person, stand up for your rights in such a way that the rights of others are violated, and achieve by inflicting deliberate hurt. The purpose of the aggressive behavior is to humiliate, dominate, or put the other person down rather than to simply express your honest emotions or thoughts. You attack the person rather than his/her behavior. (pp. 20-21)

Baer defined assertiveness in the following way:

> Assertiveness is making your own choices, standing up for yourself appropriately, and having an active orientation to life. You stand up for your legitimate rights in such a way that the rights of others

> are not violated. In the process, you may hurt someone, but that is not your intent. (p. 20)

Tucker et al. (1983) attempted to differentiate assertiveness, aggressiveness, and shyness through the use of a factor analysis study. In the study, 30 graduate student assistants in nonhuman service fields rated 419 men and women in a speech communication class. Raters were given no specific criteria against which to rate subjects. The results suggested assertiveness and aggressiveness variables correlated positively. The authors suggested that assertiveness and aggressiveness could be confused by the general public.

Alberti (1976) suggested that assertive and aggressive behavior differ principally in that the latter involves hurting or stepping on others in the course of expressing oneself. He also noted that aggression is defined by both the behavior and the social labels applied to it. Additionally, intent must be considered; that is, if the individual intended to hurt (be aggressive) or to express (be assertive).

In his extensive research on assertive behavior, Alberti (1976) has also noted that behavior must be measured according to its effects. For instance, if the receiver gets the assertive message and responds accordingly, then the individual (giver) may be classified as assertive. If the receiver is obviously hurt, then the

giver may have been aggressive. Additionally, social-cultural context must be taken into account in classifying behavior as assertive or aggressive. A culture, for example, which regards honoring one's elders as one of its ultimate values may regard an otherwise assertive request to a grandparent as clearly inappropriate and aggressive (Alberti, 1976).

In an attempt to synthesize the many perspectives which have been suggested as relevant to an adequate definition, Alberti (1976) developed a schema called CRIB to aid in assertiveness training as well as in the development of a definition of assertiveness. The term is an acronym which represents context, response, intent, and behavior. The individual's behavior is then evaluated in terms of this schema.

Finally, Alberti (1976) has urged careful avoidance of the term assertiveness because assertiveness is not a trait. He believed assertiveness should be viewed as a relative characteristic. One may exhibit assertiveness in an effective fashion, honestly expressing one's feelings, and still reject the rights and feelings of others involved.

Thus there appears to be a conflict of opinions regarding assertiveness. On the one hand, assertiveness is viewed as a mixture of polite firmness in which an individual stands up for his or her legitimate rights and

does not violate the rights of the other individual. On the other hand, the individual evaluates his or her assertiveness in terms of the context of the situation, response of the receiver, intent of the message, and behavior of the receiver.

The Influence of Parental Treatment on Children's Assertiveness

Whether assertiveness is a stable characteristic or an erratic one, research has related it to parental treatment in nursery and elementary school age children. Additionally, studies have shown that male children's assertiveness is greatly influenced by parental treatment.

Parental treatment has been related to nursery school children's assertiveness. In a study of parental control and love, Baumrind (1965) utilized 32 male and female nursery school children who manifested social attributes to a high degree. She divided the sample into three groups: Pattern I children were self-reliant, self-controlled, and affiliative; Pattern II children were discontented, withdrawn, and distrustful; Pattern III children had little self-control, self-reliance, and tended to retreat from novel experiences. After five months of observation in a nursery school and laboratory settings, parent-child interactions were obtained by means of interviews and structured observations. These

were devised to obtain characteristic expressions of the following interaction dimensions:

> Parental control refers to the socializing functions of the parent, that is, to those parental acts which are intended to shape the child's goal-oriented activity, modify his expression of dependent, aggressive, and playful behavior, and promote internalization of parental standards.
>
> Parent-child communication refers to the extent to which the parent shares with the child her objectives for the child, solicits his opinions and feelings, exhibits attentive and patient interest in the child's efforts to communicate, and comprehends the child's perspective in adult-child interactions.
>
> Parental nurturance refers to the predilection of the parent to perform the caretaking functions. Nurturance is composed of warmth and involvement. (p. 231)

The results showed that control and nurturance interacted collaboratively and that a pattern of parental behavior high in control and high in nurturance was more likely to produce self-assertive and self-confident behavior in young children than any other pattern of parental behavior.

Baumrind (1971) subsequently studied current patterns concerning parental authority by observing 146 male and female preschool children and their families. From these observations, definitions of Permissive, Authoritative, and Authoritarian parenting styles were obtained:

> Permissive. The parent offers himself or herself as a resource to the child, not as an active agent responsible for modifying or shaping behavior, and allows the child to regulate his or her own behavior as much as possible.

> Authoritative. The parent attempts to direct the child's activities, but does not insist on obedience for its own sake. The parent is realistic about use of restrictions, and shares with the child the reasoning behind the parental policy of using firm control.
>
> Authoritarian. The parent values obedience as a virtue, and favors forceful measures when the child's actions or beliefs conflict with what the parent thinks is right. (p. 191)

The results showed that authoritative parental behavior was clearly associated with independent, purposive behavior for girls but not for boys. The investigator constructed these hypotheses from the results of the study:

1. Boys and girls were affected somewhat differently by authoritarian practices, with independence in girls and social responsibility in boys most adversely affected by such patterns.

2. Preschool girls were as achievement oriented and independent as preschool boys. Baumrind (1981) suggested these aspects were probably socialized out by parental or extraparental influences. She added that if girls were stimulated and encouraged to remain achievement oriented and independent, or perhaps not punished for being so, they would continue to be achievement oriented and independent relative to boys in later life.

3. Pressures either to conform or not to conform seemed to interfere with the development in girls of the

ability to act assertively without dependence upon social norms.

Parental treatment has been related to older children's assertiveness. Mummery (1954) in a review of the children's assertiveness literature presented characteristic child rearing practices related to assertiveness. She reported that parents of assertive children differed greatly from parents of asocial, neglected, and nonassertive children. The parents of assertive children were less inclined to protect their children from normal risks and responsibilities or to prevent a normal degree of independence. These parents tended to be less restrictive in degree of control and allowed their children more freedom to use their own judgments. They also gave more respect to their children's rights and opinions.

Schilling (1979) investigated the relationship between the assertive behavior of parents and the behavior of their children. He also investigated whether or not children tended to reflect their parents' level of concern about three areas of interpersonal functioning--inclusion, control, and affection. Subjects consisted of volunteer groups of parents and their male and female children who were administered the Interpersonal Relations Questionnaire Behavior (FIRQ-B) and the Adult Self-Expression Scale. Contrary to previous findings, no relationship was found between the assertiveness of parents and that of their

children. There seemed to be no certainty that parents who acted assertively with adults would have children who were assertive with other children. The most notable result was that assertiveness related to affection rather than control.

Lamb (1976), through study of the father-son relationship, reported several results related to assertiveness. He found that if the father was nurturant but not consistently involved in family activities, it was much harder for his son to learn to be "appropriately assertive, active, independent, and competent" (p. 92). He also reported that boys who were separated from their fathers for the first four years of life were less assertive and independent in their peer relations than boys who had not been separated from their fathers. They were more often observed to be very submissive or to react with immature hostility.

Instruments

Many instruments have been devised to measure children's perceptions of how their parents behave toward them and their relationships with family members. Fewer instruments have been constructed to measure adolescents' and adults' retrospective perceptions of parent-child relations, parent-adolescent communication, and family functioning. Questionnaires have been designed to aid in shaping assertive behavior, obtaining pre- and

postmeasures of assertiveness, and determining subjects' present degrees of assertiveness. The following is a selective review of instruments that measure parent-child relationships and communication plus questionnaires that measure assertiveness.

Instruments Devised for Use With Children

Child's Parental Authority Love Statements (Child's PALS) and Projected Essential Needs, Parental Authority-Love Statements (PEN PALS). Williams (1958) developed two inventories in the area of parent-child relationships. The first is a rating scale, Child's Parental Authority Love Statements (Child's PALS) and a projective technique called Projected Essential Needs, Parental Authority-Love Statements (PEN PALS). These scales are geared to a third-grade reading level and permit a child to evaluate his or her unique interpersonal relationship with each parent as he or she sees it. The child rates each parent on two continua: Authority (one who should or must be obeyed) and Love (a source of warmth and emotional support). The "high" and "low" of each, used as axes, form a quadrant scoring system of four major categories, plus a fifth, the "Psychologically Unknown" parent, defined in terms of algebraic cancellation. These scales can be visually plotted to compare and contrast the conscious and less conscious evaluations of each parent.

Bronfenbrenner Parent Behavior Questionnaire (BPB). Siegelman (1965) described and evaluated the Bronfenbrenner Parental Behavior Questionnaire (BPB). The BPB consists of 45 statements concerning parental behavior. The same 45 statements are used for father and for mother. Children were asked to indicate the extent to which the statements are true of how their parents act toward them. The subject selects one of the following five choices for each of the first 25 items: in every case, in most cases, sometimes, seldom, and never. Fifteen variables are measured by the BPB with three statements for each variable. Siegelman (1965) concluded the BPB had considerable promise as a research instrument.

Children's Reports of Parental Behavior Inventory (CRPBI). Johnson (1976) stated that the motivation for Schaefer's (1965a) Children's Reports of Parental Behavior Inventory (CRPBI) arose from the accumulating evidence that children's reports of parental behavior were valid. An earlier version of the inventory consisted of 26 self-administered scales; each included 10 items to sample a child's perceptions of a particular concept of parental behavior. Each of the 10 items within the scale described relevant, specific, observable parental behavior. The child was instructed to indicate whether the item was "like" or "not like" his or her parents. Separate but identical forms were provided for each parent. Each of

the concepts, in turn, related to molar dimensions of parental behavior which were variants of two dimensions: Love versus Hostility and Autonomy versus Control (Johnson, 1976).

The later version of the CRPBI consists of 18 scales with 192 items (Johnson, 1976). This version was developed from an item and factor analysis of the 26 scale, 260-item version. The instructions for scoring this version were: Assign a value of 3 to L (like the parent), 2 to SL (somewhat like the parent) and 1 to NL (not like the parent).

Schaefer (1965a) in the development of the scale associated the terms "intrusiveness, suppression of aggression, and parental direction" with parental control and the terms "positive evaluation, sharing, expression of affection, and emotional support" with parental love (p. 415).

Instruments Devised for Use With Adolescents and Adults

Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire. Roe and Siegelman (1963) described the development of the Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire, which was devised to obtain a measure of the characteristic behavior of parents toward their young children, as experienced by the child. The authors stated that this questionnaire could also be used with adolescents and adults who completed it with reference to their own childhoods.

There are 10 subtests, 6 of 15 items each, for behavior characterized as Loving, Protecting, Demanding, Rejecting, Neglecting, and Casual plus 4 of 10 items each for Symbolic-Love Reward, Direct-Object Reward, Symbolic-Love Punishment, and Direct-Object Punishment. A large number were adapted from the literature and others were constructed to fit the 10 categories.

The questionnaire was administered to two samples of male and female college students and one sample of non-college students. A factor analysis of the data yielded these factors for each parent: Loving-Rejecting, Casual-Demanding, and Overt Attention. Subtest reliabilities for the questionnaire fell between .90 and .71 (Roe & Siegelman, 1963).

Parental Attitudes Questionnaire. In devising the Parental Attitudes Questionnaire, the authors (Spence & Helmreich, 1978) consulted parent interview schedules and objective questionnaires used in prior investigations (e.g., Baumrind, 1971) of parent-child relations. The first section of the questionnaire consists of 58 items inquiring about parents' attitudes and behaviors in the family atmosphere. The first eight items are statements about both parents or the family as a whole. These are followed by 25 statements about the mother and a parallel set of statements about the father. Each item is accompanied by a five-point scale, ranging from "very

characteristic" to "very uncharacteristic." The last section contains five items designed to determine the parent to whom the respondent feels closest or most resembles in ideals and personality, as well as the degree of parental agreement about child rearing. The items were designed to provide a measure of mother versus father identification.

Spence and Helmreich (1978) administered the Parental Attitudes Questionnaire to male and female high school students from intact families since birth. The students' responses were factor analyzed with the equimax rotation technique. Three factors were found and labeled Mother and Father Acceptance, Father Acceptance, and Strictness of Family Rules and Standards.

Family Relations Inventory (FRI). Johnson (1976) described Brunkan's (1965) Family Relations Inventory (FRI) as a 202-item questionnaire designed to measure the perceived attitudes of the subject's mother and father. Items are assigned to one of six scales: mother avoidance, mother acceptance, mother concentration, father avoidance, father acceptance, and father concentration. The number of items in each scale vary from 30 to 37. The items are designed to measure the individual's perceptions of his or her parent's attitudes toward him or her in childhood and adolescence.

Brunkan (1965) tested the reliability of the FRI by administering the original scales to 100 male and female undergraduate students. The coefficients of internal consistency on the scales were between .80 and .90 with the exception of father concentration, which was .59. Test-retest reliability coefficients were in the similar range except for father concentration, which was .73.

Validity was assessed through scale intercorrelations. Validity was also measured through correlation with the Grigg's Questionnaire. Further validity was established through a comparison of students and prison inmates. For both parents, the inmates scored significantly higher on avoidance and lower on acceptance (Brunkan, 1965).

Inventory of Family Feelings (IFF). Lowman (1980) developed the Inventory of Family Feelings (IFF), a 38-item, self-administered measure of interpersonal affect that maps a family's affective structure. The inventory also shows patterns of conflicted relationships and alliances among family members.

Three studies were conducted to show the reliability and validity of the measure (Lowman, 1980). The purpose of the first study was to compare the affective structure of families having a child who was an identified patient in psychotherapy with families in which no one had significant psychological problems. The IFF was first given to 34 pathological and nonpathological families. Results

demonstrated the IFF's construct validity. Members of pathological families reported, on the average, less positive feelings toward each other than members of non-pathological families. Identified patients both expressed and were the recipients of less positive feelings. In addition, correlations between IFF scores and clinicians' ratings provided support for the IFF's concurrent validity.

The purpose of the second study was to replicate Study 1 findings about the IFF's construct validity and affective structure in pathological families and to compare IFF scores with degree of individual psychopathology. Members of families requesting treatment were administered the IFF and the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) as measures of affective structure and individual psychopathology, respectively. The results demonstrated that IFF scores were generally consistent with family system predictions. Identified patients expressed less positive affect and had the highest rates of individual psychopathology within their families (Lowman, 1980).

Groups of 10 maritally satisfied couples and 10 maritally dissatisfied couples were subjects in the third study. Couple groups were compared using two scales, IFF response scores, and scores from the Locke Wallace Marital Adjustment Test. The results of this study added

to the IFF's construct validity by showing it significantly discriminated couples in marital therapy from satisfied control couples. The results also added to the current validity because of the test's correlation with a measure of marital satisfaction.

Parent-Adolescent Communication Inventory (PACI). The Parent-Adolescent Communication Inventory (PACI) developed by Bienvenu (1969a) is a general measure of communication patterns between adolescents and their parents. The first version of the PACI consisted of 36 items formulated from a review of the literature and from the author's clinical experience. To promote face validity, the 36 items were submitted to a clinical team consisting of a psychiatrist, psychologist, and psychiatric social worker whose consensus was that all of the items are relevant to intrafamily communication (Bienvenu, 1969b).

Data were then obtained from 376 male and female high school youth. At the .01 level of confidence using the chi-square test, 31 of the 36 items were found to discriminate significantly between the upper and lower quartiles on effective and noneffective parent-subject communication. Thirty out of these 31 items showed a discrimination of 20% or better between the upper and lower quartiles (Bienvenu, 1969b). For cross-validation the mean scores of three major sub-groups (three different high schools) within the sample were compared.

The same mean was found for two of the schools while the third school was one point higher.

Further validation was obtained from a study of 178 regular-session high school students and 97 summer-session students. The latter group was in attendance at summer school for reasons of failure and underachievement. Using the t test, a significant difference was found between the two groups with the regular-session students showing a higher level of parent-adolescent communication. Based on an item analysis of the first study mentioned, and an evaluation of the latter study, the PACI then underwent a major revision (Bienvenu, 1969b).

Using this revised version, a comparison was made from a study of 358 high school youth. At the .01 level of confidence using the chi-square test all 40 items were found to discriminate significantly between the upper and lower quartiles. Thirty-nine of the 40 items yielded a discrimination of 21% or higher; whereas, one item showed a discrimination of 14% (Bienvenu, 1969b).

Two additional studies with criterion groups were completed. A sample of 59 delinquent youth committed to a state training school was compared to an equal number of nondelinquent youth attending public school. The t test revealed a significant difference in the level of parent-adolescent communication between these groups with

the 59 nondelinquents showing significantly better communication with their parents (Bienvenu, 1969b).

Twenty-five 10th-grade honors students were then compared to 20 remedial students in the same school. Using the Mann-Whitney U Test, a highly significant difference in the level of parent-adolescent communication between the two groups was found in favor of the honors students (Bienvenu, 1969b).

Three reliability studies have been made with the present 40-item inventory. Using the Spearman-Brown formula, a split-half correlation coefficient, computed on scores of 74 teenage subjects on the odd-numbered and on the even-numbered statements, revealed a coefficient of .86 after correction. Using the Spearman rho, a test-retest study of 84 teenage boys and girls within a three week period revealed a .78 reliability coefficient for this inventory. In a second test-retest reliability study of 63 additional subjects within a two week period a reliability coefficient of .88 was obtained (Bienvenu, 1969b).

The PACI was used in the present study to assess retrospective parent-child communication patterns. Family communication instruments designed specifically for adults in this area were not available. As a result, subjects were informed to answer questions as if they were continuing to reside with their parents. Additionally, this

instrument was utilized because its reliability and validity have been demonstrated in previous studies.

Clarke Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire (Clarke PCR). The Clarke Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire (Clarke PCR) is a comprehensive measure of retrospective relations between adult subjects and their parents. The Clark PCR has been demonstrated to be a useful measurement of individuals' retrospective relations with their parents in the areas of affection, physical aggression, verbal aggression, restrictive control, general positive feelings, identification, aggressive and affectionate relations between the parents, and each parent's general adequacy in life; this includes intelligence, social and occupational competence, and responsible family orientation (Paitich & Langevin, 1976).

The Clarke PCR was administered to 29 men (clinical and normal) to assess the test's convergent and discriminant validity plus test-retest reliability. A factor analysis was also performed on the data. Convergent validity results suggested that the 16 scales had reasonable internal consistency and showed a moderate commonality with sufficient unique variance to present different aspects of the test (Paitich & Langevin, 1976).

Discriminant validity was determined by examining age, education, intelligence, social desirability, sex differences and mother-father differences. Discriminant

validity from these variables was claimed. Test-retest reliability varied from .64 to .84 (Paitich & Langevin, 1976).

A factor analysis showed a moderate convergence among the scales as well as uniqueness. Two bipolar factors emerged, one for mother and one for father. The factors contrasted aggressiveness and strictness at one pole with affection, indulgence, and identification at the other. Results suggested the Clarke PCR is a useful clinical and research instrument (Paitich & Langevin, 1976).

The Clarke PCR was used in the present study because it assesses a wide variety of parent-child variables. Moreover, reliability and validity have been demonstrated in previous studies.

Instruments Devised to Measure Assertiveness

Rathus Assertiveness Schedule (RAS). The Rathus Assertiveness Schedule (RAS) was the first scale for the assessment of general assertiveness to be developed in a systematic fashion. Several of the 30 items were derived from the works of Wolpe and Lazarus (1966) and Guilford and Zimmerman's (1956) Temperament Survey. Additional items were suggested by diaries maintained by the author's undergraduate classes (Rathus, 1973). Students were instructed to record behaviors they might like to exhibit but which were inhibited by fear of aversive social

consequences. By and large, RAS items are similar to those described for other scales; for instance, a typical item states, "I often have a hard time saying no." Beck and Heimberg (1983), however, speculated that this scale, more than others, may confuse the concepts of assertion and aggression. They point out item 30 as an example: "Most people seem to be more aggressive and assertive than I am." Additionally, they reported significant positive correlations between semantic differential ratings of aggressiveness and 13 of the 30 items on the RAS. However, the RAS has been demonstrated to be a useful measure of research procedures for shaping assertive behavior, obtaining pre- and postmeasures of assertiveness, and for determining a subject's present amount of assertiveness.

Test-retest reliability of the RAS was established by administering the instrument to 68 undergraduate college men and women and then retesting them after eight weeks had passed. The mean pretest score was .2941, the standard deviation 29.121. The mean posttest score was 1.6176, and the standard deviation was 27.632. A Pearson product moment correlation coefficient was then run between respondents' pre- and posttest scores, yielding an r of .778 ($p < .01$). This indicated moderate to high stability of test scores over a two month period (Rathus, 1973).

Internal consistency of the RAS was determined by having 18 college juniors and seniors administer the test to 67 people off campus. Results showed their RAS scores varied from the +60's to the -70's. A Pearson product moment correlation coefficient was run between total odd and total even scores, yielding a $\underline{r}$ of .77, suggesting that the qualities measured by the RAS possess moderate to high homogeneity (Rathus, 1973).

Validity of the RAS was established by comparing self-reported RAS scores to two external measures of assertiveness. In Study 1, college students who administered the RAS to subjects they knew well then rated these subjects on a 17-item schedule constructed according to the semantic differential technique. The modifier "very" was attached to the extreme positions of each scale, "slightly" to the central positions, and "rather" or "quite" to the moderate positions. The extreme positional pole of each scale was assigned to the number +3, and positions were numbered consecutively, omitting zero because of the absence of a central point, to -3, the negative pole of each scale (Rathus, 1973).

The factor structure of the 17-item rating schedule was determined by factor analyzing raters' responses. Five factors accounting for 71.2% of the total variance were then obtained: Assertiveness, Contentment, Intelligence, Prosperity, and Health. Pearson product moment

correlation coefficients were then run, and RAS scores correlated significantly with each of the five scales comprising the assertiveness factor of the rating schedule. Rathus (1973) concluded that RAS scores served as valid indicators of respondents' assertiveness in terms of the impressions they made on other people.

The RAS was used in the present study as a general measure of assertiveness. This instrument was chosen because a number of studies utilizing college students have suggested that it is a reliable and valid instrument for the measurement of assertive behavior.

College Self-Expression Scale (CSES). The College Self-Expression Scale (CSES) is a 50 item, self-report measure of assertiveness (Galassi, Delo, Galassi, & Bastien, 1974). It utilizes a five-point Likert format (0-4) with 21 positively worded items and 29 negatively worded items. The scale attempts to measure three aspects of assertiveness: positive, negative, and self-denial. Positive assertiveness consists of expressing feelings of love, affection, admiration, approval, and agreement. Negative assertiveness includes expressions of justified anger, disagreement, and annoyance. Self-denial includes apologizing, interpersonal anxiety, and exaggerated concern for others. The scale also indicates an individual's level of assertiveness through a variety of role occupants: strangers, authority figures,

business relations, family, relatives, and like and opposite sex peers.

Normative data were collected on four samples of college students. Test-retest reliability data were collected for the first two samples of students over a two week period. Results showed that in all of the samples, males achieved slightly higher scores than females. The test-retest reliability coefficients were between .89 and .90. In terms of construct validity, the CSES correlated positively and significantly with scales from the Gough Adjective Check List (Galassi et al., 1974).

The authors believed the scale could be used by therapists to determine quickly the type of assertive responses which a client would fail to emit, as well as the interpersonal situations in which appropriate assertiveness was not forthcoming.

Assertiveness Inventory. Gambrill and Richey (1975) presented the Assertiveness Inventory in a study to assess its use in assessment and research. The Assertiveness Inventory is a 40-item self-report questionnaire. For each item, the respondent is requested to indicate: (a) degree of discomfort or anxiety on a five-point scale; (b) the probability of displaying the behavior if actually presented with the situation on a five-point scale; and (c) the situations in which he or she would like to be more assertive.

The 40 items of the Assertiveness Inventory fall into the following categories: (a) turning down requests; (b) expressing personal limitations; (c) initiating social contacts; (d) expressing positive feelings; (e) handling criticism; (f) differing with others; (g) assertion in service situations; and (h) giving negative feedback.

Normative data were collected from three samples of undergraduates enrolled in social science classes as well as from a sample of women participating in assertiveness training programs (Gambrill & Richey, 1975). The authors concluded from the study that the Assertiveness Inventory appeared to be useful clinically as well as in the investigation of between group differences. It could be used for assessment purposes to scan areas in which a client might have a dysfunctional assertiveness repertoire as well as employed as an instrument in determining degree of change following interventions.

Wolpe-Lazarus Assertiveness Scale (WLAS). The Wolpe-Lazarus Assertiveness Scale (WLAS) consists of 30 true-false items devised by Wolpe and Lazarus (1966) on the basis of clinical intuition. The psychometric properties of the scale were investigated by Hersen, Bellack, Turner, Williams, Harper, and Watts (1979).

Subjects consisted of male and femal psychiatric day hospital and inpatients at a psychiatric institute.

Each of the subjects was asked to complete the WLAS after psychotropic medication had regulated major symptomatology. Approximately one week later, subjects were requested to once again complete the WLAS to obtain a measure of test-retest reliability (Hersen et al., 1979).

Results showed there were no significant differences between males and females on total WLAS scores. The WLAS appeared to be internally consistent and had acceptable split-half and test-retest reliabilities. A factor analysis performed separately for males and females indicated that the 10 most prominent factors accounted for about 60% of the variance. The primary factor shared by males and females was labeled General Expressiveness. There was little evidence for the external validity of the WLAS when total scores were correlated with performance on a role play test. However, when WLAS factor scores were evaluated in light of role played performance, somewhat better evidence of the external validity was found in two of the factors for females; they were General Expressiveness and Response to Being Wronged.

Statement of the Problem

In spite of the many studies which have reported children's perceptions of parental characteristics, little is known about the familial characteristics that influenced whether an adult would be assertive or nonassertive. Most of the data on the characteristics and perceptions of

parents were inferred from studies utilizing children or adolescents as subjects. Mummery (1954) was the only investigator who studied family backgrounds of assertive and nonassertive individuals. However, the study had several weaknesses. First, she used the term "ascendance" to identify individuals who attained and maintained mastery of social situations even though the terms "assertive" and "nonassertive" were employed in the study's title. Since then, this term has virtually been replaced by the term "assertiveness." The definition has also been updated to include more specific descriptions of assertive behavior. Second, Mummery did not devise an original study but reviewed ascendance studies dating from 1933 to 1950. Third, Mummery reviewed studies that utilized young children as subjects; neither adolescent or adult ascendance studies were reviewed.

Another problem that appeared in the review of the literature was the possible confusion of assertiveness with aggressiveness by laypeople. Alberti (1976) and Tucker et al. (1983) indicated that the general public perceived the concepts of assertion and aggression to be closely related.

A final problem revealed in the literature was conflicting views concerning what parental characteristics produce assertiveness in children. Mummery (1954) proposed that parents who allowed independence and were not

consistently controlling produced assertive boys and girls. Baumrind (1965) reported that high parental control and nurturance produced assertiveness in preschool boys and girls. Baumrind (1971) subsequently hypothesized that preschool girls were just as assertive as preschool boys until they reached elementary school. She attributed this to parental pressures to conform. Lamb (1976) reported that consistent paternal involvement and warmth produced assertiveness in elementary school age boys. Additionally, boys separated from their fathers during the first four years were nonassertive. Finally, Schilling (1979) found that assertiveness in male and female children was related to parental affection rather than control.

The present study explored the relationship between assertiveness and college males' and females' perceived relationships with their parents. Because not all relationships between child behaviors and parental child rearing patterns were the same for boys and girls, the relationships were examined separately for the sexes. Since the literature is unclear, and since many of the earlier studies have utilized children as subjects, hypotheses were not proposed in this exploratory investigation.

METHOD

Subjects

Subjects were 199 Appalachian State University undergraduate students: 100 women and 99 men. They ranged in age from 18 to 28 with a mean age of 19.93 and median of 19.87. Age was positively skewed, as these data have indicated. The number of subjects from each classification consisted of 56 freshmen, 46 sophomores, 54 juniors, and 43 seniors.

Apparatus

Rathus Assertiveness Schedule (RAS). The Rathus Assertiveness Schedule (RAS) is a general measure of assertiveness (Rathus, 1973). It consists of 30 items in which subjects indicate how characteristic statements are of them by a scale of +3 through -3, with +3 denoting "very characteristic" and -3 denoting "very uncharacteristic." When the completed questionnaires were received by the investigator, the RAS scoring scales of +3, +2, +1, -1, -2, and -3 were assigned values of +5, +4, +3, +2, +1, and 0 consecutively to eliminate negative scores and therefore maintain the standard deviation (see Appendix A).

Clarke Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire (Clarke PCR). The Clarke Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire (Clarke PCR) consists of 132 items in which subjects assess retrospective relations with their parents. Questions may be answered with "Yes," "No," "Often," "Sometimes," or "Never" responses (Paitich & Langevin, 1976). The following scales make up the instrument:

1. Mother's Aggression toward the Subject. A high score indicates the mother was bad tempered, domineering, and critical toward the subject and probably caused hurt feelings quite often.

2. Father's Aggression toward the Subject. A high score indicates the father was bad tempered, domineering, and critical toward the subject and probably caused hurt feelings quite often.

3. Subject's Aggression toward the Mother. A high score indicates the subject was argumentative and verbally hostile toward the mother and probably disliked her quite frequently.

4. Subject's Aggression toward the Father. A high score indicates the subject was argumentative and verbally hostile toward the father and probably disliked him quite frequently.

5. Mother's Aggression toward the Father. A high score indicates the mother was domineering, bad tempered,

and disrespectful toward the father and probably criticized him quite a lot.

6. Father's Aggression toward the Mother. A high score indicates the father was domineering, bad tempered, and disrespectful toward the subject's mother and probably criticized her quite a lot.

7. Mother's Competence. A high score indicates in the eyes of the subject the mother was sociable, intelligent, and generally successful in life. The subject also sees the mother as efficient and reasonable.

8. Father's Competence. A high score indicates in the opinion of the subject, the father was sociable, intelligent, and generally successful in life. Also, the subject sees him as efficient and reasonable.

9. Mother's Affection. A high score indicates the mother seems to have been generally attentive and affectionate toward the subject. The subject sees her as sympathetic and possibly tenderhearted.

10. Father's Affection. A high score indicates the father seems to have been generally attentive and affectionate toward the subject. The subject sees him as sympathetic and possibly tenderhearted.

11. Mother's Strictness. A high score indicates the mother seems to have been controlling and rather strict with the subject and probably used physical punishment fairly often.

12. Father's Strictness. A high score indicates the father seems to have been controlling and rather strict with the subject and probably used physical punishment fairly often.

13. Mother Identification. A high score indicates the subject admired the mother, generally had pleasing relations with her, and wished to be similar to her.

14. Father Identification. A high score indicates the subject admired the father, generally had pleasing relations with him, and wished to be similar to him.

15. Mother's Indulgence. A high score indicates the mother apparently spoiled the subject and showed considerable favoritism toward the subject.

16. Father's Indulgence. A high score indicates the father apparently spoiled the subject and showed considerable favoritism toward the subject.

17. Denial of Mother. A high score indicates the subject shows defensiveness in describing the relationship with the mother and seems to be unwilling to acknowledge her unfavorable characteristics.

18. Denial of Father. A high score indicates the subject shows defensiveness in describing the relationship with the father and seems to be unwilling to acknowledge his unfavorable characteristics. (See Appendix B for a copy of the questionnaire.)

Parent-Adolescent Communication Inventory (PACI). Bienvenu (1969b) developed the Parent-Adolescent Communication Inventory (PACI) Form A. The inventory consists of 40 questions which may be answered "Yes" (Usually), "Sometimes," or "No" (Seldom). Items were designed to assess parent-teen relations and communication. Subjects in the present study were asked to answer questions as if they were living with their parents.

Bienvenu (1969b) defines communication as the way people exchange feelings and meanings as they try to see problems and differences from the other person's point of view. Communication is not limited to words. It also occurs through facial expressions, gestures, and through silences and listening (see Appendix C for a copy of the inventory).

Personal Data Form. The Personal Data Form, developed by the investigator, assessed subject's demographic information. The 17 item questionnaire included questions to determine number of children in the family, number of brothers older and younger, ordinal position, parents' education and occupation, size of home town, distance of home from campus, and family mobility. However, the demographic data of name, sex, classification, and age were the only data from the form utilized in the present study.

Procedure

Five hundred and seventy Appalachian State University undergraduate males and females were randomly selected from the Appalachian State University Student Directory. A stratified sample consisting of approximately equal numbers of subjects from each classification were then chosen from the original sample; this resulted in 300 subjects. Packets were then mailed to each subject. These packets contained the Rathus Assertiveness Schedule, Clarke Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire, Parent-Adolescent Communication Inventory, the Personal Data Form, and a cover letter explaining the nature of the study and informing subjects that the names of those who completed the forms would be eligible for a $40.00 prize. A copy of the letter may be found in Appendix E.

One hundred ninety-nine subjects (100 females, 99 males) returned completed packets to the investigator through campus mail. A drawing was then completed, and a male sophomore student received a check for $40.00.

Statistical Analysis

Data obtained from the Rathus Assertiveness Schedule, Clarke Parent-Child Relations Inventory, Parent-Adolescent Communication Inventory, and selected data from the Personal Data Form were then analyzed by a stepwise multiple regression analysis and Pearson product moment correlation coefficient. In addition, measures of central

tendency (mean and median) and variability (standard deviations and ranges) were calculated. Finally, a one-way analysis of variance for each variable was computed to determine if scores of males and females differed significantly. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) programs were utilized in the analyses.

RESULTS

Table 1 shows the mean, median, standard deviation, and range for the total group of subjects. Note that scores on some of the variables tended to be positively or negatively skewed rather than normally distributed.

Descriptive data for males and females on each variable as well as *F* - values and significance levels of the one-way analysis of variance are presented in Table 2. Results indicated that males and females differed significantly on 4 of the 20 variables but not on the variable of assertiveness; an *F* - value of .41 for males and females was found for the variable of assertiveness. The mother's aggression toward the father score yielded a significant *F* - value of 4.55 ($p < .05$), indicating that females perceived mothers to be more aggressive toward fathers than males. A significant *F* - value of 6.64 ($p = .01$) was found for the mother's strictness toward the subject, with males viewing mothers as stricter toward them than females. The father's strictness toward the subject also resulted in a significant *F* - value of 11.66 ($p = .001$). Once again males perceived fathers to be stricter toward them than females. A significant *F* -

Table 1

Descriptive Data for the Total Group

Variable	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Range
Age	19.93	19.87	2.07	18-28
Assertiveness	79.61	78.87	12.05	52-114
Parent-Subject communication	94.57	97.85	16.20	42-121
Mother's aggression toward subject	3.68	2.97	3.28	0-19
Father's aggression toward subject	3.99	3.18	3.63	0-20
Subject's aggression toward mother	2.44	2.18	1.54	0-8
Subject's aggression toward father	2.18	1.96	1.66	0-8
Mother's aggression toward father	5.15	3.94	3.91	0-20
Father's aggression toward mother	4.59	2.96	5.23	0-24
Mother's competence	17.03	18.06	3.68	0-20
Father's competence	17.98	19.03	2.93	4-20

Table 1 (continued)

Variable	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Range
Mother's affection toward subject	6.28	6.11	1.46	0-13
Father's affection toward subject	7.55	7.87	2.11	2-12
Mother's strictness toward subject	3.48	3.27	2.19	0-10
Father's strictness toward subject	3.51	3.12	2.50	0-15
Subject's identification with mother	5.35	5.78	1.23	0-6
Subject's identification with father	5.28	5.78	1.30	0-6
Mother's indulgence of subject	2.72	2.59	2.39	0-8
Father's indulgence of subject	2.43	1.71	2.21	0-13
Subject's denial of mother's faults	12.92	13.46	3.06	0-18
Subject's denial of father's faults	13.66	14.22	3.15	1-18

Table 2

Descriptive Data for Males and Females and Results of the Analysis of Variance

Variable	Female		Male			Significance
	M	SD	M	SD	F	of F
Assertiveness	80.16	12.97	79.07	11.09	0.41	0.53
Parent-Subject communication	94.22	18.03	94.92	14.19	0.10	0.76
Mother's aggression toward subject	3.84	3.63	3.52	2.90	0.46	0.50
Father's aggression toward subject	3.77	4.06	4.21	3.14	0.74	0.39
Subject's aggression toward mother	2.64	1.73	2.24	1.31	3.32	0.07
Subject's aggression toward father	2.27	1.80	2.09	1.52	0.57	0.45
Mother's aggression toward father	5.74	4.52	4.56	3.10	4.55	0.03*
Father's aggression toward mother	4.87	5.61	4.32	4.83	0.54	0.47
Mother's competence	17.20	3.86	16.86	3.51	0.40	0.53
Father's competence	18.10	2.76	17.85	3.10	0.34	0.56

Table 2 (continued)

Variable	Female M	Female SD	Male M	Male SD	F	Significance of F
Mother's affection toward subject	6.27	1.46	6.29	1.46	0.01	0.91
Father's affection toward subject	7.73	2.22	7.37	1.97	1.42	0.23
Mother's strictness toward subject	3.09	2.17	3.87	2.13	6.64	0.01**
Father's strictness toward subject	2.93	2.41	4.11	2.46	11.66	0.001***
Subject's identification with mother	5.29	1.38	5.41	1.06	0.50	0.48
Subject's identification with father	5.24	1.34	5.33	1.27	0.25	0.62
Mother's indulgence of subject	2.83	2.73	2.62	2.00	0.35	0.55
Father's indulgence of subject	2.83	2.18	2.03	2.17	6.70	0.01**
Subject's denial of mother's faults	12.60	3.32	13.24	2.77	2.19	0.14
Subject's denial of father's faults	13.71	3.07	13.61	3.25	0.04	0.83

*Significant at the .05 level.

**Significant at the .01 level.

***Significant at the .001 level.

value of 6.70 ($p = .01$) was found for the father's indulgence of the subject, revealing that females saw fathers as more indulgent of them than males.

Pearson product moment correlations were computed based on test scores for the total group as well as for males and females separately. Table 3 depicts the intercorrelations between subjects' assertiveness and their perceptions of interactions for males and females. (See Appendices F and G for intercorrelations between all variables for the entire sample and for males and females separately.) Assertiveness was significantly negatively related to parent-subject communication, -.190 ($p < .01$) and the subject's identification with the father, -.131 ($p < .05$). Assertiveness was significantly positively related to the mother's aggression toward the subject and the father, .143 ($p < .05$) and .136 ($p < .05$), respectively. Additionally, the father's aggression toward the subject was significantly positively related to assertiveness, .179 ($p < .01$).

The following results were found for the female group. Assertiveness was significantly negatively related to parent-subject communication, -.205 ($p < .05$) and positively related to the mother's indulgence of the subject, .168 ($p < .05$) and father's indulgence of the subject, .295 ($p < .001$).

Table 3

Intercorrelations between Assertiveness and Parent-Child Measures for Males and Females and the Total Group

Variable	Males	Females	Total Group
Parent-Subject communication	-.165	-.205*	-.190**
Mother's aggression toward subject	.272**	.053	.143*
Father's aggression toward subject	.302***	.104	.179**
Subject's aggression toward mother	.048	-.058	-.011
Subject's aggression toward father	.032	-.017	.006
Mother's aggression toward father	.010	.150	.136*
Father's aggression toward mother	.108	.088	.099
Mother's competence	-.059	-.103	-.082
Father's competence	-.061	-.138	-.088

Table 3 (continued)

Variable	Males	Females	Total Group
Mother's affection toward subject	.053	.114	.085
Father's affection toward subject	-.104	-.059	-.074
Mother's strictness toward subject	.062	.062	.053
Father's strictness toward subject	.173*	.027	.081
Subject's identification with mother	-.118	-.002	-.050
Subject's identification with father	-.187*	-.084	-.131*
Mother's indulgence of subject	-.069	.168*	.079
Father's indulgence of subject	-.143	.295***	.101
Subject's denial of mother's faults	-.019	-.153	-.102
Subject's denial of father's faults	-.190*	-.051	-.115

*Significant at the .05 level.

**Significant at the .01 level.

***Significant at the .001 level.

In the male group, assertiveness was significantly negatively related to the subject's identification with the father, -.187 ($p < .05$) and the subject's denial of the father's shortcomings, -.190 ($p < .05$). Additionally, assertiveness was significantly positively related to the mother's and father's aggression toward the subject, .272 ($p < .01$) and .302 ($p = .001$) as well as the father's strictness toward the subject, .173 ($p < .05$).

The stepwise multiple regression analysis revealed different variables for males and females as predictors of assertiveness.

Table 4 shows the multiple regression data for the female group. Multiple R was .295 for the variable of father's indulgence of the subject, accounting for 7.78% of the variance ($F = 9.35$, $p < .003$). When the variable of parent-subject communication was stepped in, a Multiple R of .363 resulted, indicating the combination of these variables accounted for 11.37% of the variance ($F = 7.35$, $p < .001$). No other variable added significantly to the regression equation; which is as follows: Assertiveness = 1.778 Father's Indulgence of the Subject - 0.151 Parent-Subject Communication + 89.418. This indicated a gain of 11% over chance in predicting assertiveness scores for females.

The multiple regression for the male group, shown in Table 5 indicates a Multiple R of .301 for the variable

Table 4

Multiple Regression Data for the Female Group

Step No.	Variable	Multiple R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Percent Variance Accounted For	F	Significance
1	Father's Indulgence of Subject	.295	.087	.078	7.78	9.354	.003
2	Parent-Subject Communication	.363	.0132	.114	11.37	7.349	.001

Table 5

Multiple Regression Data for the Male Group

Step No.	Variable	Multiple R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Percent Variance Accounted For	F	Significance
1	Father's Aggression Toward Subject	.301	.091	.082	8.15	9.697	.002

of father's aggression toward the subject. This accounted for 8.15% of the variance (F = 9.70, p < .002). From this analysis the following regression equation was derived: Assertiveness = 1.063 Father's Aggression toward the Subject + 74.589. This indicates a gain of 8% over chance in predicting assertiveness for males.

The stepwise multiple regression analysis for the total group, portrayed in Table 6, resulted in a Multiple R of .190 for the variable of parent-subject communication. This accounted for 3.11% of the variance (F = 7.35, p < .007). From this analysis the following regression equation was derived: Assertiveness = 92.962 - 0.141 Parent-Subject Communication. This indicates a gain of only 3% over chance in predicting assertiveness scores for college students.

Table 6

Multiple Regression Data for the Total Group

Step No.	Variable	Multiple R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Percent Variance Accounted For	F	Significance
1	Parent-Subject Communication	.190	.036	.031	3.11	7.347	.007

DISCUSSION

The major findings indicated the following:

1. There were no sex differences in assertiveness of the college males and females.

2. There were sex differences in subjects' perceptions of mother-father instruction and parent-subject interaction.

3. Assertiveness and parent-subject communication were negatively related for all groups.

4. Male and female correlations had no commonality with variables significantly related to assertiveness.

5. Female and male regression equations produced divergent results.

The first major finding showed there were no sex differences in assertiveness for the sample of male and female college students. This is contrary to past findings which reported that males were more assertive than females (e.g., Rodriquez et al., 1980). However, the use of a random sample in the present study gives strength to these findings in relationship to a Southern regional university population but not to a random sample of adults nationwide.

A second important result suggested that males and females perceived relationships with their parents in different ways. For instance, males perceived their parents to be stricter than did females. This is consistent with previous research. Lamb (1976) proposed that males learn to be masculine and aggressive by modeling themselves after fathers who are nurturant and consistently set limits. Additionally, females perceived their mothers to be more aggressive toward their fathers than males. They also viewed their fathers as more indulgent of them. The latter finding is congruous with previous results. For instance, Lamb (1976) suggested that a moderate level of paternal involvement in decision-making plus paternal warmth and nurturance were important in the girl's feminine development.

In the third significant finding, assertiveness and parent-subject communication were found to be negatively related in the total group as well as the male and female groups. This lends support to Mummery's (1954) finding that parents of assertive children were less inclined to protect their children from normal risks and responsibilities or to prevent a normal amount of independence; this finding suggests that communication could be perceived to be lower among assertive children and their parents. Furthermore, it is possible that subjects equated assertiveness with aggressiveness in responding to items on the

Rathus Assertiveness Schedule (RAS). This is possible since recent studies indicated the RAS may confound the variables of assertiveness and aggressiveness (Tucker et al., 1983). If this suggestion is correct, then the RAS may not be an adequate measure of assertiveness.

The fourth major result showed that male and female groups had no variables in common that significantly related to the variable of assertiveness. In the female group, correlational data suggested that parental indulgence is important in the development of assertiveness; whereas, good communication with parents could have interfered with the development of this characteristic. This finding suggests parental indulgence may increase the female's self-confidence and sense of well-being. However, the indulged female, who has been spoiled and shown considerable favoritism, may perceive communication to be lower between herself and her parents.

In the male group, parental aggression toward the subject as well as paternal strictness seemed to foster assertiveness. Again, confusion of assertiveness with aggressiveness is suggested. Likewise, the ability to identify with the father and denial of the father's shortcomings seemed to impede the development of assertiveness in the male group. Note that the high amount of intercorrelations among the variables may have lessened the impact of this correlational data.

The fifth and most important finding indicated that female and male regression equations produced contrasting results. Regression data suggested that the female's assertiveness is strongly influenced by the father's indulgence of her and surprisingly by poor communication with her parents. The former result is consistent with Lamb's (1976) findings. He proposed that the father's consistent interest in the child contributed strongly to the development of the child's self-confidence and self-esteem. Additionally, fathers who were nurturant usually produced well-adjusted daughters. The latter finding is again consistent with Mummery's (1954) research that assertive children might perceive communication to be lower between themselves and their parents.

The male's assertiveness, on the other hand, seemed to be strongly influenced by the father's aggressiveness. This is reasonable when viewed in light of Lamb's (1976) opinion of the father's role. He felt that one of the most prominent characteristics of the father-child interaction was discipline. He also stressed that boys often learned to be aggressive and masculine by modeling themselves after their fathers. Paternal modeling then appears to be important in the development of assertiveness in males.

To summarize, the unique variables found in the stepwise multiple regression analysis were paternal

indulgence and parent-subject communication for the female group; paternal aggression for the male group; and parent-subject communication for the total group. Perhaps the choice of a more distinct parent-child relations measure would have led to more significant findings.

In conclusion, the present study suggests that assertiveness is encouraged by the father's behaviors, with aggressiveness being important for the boy and indulgence being important for the girl. In addition, contrary to expectations, parent-child communication was found to be negatively related to assertiveness. When these are considered, several points need to be assessed. First, do certain RAS items need to be revised? Second, should the validity and reliability of the RAS be reassessed; and third, does this scale more than other assertiveness instruments confuse the concepts of assertiveness and aggressiveness? With this in mind, future research needs to be directed toward clarifying these questions and in addition answering such questions as the following: Does the general public confuse assertiveness with aggressiveness? Is assertiveness inadvertently used as an outlet for negative feelings? Is a more precise definition of assertiveness needed? Until such clarification is completed, it is suggested that the term assertiveness be

replaced by one which will evoke less negative evaluations.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Alberti, R. E. (1976). Assertiveness: Innovations, applications, and issues. California: Impact.

Alberti, R. E., & Emmons, M. (1970). Your perfect right. California: Impact.

Baer, J. (1976). How to be an assertive (not aggressive) woman in life, in love, and on the job. New York: New American Library.

Baumrind, D. (1965). Parental control and parental love. Children, 12, 230-234.

Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. Developmental Psychology Monographs, 4, 1-107.

Baumrind, D. (1981). Parenting styles and children's behavior. Family Relations, 30, 191-195.

Beck, J. G., & Heimberg, G. H. (1983). Self-report assessment of assertive behavior. Behavior Modification, 7, 451-487.

Becker, W., & Krug, R. (1965). The parent attitude research instrument--a research review. Child Development, 36, 329-365.

Bienvenu, M. (1969a). Measurement of parent-communication. The Family Coordinator, 18, 117-121.

Bienvenu, M. (1969b). A counselor's guide to accompany a parent-adolescent communication inventory. North Carolina: Family Life Publications.

Brown, A., Morrison, J., & Couch, G. (1947). Influence of affectional family relationships on character development. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 42, 422-428.

Brunkan, R. (1965). Perceived parental attitudes and parental identification in relation to field of vocational choice. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 12, 39-47.

Cicirelli, V. (1980). A comparison of college women's feelings toward their siblings and parents. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 42, 111-118.

Frankiel, R. (1959). A review of research on parent influence on child personality. New York: Family Service Association of America.

Freud, S. (1951). Observation on child development. Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, 6, 18-30.

Galassi, J., Delo, J., Galassi, M., & Bastien, S. (1974). The college self-expression scale: A measure of assertiveness. Behavior Therapy, 5, 165-171.

Gambrill, E., & Richey, C. (1975). An assertion inventory for use in assessment and research. Behavior Therapy, 6, 550-561.

Guilford, J., & Zimmerman, W. (1956). The Guilford temperament survey. California: Sheridan Psychological Services.

Hawkes, G., Burchinal, L., & Gardner, B. (1956). Marital satisfaction, personality characteristics, and parental acceptance of children. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 3, 216-221.

Hersen, M., Bellack, A., Turner, S., Williams, M., Harper, K., & Watts, J. (1979). Psychometric properties of the Wolpe-Lazarus Assertiveness Scale. Behavior Research and Therapy, 17, 63-69.

Hoffman, M. (1960). Power assertion by the parent and its impact on the child. Child Development, 31, 129-143.

Jakubowski, P., & Spector, P. (1973). Facilitating the growth of women through assertiveness training. The Counseling Psychologist, 4, 75-86.

Johnson, O. (1976). Tests and measurements in child development: Handbook II, volume I. California: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Kagan, J. (1964). The importance and acquisition of sex-typing. In M. L. Hoffman & L. W. Hoffman (Eds.), Review of child development research. New York: Russel Sage.

Kagan, J., & Moss, H. A. (1962). Birth to maturity. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Lamb, M. E. (1976). The role of the father in child development. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Lowman, J. (1980). Measurement of family affective structure. Journal of Personality Assessment, 44, 130-141.

Lynn, D. (1966). The process of learning parental and sex-role identification. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 28, 466-470.

Mummery, D. (1954). Family backgrounds of assertive and nonassertive children. Child Development, 25, 63-80.

Paitich, D., & Langevin, R. (1976). The Clarke Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire: A clinically useful test for adults. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 44, 428-436.

Rathus, S. (1973). A 30-item schedule for assessing assertive behavior. Behavior Therapy, 4, 398-406.

Rodriquez, R., Nietze, M., & Berzins, J. (1980). Sex role orientation and assertiveness among female college students. Behavior Therapy, 11, 353-366.

Roe, A., & Siegelman, M. (1963). A parent-child relations questionnaire. Child Development, 34, 355-369.

Rogers, D. (1972). Issues in adolescent psychology. New York: Appleton-Century-Crafts.

Salter, A. (1949). Conditioned reflex therapy: The direct approach to the reconstruction of personality. New York: Creative Age.

Schaefer, E. (1961). Multivariate measurement and factorial structure of children's perceptions of maternal and paternal behavior. American Psychologist, 16, 345-346.

Schaefer, E. (1965a). Children's reports of parental behavior: An inventory. Child Development, 36, 413-424.

Schaefer, E. (1965b). A configurational analysis of children's reports of parent behavior. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 29, 552-557.

Schaefer, E., & Bell, R. (1958). Development of a parental attitude research instrument. Child Development, 29, 339-361.

Schilling, C. (1979). The relationship between the assertive behavior of parents and the behavior of their children. American Journal of Family Therapy, 7, 59-64.

Sears, R., Maccoby, E., & Levin, H. (1957). Patterns of child rearing. Illinois: Row Peterson.

Siegelman, M. (1965). Evaluation of Bronfenbrenner's questionnaire for children concerning parental behavior. Child Development, 36, 164-174.

Spence, J., & Helmreich, R. (1978). Masculinity and femininity. Austin, TX and London: University of Texas Press.

Stogdill, R. (1937). Survey of experiments on children's attitudes towards parents: 1894-1936. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 51, 293-303.

Sutton-Smith, B., & Rosenberg, G. (1970). The sibling. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Tucker, R. K., Weaver, R. L., & Redden, E. M. (1983). Differentiating assertiveness, aggressiveness, and shyness: A factor analysis. Psychological Reports, 53, 607-611.

Williams, W. W. (1958). The PALS tests: A technique for children to evaluate both parents. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 22, 487-495.

Wolpe, J., & Lazarus, A. (1966). Behavior therapy techniques: A guide to the treatment of neuroses. New York: Pergamon Press.

APPENDIX A

Rathus Assertiveness Schedule

Rathus Assertiveness Schedule

DIRECTIONS: Indicate how characteristic or descriptive each of the following statements is of you by using the code given below:

+3 very characteristic of me, extremely descriptive

+2 rather characteristic of me, quite descriptive

+1 somewhat characteristic of me, slightly descriptive

-1 somewhat uncharacteristic of me, slightly nondescriptive

-2 rather uncharacteristic of me, quite nondescriptive

-3 very uncharacteristic of me, extremely nondescriptive

		X through your choice
1.	I have hesitated to make or accept dates because of shyness.	+3+2+1-1-2-3
2.	When the food served at a restaurant is not done to my satisfaction, I complain about it to the waiter or waitress.	+3+2+1-1-2-3
3.	I am careful to avoid hurting other people's feelings, even when I feel that I have been injured.	+3+2+1-1-2-3
4.	If a salesman has gone to considerable trouble to show me merchandise which is not quite suitable, I have a difficult time in saying "No."	+3+2+1-1-2-3
5.	When I am asked to do something, I insist upon knowing why.	+3+2+1-1-2-3

X through your choice

6. There are times when I look for a good, vigorous argument. +3+2+1-1-2-3

7. I strive to get ahead as well as most people in my position. +3+2+1-1-2-3

8. To be honest, people often take advantage of me. +3+2+1-1-2-3

9. I enjoy starting conversations with new acquaintances and strangers. +3+2+1-1-2-3

10. I often don't know what to say to attractive persons of the opposite sex. +3+2+1-1-2-3

11. I will hesitate to make phone calls to business establishments and institutions. +3+2+1-1-2-3

12. I would rather apply for a job or for admission to a college by writing letters than by going through with personal interviews. +3+2+1-1-2-3

13. I find it embarrassing to return merchandise. +3+2+1-1-2-3

14. If a close and respected relative were annoying me, I would smother my feelings rather than express annoyance. +3+2+1-1-2-3

15. I have avoided asking questions for fear of sounding stupid. +3+2+1-1-2-3

16. During an argument I am sometimes afraid that I will get so upset that I will shake all over. +3+2+1-1-2-3

X through your choice

17. If a famed and respected lecturer makes a statement which I think is incorrect, I will have the audience hear my point of view as well. +3+2+1-1-2-3

18. I avoid arguing over prices with clerks and salesmen. +3+2+1-1-2-3

19. When I have done something important or worthwhile, I manage to let others know about it. +3+2+1-1-2-3

20. I am open and frank about my feelings. +3+2+1-1-2-3

21. If someone has been spreading false and bad stories about me, I see him or her as soon as possible to "Have a talk" about it. +3+2+1-1-2-3

22. I often have a hard time saying "No." +3+2+1-1-2-3

23. I tend to bottle up my emotions rather than make a scene. +3+2+1-1-2-3

24. I complain about poor service in a restaurant and elsewhere. +3+2+1-1-2-3

25. When I am given a compliment, I sometimes just don't know what to say. +3+2+1-1-2-3

26. If a couple near me in a theatre or at a lecture were conversing rather loudly, I would ask them to take their conversation elsewhere. +3+2+1-1-2-3

27. Anyone attempting to push ahead of me in a line is in for a good battle. +3+2+1-1-2-3

		X through your choice
28.	I am quick to express an opinion.	+3+2+1-1-2-3
29.	There are times when I just can't say anything.	+3+2+1-1-2-3
30.	Most people seem to be more aggressive and assertive than I am.	+3+2+1-1-2-3

APPENDIX B

Clarke Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire

Clarke Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire

DIRECTIONS: Circle the answer that best applies to you.

1. Did your mother have a bad temper with you?

   A. Yes B. No

2. Did your father have a bad temper with you?

   A. Yes B. No

3. How often was your mother grouchy with you?

   A. Often B. Sometimes C. Never

4. How often was your father grouchy with you?

   A. Often B. Sometimes C. Never

5. How often did your mother strike you with her fists?

   A. Often B. Sometimes C. Never

6. How often did your father strike you with his fists?

   A. Often B. Sometimes C. Never

7. How often were you afraid of your mother?

   A. Often B. Sometimes C. Never

8. How often were you afraid of your father?

   A. Often B. Sometimes C. Never

9. Was your mother too domineering or too bossy with you?

   A. Yes B. No

10. Was your father too domineering or too bossy with you?

    A. Yes B. No

11. Did your mother hurt your feelings?

    A. Often B. Sometimes C. Never

12. Did your father hurt your feelings?

    A. Often B. Sometimes C. Never

13. Did your mother say you wouldn't amount to much?

A. Yes B. No

14. Did your father say you wouldn't amount to much?

A. Yes B. No

15. Did your mother feel this way?

A. Yes B. No

16. Did your father feel this way?

A. Yes B. No

17. Was your mother cruel to you?

A. Yes B. Sometimes C. Never

18. Was your father cruel to you?

A. Yes B. Sometimes C. Never

19. Did your mother criticize you?

A. Often B. Sometimes C. Never

20. Did your father criticize you?

A. Often B. Sometimes C. Never

21. Did your mother sulk and refuse to talk?

A. Often B. Sometimes C. Never

22. Did your father sulk and refuse to talk?

A. Often B. Sometimes C. Never

23. Did you argue with your mother?

A. Often B. Sometimes C. Never

24. Did you argue with your father?

A. Often B. Sometimes C. Never

25. Did you dislike your mother?

A. Often B. Sometimes C. Never

26. Did you dislike your father?

A. Often B. Sometimes C. Never

27. Did you ever get so angry at your mother you felt like killing her?

A. Yes B. No

28. Did you ever get so angry at your father you felt like killing him?

A. Yes B. No

29. Did you ever shout at your mother in an argument?

A. Often B. Sometimes C. Never

30. Did you ever shout at your father in an argument?

A. Often B. Sometimes C. Never

31. Was your mother cold and reserved with your father?

A. Often B. Sometimes C. Never

32. Was your father cold and reserved with your mother?

A. Often B. Sometimes C. Never

33. Should your father have been more forceful with your mother?

A. Often B. Sometimes C. Never

34. Did your father watch TV, read, sleep, etc., instead of paying attention to the family?

A. Yes B. No

35. Did you see your mother strike your father?

A. Often B. Sometimes C. Never

36. Did you see your father strike your mother?

A. Often B. Sometimes C. Never

37. Was your mother too domineering or bossy with your father?

A. Yes B. No

38. Was your father too domineering or bossy with your mother?

A. Yes B. No

39. Would you say that your mother was cruel to your father?

A. Often B. Sometimes C. Never

40. Would you say that your father was cruel to your mother?

A. Often B. Sometimes C. Never

41. Did your mother tell your father he didn't amount to much?

A. Often B. Sometimes C. Never

42. Did your father try to act like a big shot?

A. Yes B. No

43. Did your mother <u>feel</u> that your father didn't amount to much?

A. Yes B. No

44. Did your father spend too much time away from home?

A. Yes B. No

45. Was your mother bad-tempered with your father?

A. Often B. Sometimes C. Never

46. Was your father bad-tempered with your mother?

A. Often B. Sometimes C. Never

47. Did your mother criticize your father?

A. Often B. Sometimes C. Never

48. Did your father criticize your mother?

A. Often B. Sometimes C. Never

49. Did your mother consider this a happy marriage?

A. No B. Yes

50. Did your father consider this a happy marriage?

A. No B. Yes

51. Did your mother show respect for your father?

A. No B. Yes

52. Did your father show respect for your mother?

A. No B. Yes

53. Was your father hen-pecked?

A. Yes B. No

54. Was your father too forceful with your mother?

A. Yes B. No

55. Did your mother have temper tantrums?

A. Yes B. No

56. Did your father have temper tantrums?

A. Yes B. No

57. Were you ever afraid that your mother would leave the home?

A. Yes B. No

58. Did your mother and father only put up with each other?

A. Yes B. No

59. Would you say that your mother was intelligent?

A. Yes B. No

60. Would you say that your father was intelligent?

A. Yes B. No

61. Was your mother good at meeting people?

A. Yes B. No

62. Was your father good at meeting people?

A. Yes B. No

63. Was your mother a nervous person?

A. No B. Yes

64. Was your father a nervous person?

A. Yes B. No

65. Did you ever feel ashamed of your mother?

A. No B. Yes

66. Did you ever feel ashamed of your father?

A. Yes B. No

67. Was your mother a success in life as a person?

A. Yes B. No

68. Was your father a success in life as a person?

A. Yes B. No

69. Did you ever feel your mother was stupid or silly?

A. No B. Yes

70. Did you ever feel your father was stupid or silly?

A. No B. Yes

71. Was your mother a show-off?

A. No B. Yes

72. Was your father a show-off?

A. No B. Yes

73. Did your mother have leadership qualities?

A. Yes B. No

74. Did your father have leadership qualities?

A. Yes B. No

75. Was your mother a good organizer and efficient?

A. Yes B. No

76. Was your father a good organizer and efficient?

A. Yes B. No

77. In a crisis at home, would your mother be able to take charge?

A. Yes B. No

78. In a crisis at home, would your father be able to take charge?

A. Yes B. No

79. Was your mother sympathetic and friendly to you?

A. Often B. Sometimes C. Never

80. Was your father sympathetic and friendly to you?

A. Often B. Sometimes C. Never

81. Did you feel close to your mother?

A. Yes B. No

82. Did you feel close to your father?

A. Yes B. No

83. Did you feel that your mother neglected you?

A. Never B. Sometimes C. Never

84. Did you feel that your father neglected you?

A. Often B. Sometimes C. Never

85. Did you feel that your mother did not want to pay much attention to you?

A. No B. Yes

86. Did you feel that your father did not want to pay much attention to you?

A. No B. Yes

87. Was your mother cold and reserved with you?

A. Never B. Sometimes C. Never

88. Was your father cold and reserved with you?

A. Never B. Sometimes C. Never

89. Did you get tenderness and affection from your mother?

A. Often B. Sometimes C. Never

90. Did you get tenderness and affection from your father?

A. Often B. Sometimes C. Never

91. Was your mother strict with you?

A. Yes B. No

92. Was your father strict with you?

A. Yes B. No

93. Did your mother punish you with a strap, switch, or cane?

A. Often B. Sometimes C. Never

94. Did your father punish you with a strap, switch, or cane?

A. Often B. Sometimes C. Never

95. Did your mother slap or spank you?

A. Often B. Sometimes C. Never

96. Did your father slap or spank you?

A. Often B. Sometimes C. Never

97. Did you have trouble getting permission from your mother to do the things you wanted?

A. Yes B. No

98. Did you have trouble getting permission from your father to do the things you wanted?

A. Yes B. No

99. Did your mother try to control you?

A. Often B. Sometimes C. Never

100. Did your father try to control you?

A. Often B. Sometimes C. Never

101. Did your mother have qualities you admired and that you would like to have yourself?

A. Several B. 1 or 2 C. None

102. Did your father have qualities you admired and that you would like to have yourself?

A. Several B. 1 or 2 C. None

103. Are you in some ways similar to your mother?

A. Yes B. No

104. Are you in some ways similar to your father?

A. Yes B. No

105. Was your relationship with your mother pleasing to you on the whole?

A. Yes B. No

106. Was your relationship with your father pleasing to you on the whole?

A. Yes B. No

107. Did you worship your mother?

A. Yes B. No

108. Did you worship your father?

A. Yes B. No

109. Did you feel like your mother's favorite?

A. Yes B. No

110. Did you feel like your father's favorite?

A. Yes B. No

111. Did your mother spoil you; give you what you wanted?

A. Often B. Sometimes C. Never

112. Did your father spoil you; give you what you wanted?

A. Often B. Sometimes C. Never

113. Did your mother smother you with love, attention, and fussing over you?

A. Yes B. No

114. Did your father smother you with love, attention, and fussing over you?

A. Yes B. No

115. Was your mother grouchy or bad tempered with you?

A. Never B. Sometimes C. Often

116. Was your father grouchy or bad tempered with you?

A. Never B. Sometimes C. Never

117. Did you ever feel ashamed of your mother?

A. No B. Yes

118. Did you ever feel ashamed of your father?

A. No B. Yes

119. Was your mother cruel to your father?

A. No B. Yes

120. Was your father cruel to your mother?

A. No B. Yes

121. Was your mother too domineering with your father?

A. No B. Yes

122. Was your father a show-off?

A. No B. Yes

123. Did you argue with your mother?

A. Never B. Sometimes C. Often

124. Was your father bad tempered with your mother?

A. Never B. Sometimes C. Often

125. Was your mother too domineering with you?

A. No B. Yes

126. Was your father cold and reserved with you?

A. Never B. Sometimes C. Often

127. How often did your mother criticize you?

A. Never B. Sometimes C. Often

128. How often did your father criticize you?

A. Never B. Sometimes C. Often

129. Did you shout at your mother in an argument?

A. Never B. Sometimes C. Often

130. Did your father sulk and refuse to talk with you?

A. Never B. Sometimes C. Often

131. How often did your mother criticize your father?

A. Never B. Sometimes C. Often

132. Did your father criticize your mother?

A. Never B. Sometimes C. Often

APPENDIX C

Parent-Adolescent Communication Inventory

Parent-Adolescent Communication Inventory

DIRECTIONS: Answer each question as if you were still living at home with your parents by placing a check mark in one of the three blanks to the right of each item.

		YES Usually	Some-Times	NO Seldom
1.	Is family conversation easy and pleasant at meals?	_____	_____	_____
2.	Do your parents wait until you are through talking before "having their say?"	_____	_____	_____
3.	Do you pretend you are listening to your parents when actually you have tuned them out?	_____	_____	_____
4.	Do you feel that your father lectures and preaches to you too much?	_____	_____	_____
5.	Does your family have good times?	_____	_____	_____
6.	Do your parents seem to respect your opinion?	_____	_____	_____
7.	Do they laugh at you or make fun of you?	_____	_____	_____
8.	Do you feel your mother wishes you were a different kind of person?	_____	_____	_____
9.	Do either of your parents believe that you are bad?	_____	_____	_____
10.	Does your family talk things over with each other?	_____	_____	_____

		YES Usually	Some-Times	NO Seldom
11.	Do you discuss personal problems with your father?	_____	_____	_____
12.	Do you feel your father wishes you were a different kind of person?	_____	_____	_____
13.	Do your parents seem to talk to you as if you were much younger than you actually are?	_____	_____	_____
14.	Do they show an interest in your interests and activities.	_____	_____	_____
15.	Do you discuss personal problems with your father?	_____	_____	_____
16.	Does he pay you compliments or say nice things to you?	_____	_____	_____
17.	Do your parents ask your opinion in deciding how much spending money you should have?	_____	_____	_____
18.	Do you discuss matters of sex with either of your parents?	_____	_____	_____
19.	Do you feel that your father trusts you?	_____	_____	_____
20.	Do you help your parents understand you by saying how you think and feel?	_____	_____	_____
21.	Does your mother pay compliments or say nice things to you?	_____	_____	_____

		YES Usually	Some-Times	NO Seldom
22.	Does she have confidence in your abilities?	_____	_____	_____
23.	Are your parents sarcastic toward you?	_____	_____	_____
24.	Do you feel that your mother trusts you?	_____	_____	_____
25.	Does your father have confidence in your abilities?	_____	_____	_____
26.	Do you hesitate to disagree with either of your parents?	_____	_____	_____
27.	Do you fail to ask your parents for things because you believe they will deny your requests?	_____	_____	_____
28.	Does your mother criticize you too much?	_____	_____	_____
29.	Does your father really try to see your side of things?	_____	_____	_____
30.	Do either of your parents allow you to get angry and blow off steam?	_____	_____	_____
31.	Do either of your parents consider your opinion in making decisions which concern you?	_____	_____	_____
32.	Does your father criticize you too much?	_____	_____	_____
33.	Do you find your mother's tone of voice irritating?	_____	_____	_____
34.	Do your parents try to make you feel better when you are "down in the dumps?"	_____	_____	_____

	YES Usually	Some-Times	NO Seldom
35. Does your mother really try to see your side of things?	_____	_____	_____
36. Do you feel that your mother lectures and preaches to you too much?	_____	_____	_____
37. Do either of your parents explain their reason for not letting you do something?	_____	_____	_____
38. Do you feel that your mother lectures and preaches to you too much?	_____	_____	_____
39. Do you ask your parents about their reasons for decisions they make concerning you?	_____	_____	_____
40. Do you find it hard to say what you feel at home?	_____	_____	_____

APPENDIX D

Personal Data Form

Personal Data Form

NAME: _____ AGE: _____ SEX: _____

LOCAL ADDRESS: _____ PHONE: _____

CLASS (Freshman, Sophomore, etc.): _____

1. When you lived at home, did you live with

   _____ Real Mother _____ Real Father

   _____ Step-Mother _____ Step-Father

   Other _____

2. How many children were in your home (not counting yourself)? _____

3. Where do you fit in the family (circle one)?

   Oldest Child In the Middle Youngest Only Child

4. Do you have any brothers? _____ Yes _____ No

   If yes,

   How many? _____

   How many are older than you are? _____

   How many are younger than you are? _____

5. Draw a circle around the number of years of schooling your father has completed.

Grade School	High School	College	Grad. School
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	9 10 11 12	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4

6. Draw a circle around the number of years of schooling your mother has completed.

Grade School	High School	College	Grad. School
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	9 10 11 12	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4

7. Your father's work is _____

8. Your mother's work is _____

9. How many times did your family move while you were living at home? _____

10. How many people live in your home town or city?

_____

11. Approximately what is the distance from campus to your home? _____

APPENDIX E

Cover Letter

Cover Letter

March 15, 1984

Dear Student,

I am an Appalachian State University graduate student working on my Master of Arts Thesis. Your name has been randomly drawn from the Student Directory as a potential subject for my study. As a part of this endeavor, I need you to complete the enclosed questionnaires and return them as soon as possible; this should take approximately 15-20 minutes of your time. Additionally, all information will be treated confidentially. In appreciation for your assistance, your name will be placed in a drawing in which the winner will receive $40.00. A self-addressed envelope is included for your convenience. Moreover, if I do not hear from you within one week, a postcard will be sent as a reminder.

Your cooperation and promptness will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

Patricia Buckner

APPENDIX F

Intercorrelations Among Subjects' Perceptions of Interactions with Their Parents for the Total Group

Intercorrelations Among Subjects' Perceptions of Interactions with Their Parents for the Total Group

Variable with Corresponding Number	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
1 Assertiveness	-																			
2 Parent-subject communication	.190**	-																		
3 Mother's aggression toward subject	.143*	.554	-																	
4 Father's aggression toward subject	.179**	.532	.365	-																
5 Subject's aggression toward mother	.011	.313	.585	.165*	-															
6 Subject's aggression toward father	.066	.292	.245	.598	.444	-														
7 Mother's aggression toward father	.136*	.467	.657	.305	.500	.393	-													
8 Father's aggression toward mother	.099	.401	.308	.601	.269	.499	.502	-												
9 Mother's competence	.082	.415	.416	.299	.227***	.178**	.393**	.282	-											
10 Father's competence	.088	.262	.239	.319	.125*	.331	.407	.448	.379	-										
11 Mother's affection toward subject	.085	.156*	.077	.031	.080	.007	.043	.191**	.150*	.072	-									
12 Father's affection toward subject	.074	.389	.067	.496	.029	.346	.119*	.419	.229***	.322	.193**	-								
13 Mother's strictness toward subject	.053	.332	.471	.118*	.249	.052	.234	.060	.106	.171**	.129*	.031	-							
14 Father's strictness toward subject	.081	.382	.176**	.425	.054	.260	.123*	.208**	.143*	.122*	.051	.289	.361	-						
15 Subject's identification with mother	.050	.486	.510	.193**	.354	.105	.447	.231***	.612	.228***	.241	.136*	.263	.201**	-					
16 Subject's identification with father	.131*	.350	.170**	.447	.115	.390	.257	.454	.204**	.441	.003	.515	.057	.146*	[illegible]	-				
17 Mother's indulgence of subject	.079	.060	.110	.043	.003	.116	.144*	.171**	.035	.096	.253	.055	.175**	.010	.101	.155*	-			
18 Father's indulgence of subject	.101	.063	.071	.241	.086	.216***	.125*	.053	.024	.002	.010	.282	.046	.196**	.086	.144*	.214	-		
19 Subject's denial of mother's faults	.102	.410	.507	.294	.441	.371	.561	.402	.595	.412	.113	.214***	.208**	.160*	.520	.198**	.004	.022	-	
20 Subject's denial of father's faults	.115	.345	.329	.577	.223***	[illegible]	.383	.744	.373	.534	.105	.408	.106	.265	.291	.451	.115	.185**	.532	-

Note. Decimals have been omitted from all the correlation coefficients.

*Significant at the .05 level.

**Significant at the .01 level.

***Significant at the .001 level.

APPENDIX G

Intercorrelations Among Subjects' Perceptions of Interactions with Their Parents for Males and Females Separately

Intercorrelations Among Subjects' Perceptions of Interactions with Their Parents for Males and Females Separately

Variable with Corresponding Number	Variable Number 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
1 Assertiveness	-	.165	.272**	.302**	.048	.032	.010	.108	.059	.061	.053	.104	.062	.173*	.118	.187*	.069	.143	.029	.190*
2 Parent-subject communication	.205*	-	.492	.494	.301***	.313***	.307***	.376	.320***	.287**	.112	.348	.199*	.244**	.310***	.224*	.171*	.130	.241**	.322**
3 Mother's aggression toward subject	.053	.593	-	.445	.403	.240**	.524	.377	.347	.351	.068	.194*	.381	.106	.333	.189*	.233*	.041	.347	.398
4 Father's aggression toward subject	.104	.559	.322***	-	.210*	.521	.230*	.607	.222*	.294**	.044	.463	.136	.196	.097	.353	.176*	.264**	.237**	.550
5 Subject's aggression toward mother	.058	.315***	.693	.154	-	.469	.473	.329	.210*	.297***	.091	.248**	.200*	.083	.213*	.141	.031	.023	.351	.753
6 Subject's aggression toward father	.017	.277**	.246**	.657	.425	-	.413	.498	.194*	.411	.099	.438	.179*	.136	.106	.348	.085	.201*	.291***	.427
7 Mother's aggression toward father	.150	.556	.734	.365	.526	.379	-	.493	.414	.596	.062	.156	.152	.054	.478	.294**	.051	.081	.392	.347
8 Father's aggression toward mother	.088	.417	.258**	.607	.254*	.498	.509	-	.224*	.502	.208*	.407	.091	.064	.241**	.466	.053	.091	.400	.703
9 Mother's competence	.103	.487	.473	.351	.254**	.172*	.406	.332	-	.404	.113	.291**	.096	.042	.549	.191*	.023	.042	.458	.355
10 Father's competence	.138	.250**	.150	.349	.003	.269**	.342	.411	.356	-	.031	.391	.156	.078	.440	.514	.103	.001	.564	.669
11 Mother's affection toward subject	.114	.191*	.085	.021	.072	.079	.119	.179*	.184*	.116	-	.314***	.057	.184*	.046	.070	.266**	.145	.065	.105
12 Father's affection toward subject	.059	.425	.015	.517	.097	.288**	.122	.444	.174*	.254**	.090	-	.071	.216*	.125	.446	.221*	.247**	.406	.479
13 Mother's strictness toward subject	.062	.454	.421	.090	.347	.032	.353	.054	.112	.196*	.206*	.076	-	.407	.241**	.053	.144	.120	.190*	.216*
14 Father's strictness toward subject	.077	.527	.266**	.609	.093	.408	.322***	.371	.223*	.160*	.077	.334	.261**	-	.096	.022	.082	.177*	.091	.177*
15 Subject's identification with mother	.002	.591	.616	.255**	.430	.100	.429	.221*	.665	.061	.392	.153	.306***	.320***	-	.397	.016	.090	.421	.369
16 Subject's identification with father	.084	.443	.155	.524	.092	.405	.235**	.443	.219*	.373	.369	.083	.076	.290**	.319***	-	.017	.166	.293**	.550
17 Mother's indulgence of subject	.168*	.002	.042	.170*	.013	.234**	.234*	.309***	.078	.265**	.250**	.239**	.192*	.061	.151	.273**	-	.346	.125	.106
18 Father's indulgence of subject	.295***	.021	.147	.215*	.098	.255**	.116	.041	.007	.021	.062	.298***	.088	.142	.060	.141	.222*	-	.085	.186*
19 Subject's denial of mother's faults	.153	.535	.611	.344	[illegible]	.331	.450	.398	.713	.293**	.151	.091	.267**	.272**	.580	.121	.075	.042	-	[illegible]
20 Subject's denial of father's faults	.051	.372	.277**	.412	[illegible]	.566	.435	.141	.341	.377	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	.129*	.157	.241**	.185*	.457	-

Note 1. Female intercorrelations are below the diagonal, Male intercorrelations are above the diagonal.

Note 2. Decimals have been omitted from all the correlation coefficients.

*Significant at the .05 level

**Significant at the .01 level

***Significant at the .001 level

VITA

Patricia Buckner Neilson was born in Asheville, North Carolina, on January 29, 1960. She attended elementary school in Mars Hill, North Carolina, and graduated from Madison High School, Marshall, North Carolina, in June 1978. The following September she entered Mars Hill College, and in May 1982, she received a Bachelor of Arts degree in Psychology.

In the fall of 1982, she entered Appalachian State University and began work towards a Master of Arts degree. This degree was awarded in 1985 in the field of Clinical Psychology. Ms. Neilson will be employed with the Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services of Florida after graduation.

The author is a member of the National Honor Society in Psychology, Psi Chi.

Ms. Neilson's address is 1720 Bottlebrush Drive, Palm Bay, Florida.

Her parents are Mr. and Mrs. Harold Buckner of Mars Hill, North Carolina. She is married to Tom Neilson, a native of Fulton, New York.