

FAMILY ROLE TRANSFORMATION ONTO OCCUPATIONAL ROLES

by

HELEN ANNE MACGREGOR

B.A. Honours, Carleton University, 1977

M.S., George Peabody College, 1979

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

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
(Department of Counselling Psychology)

We accept this thesis as conforming
to the required standard.

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA



March 1984

Helen Anne MacGregor, 1984

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the head of my department or by his or her representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of Counselling Psychology

The University of British Columbia
1956 Main Mall
Vancouver, Canada
V6T 1Y3

Date April 13 1984

Abstract

In a series of ten case studies, this study examined the theoretical proposition that family experience serves as a metaphor for the world. Through a metaphoric transformation, family roles were expected to be displaced onto work roles, where they serve as types for understanding and relating within a work setting.

Ten individuals, five men and five women, ranging in age from 23 to 62 were recruited through contacts, for participation in the study. All had a minimum of at least one year's experience in their present jobs. Participants were selected to represent a diverse range of occupations ranging from parking checker and hairdresser to lawyer and artist.

Using 46 traits selected from Holland's (1978) theory of career development, each participant Q-sorted roles from the domains of self, family of origin, and work. For each participant separately, role inter-correlations were subjected to factor analysis. A principal components solution was first obtained and then submitted to a varimax rotation (Boldt, 1980). A visual display of role organization was presented to each participant for subjective validation and to stimulate a discussion of correspondences between family and work.

The results indicated substantial interrelationships among roles. In addition, participants strongly confirmed the findings both by direct affirmation, indirect emotional responses, and their ability to elaborate and give meaning to the role relationships. Work roles appeared as variants of roles from one's family of origin.

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER ONE	
Introduction	1
CHAPTER TWO	
Literature Review	7
The Influence of Family on Occupational Choice	10
(a) Effects of Interpersonal Relationships With Parents Upon Occupational Selection	10
(b) The Extent to Which Children Follow the Same Occupations as Their Parents	14
(c) Identification With Parents	15
Role Theory: The Revelation of Self Through Occupational Choice	16
(a) Self-concept	16
(b) Stability of Self-concept	18
Role Transformation and Displacement	19
(a) Single Case Studies	20
(b) Q-Technique	25
CHAPTER THREE	
Methodology	28
Description of Subjects	28
Q-Sorts	28
Q-Sort Items	30
Procedure	33

Method of Analysis	34
Validation Interview	35
CHAPTER FOUR	
Results	37
Correlations Among Roles	37
Principal Components	39
CHAPTER FIVE	
Results: Case Studies	42
Iris	44
Carly	50
Blake	56
Irma	61
Dave	66
Lou	71
Elizabeth	77
Kate	82
Carl	87
Frank	92
Conclusion	96
CHAPTER SIX	
Discussion	97
Delimitations and Limitations of the Study	98
Theoretical Implications	99
Practical Implications	102
Implications for Future Research	104

Conclusion	106
References	108
Reference Note	116
APPENDIX A: A Qualitative Description of Role	
Correspondences for Each Participant	117
APPENDIX B: Significant Correlations Between	
Roles for Each Participant	121
APPENDIX C: Distinguishing Attributes and Significant	
Z Scores for Each Participant	160

List of Tables

	<u>Page</u>
Table 1 Traits Used in the Q-sort of the Study	32
Table 2 Does Each Work Role Relate to Selves/Family?	117
Table 3 Does Self as Job Correlate With Selves/Family? . . .	120
Table 4 The Extent to Which Role Types are Mixed with Self Roles, Family Roles, and Work Roles After Varimax Rotation	121
Table 5 Iris Significant Roles and Factor Loadings for each Factor or Type	44
Table 6 Carly Significant Roles and Factor Loadings for each Factor or Type	50
Table 7 Blake Significant Roles and Factor Loadings for each Factor or Type	56
Table 8 Irma Significant Roles and Factor Loadings for each Factor or Type	61
Table 9 Dave Significant Roles and Factor Loadings for each Factor or Type	66
Table 10 Lou Significant Roles and Factor Loadings for each Factor or Type	71
Table 11 Elizabeth Significant Roles and Factor Loadings for each Factor or Type	77
Table 12 Kate Significant Roles and Factor Loadings for each Factor or Type	83

Table 13	Carl Significant Roles and Factor Loadings for each Factor or Type	87
Table 14	Frank Significant Roles and Factor Loadings for each Factor or Type	92

Acknowledgements

To the significant people in my life. To my parents, Sylvia and Alistair MacGregor for their love and belief in me, also my sister Alison and my grandparents Elsa and Len Hutchinson. To Larry Cochran for his unflagging interest in the research and help and encouragement. Thanks also to the members of my research committee, Norm Amundson, Walter Boldt, Bill Borgen and Marv Westwood. And finally to my friends: Dale, Rick, Barb, Colleen, Susan, Emily, Chuck, Chris, Linda and Dennis --a big hug for hanging in there and being so supportive.

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

The aim of this study is to explore a theoretical proposition that in enacting an occupational role, one is re-enacting a drama from one's family of origin. The drama that one re-enacts need not be restricted to an actual family pattern, but may include dramas of fulfillment which were only experienced as potentials previously. For example, a person with a 'bad' father might seek a 'good' father in an occupation.

It is difficult to test a proposition such as this directly. However, it is possible to explore the question and seek support for it in a more indirect manner by focusing upon roles. If one re-enacts a drama from one's family of origin in working, then there should be some degree of correspondence between people in one's family and people in one's work setting, and between self as a family member and self as a worker. To be in the same kind of drama requires that people be cast in similar roles and be seen in similar ways. Or in the case of a drama that is a direct opposition (e.g., bad to good father figure), people are cast in opposing roles and seen in opposing ways. This study is concerned with exploring the theoretical proposition in two complementary ways. First, the proposition is explored through examining the correspondences between roles in one's family of origin and work setting. Second, through interviews, the role structure is used to elaborate a drama arising in one's family of origin and applied to one's work setting.

According to Cochran (reference note 1) family experience is used as a metaphor for the world. As children engage in recurrent interactions within the family which define rules of conduct for varying reciprocal roles, these roles and their relationships are explicitly or implicitly incorporated as abstract schema or constructions that serve to orient them to the world. For example, if a child enacts the role of "helpless waif" in relation to mother's role of "loving caretaker." the child learns not only the role enacted, but also roles that are related to it. When enacting "helpless waif," the child would anticipate another to play "loving caretaker" and vice versa. The child learns a pattern of dramatic enaction, composed of role figures that perform like parts in a play. It is this composition of role positions that can be metaphorically extended to the world as when, for instance, a child acts toward teacher as a "helpless waif," anticipating teacher to become a "loving caretaker."

Within a family, some roles are more esteemed than others. Children not only form a conception of which roles are more ideal, but of which roles are possible or compatible with self-conception. Role-strivings, or attempts to enact a role (McCall and Simmons, 1966), can be seen as a compromise or dialectic between what is conceived to be ideal and what is conceived to be realistic and comfortable for oneself. Life situations offer various possibilities for dramatic composition and for different role enactments within a composition. That is, a person might vary in the dramatic compositions applied metaphorically to make sense of situations, and also vary in the roles he or she enacts. What does not vary is the enactment of dramatic compositions, or the attempt to enact them.

With regard to occupations, a person might strive for an occupational role that allows one to enact a more ideal family role or to seek to restructure the occupational role one obtains. Either way, it is expected that in assuming an occupational role within an occupational role structure, one re-enacts a dramatic composition of roles from one's family of origin. A role structure consists of roles and reciprocal roles. In the case of work, the role structure would include boss, worker, colleagues and customers.

This theoretical rationale has two immediate implications for research. First, a person's occupational role is expected to relate strongly to at least one role within one's family of origin, since it is viewed as a displaced re-enactment of a family role. It is not assumed that a person will necessarily enact father's role, mother's role, or any one specific role. Rather, a person is expected to enact a role from the role repertoire learned in the family. Second, occupational roles within the occupational role structure of a job are expected to relate to family roles, since occupational roles are viewed as a displacement of and a re-enactment of a dramatic composition of family roles. A person's boss might be viewed as similar to father, to father at his best, to father at his worst, to mother, and so on. What specifically a boss represents might vary, but it is expected that a relationship between boss and at least one family role would be obtained.

This latter hypothesis is supported indirectly by research. Previous research has been more or less successful in showing that an occupational role is construed as similar to self, or to self-ideal, or

to father. However, a role has no meaning in isolation. A role is a role by virtue of its place within a context of related roles. For example, McCall and Simmons (1966) define altercasting as the tendency to project an image of others that complements an expression of self. When acting like Romeo, a male requires a Juliet to complete his role identity. When enacting the role of a leader, one requires followers to complete the role. Thus it is expected that when one defines an occupational role as similar to father (or mother or whatever), there are also projected role definitions within an occupational role structure that will complement and complete one's self-defined role.

This point of view is compatible with a wide variety of current approaches in psychology. It is most indebted to the Freudian notion that the child is the father to the man and Adler's hypothesis that family atmosphere significantly influences its members.

Freud (1966) suggested that the child becomes attached to its mother as its first caretaker and love object. Once the child passes through the oedipal phase, there is a strong intensification of the identification with the parents. Identification is a form of attachment to someone else (Freud, 1966). That is, if a boy identifies with his father, he wants to be like his father.

Others have an impact on the child's ego but only the earliest parental images determine the superego (Freud, 1966). The superego is also a vehicle of the ego ideal by which the ego measures itself, which it emulates and whose demand for even greater perfection, it strives to fulfill (Freud, 1966). "There is no doubt that this ego

ideal is the precipitate of the old picture of the parents, the expression of admiration for the perfection which the child then attributed to them" (Freud, 1966, p. 529).

Adler viewed the individual as a unitary, goal directed self which in the healthy state is in a constructive, ethical relationship to his fellow man (Ansbacher and Ansbacher, 1979). He believed that the child is not only a product of environment and heredity but also is able to creatively make decisions about how to behave. "It is neither heredity nor environment which determines his relationship to the outside world. Heredity only endows him with certain abilities. Environment only gives him certain impressions. These abilities and impressions, and the manner in which he 'experiences' them--that is to say, the interpretation of the experiences--are the bricks which he uses in his own 'creative' way in building up his attitude toward life...it is his attitude toward life--which determines his relationship to the outside world" (Ansbacher and Ansbacher, 1979, p. 67).

The dramaturgical approaches such as that of McCall and Simmons (1976) are a further influence. However, the most immediate precursor for this research is a study by Baas and Brown (1973) which will be described more fully in the final section of the next chapter. They used a Q-sort (Stephenson, 1953) to examine the proposition that a person displaced private motives onto the political domain, where they are objectified. In the present study, a Q-sort was developed from Holland's (1973) typology of people and work settings, and applied in the same fashion.

Q-methodology or Q-technique was devised by Stephenson (1953) and was shown to be dissimilar to the method often used to sample large populations. This method was called R-methodology (Stephenson, 1953). The Q-sort and principal components analysis are methods included under the umbrella of Q-methodology.

A Q-sort is a sophisticated form of rating and rank ordering stimuli and is an ipsative measurement (Brown and Brenner, 1972). It is an excellent exploratory technique with a heuristic quality (Kerlinger, 1972). It may also point toward alternative theoretical views and possibilities for future research (Kerlinger, 1972).

Participants in this study were asked to sort 46 adjectives selected from Holland's (1973) typology using the dimensions of most characteristic and least characteristic. The distribution of the sort was a forced quasi-normal distribution. Participants were then presented with the results of the Q-sort and were interviewed to provide further subjective validation and elaboration of the results.

The Q-sort is used when the emphasis is on the measurement of the characteristics of single individuals, and it allows one to make complex comparisons of sets of measures within the data of one individual (Brown and Brenner, 1972). Thus, the Q-sort has unique value in allowing a researcher to investigate the subjective viewpoint of people.

CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review

The aim of this chapter is to review literature which is related to this position. First, the general way family is viewed by vocational theorists will be described. Second, there are three general types of studies that have attempted to show how family influences occupational choice. This section will review empirical evidence for these three types of influences. Third, role theory has been very influential in career development theories, particularly for Super's (1963) approach. This section will review evidence that people choose occupational roles that are compatible with self-definition, either actual or idealized. Fourthly, a single study concerned with role displacement will be discussed in detail since it provides direct support for the position above, and offers a paradigm for research. Finally, the single case study will be described followed by a description of the Q-technique.

Family has been defined by Goldenberg and Goldenberg (1980) as a: "Natural social system with properties all its own, one that has evolved a set of rules, roles, a power structure, forms of communication, and ways of negotiation and problem solving that allows various tasks to be performed effectively" (p. 3).

Osipow (1973) criticizes vocational theorists for failing to account for the explicit role of family in career development. Trait factor, needs, values and behavioral personality approaches rarely investigate the role of family influences. Values and needs are, how-

ever, seen as being shaped in some fashion by the family context (Osipow, 1973). Super (1963) stated that the family is critical in helping the formation of a person's self-concept and in providing a place where new roles can be tried out. Psychoanalytical thinkers believe that family structure and member interaction are great influences on an individual's psychosexual development (Maddi, 1976). Roe (1957) stated that the family is crucial in determining the kinds of interactions with people that a child will learn to develop. Social systems theorists such as Ginzberg also agree that the family plays a major role in determining the specifics of the career decisions an individual will make. The family determines our social class, financial resources and attitudes towards work (Osipow, 1973).

Osipow (1973) stated that the family influences our educational, economic, hygienic and medical resources, social support and reinforcement as well as providing a context for work. In addition, familial factors are important in intra-individual variables that have a genetic component such as physical and psychological characteristics.

Psychological theorists are seen as ignoring social-system factors such as the environment, cultural expectations, social class, family background, race and sex (Osipow, 1973). A psychological theory which does account for social-system factors is the family systems perspective.

In a recent article, Bratcher (1982) noted that although the systems model has usually been used with dysfunctional families, it could be used in examining career choice. Basic assumptions are that:

(1) the family is the primary and the most powerful emotional system that people ever belong to; (2) the family shapes and continues to determine the course and outcome of its members lives; (3) relationships within the family tend to be reciprocal, patterned and repetitive; and (4) each member of the family affects and is effected by the other family members.

Families are seen as developing operating principles or rules that make constancy and predictability possible (Bratcher, 1982). These rules tend to have been passed down from the spouses' original families and while they can be altered by family members, usually are not in conscious awareness (Bratcher, 1982). Family myths also affect the behavior of family members and like rules prescribe behavior. However, unlike rules, myths also predict outcome. Rules and myths help a family gain somewhat predictable relationships and environments.

The establishment and maintenance of roles is affected by the family's rules and myths. Roles, in turn, provide the basis for the development and maintenance of family traditions. Traditions help a family develop a "character" as well as providing a link to past and future generations (Bratcher, 1982).

"The importance placed on money, religion, prestige, status or service to others reflects the way the family rules and myths have operated to define and sustain family values and traditions. This will be perhaps the most important variable to be considered when children begin to think in terms of a career choice" (Bratcher, 1982, p. 88).

The more a family system encourages independent thinking, the less difficulty and more flexibility a member will presumably experience in selecting a career. An individual in a more rigid family may have fewer options (Bratcher, 1982).

This section has put family roles and occupational roles generally into a common context. The next section examines more specific research concerning family influences on occupational choice.

The Influence of Family on Occupational Choice

This section will be divided into three parts: (a) effects of interpersonal relationships with parents upon occupational selection; (b) the extent to which children follow the same occupations as their parents; and (c) identification with parents.

(a) Effects of Interpersonal Relationships With Parents Upon Occupational Selection

Ann Roe (1956) was one of the first theorists to discuss the early determinants of occupational choice. She suggested that the directions we take in life are determined by a developing pattern of need primaries and that this pattern of psychic energies helps determine the fields we will apply ourselves to. Roe (1957) described three dominant patterns in the home:

1. Emotional concentration on the child ranging from overprotection to overdemanding.
2. Avoidance of the child with the continuum ranging from emotional rejection to neglect of the child. The latter is seen

as less psychologically damaging to the child.

3. Acceptance of the child ranging from casual acceptance to loving acceptance.

As a result of the dominant family atmosphere, it was hypothesized (Roe, 1957) that the child becomes oriented either towards persons or towards non-persons. Roe (1957) also claimed that the child's development of basic interests, aptitudes and values within the family, will be manifest in all areas of his life, including vocational choice.

Roe (1956) categorized occupations as service, business contract, general cultural organizations, arts and entertainment, technological, outdoor and science. Many people who choose service, business contract, general cultural organizations, arts and entertainment will tend to be oriented towards persons. Those choosing technological, outdoor and science occupations are seen as being oriented towards non-persons.

Research supporting Roe's hypothesis has been equivocal. Grigg (1959) and Utton (1962) investigated whether women in people oriented occupations and non-people oriented occupations differed on childhood experience rating scales. No significant differences in perceptions of family atmosphere were found.

Roe (1962) responded to the apparent lack of support for her theory by noting that Grigg (1959) had erred in considering nursing as a service rather than as a scientific occupation. She questioned the reliability and validity of the scales both studies had used and reiterated that the most important factor in vocational development is the interaction between a child and its parents. Roe concluded that

her theory may apply only to men since vocational development was more complex and less understood for women.

Other studies testing Roe's theory were done with male college students, but again the results generally did not support the theory. Hagen (1960), Switzer, Grigg, Miller and Young (1962) and Byers, Forrest and Jaccasia (1969) found no differences in the proportion of towards-people or towards-non-people occupations in any category of family atmosphere. The researchers noted that careers may have been misclassified and family atmosphere may have been inaccurately gauged. It was noted (Switzer et al., 1962) that the scales they used correlated .63 and that general factors such as overall attitudes towards parents or towards testing were being measured. Hagen (1960) suggested that within occupational classifications, there are a wide variety of interests and orientations. This range would serve to mask the influences of family atmosphere.

Studies using a younger population of junior high and senior high school students (Kinnane and Pable, 1962; Green and Parker, 1969) hypothesized that the family influences its members by providing role models for work and play, and values around status-striving. Results yielded low correlations and did not substantiate Roe's theory. These researchers also suggested that the questionnaires were not sufficiently reliable or valid. They also stated, following Hagen (1960) that it might be how a job is seen, rather than the job itself which is important, since the range of interpersonal contact in a job is too large to be dichotomized into towards person/towards non-person.

Roe's theory has tended to be supported by psychoanalytic retrospective interview data. Even then, only weak support for Roe's theory has been found (Nachmann, 1960). This latter study had severe methodological problems. The subjects were not chosen randomly and the interviewers were familiar with the hypotheses. It is plausible that Nachmann uncovered class differences rather than differences in family atmosphere.

In summary then, Roe's predictions have not been substantiated. Many of the basic assumptions of Roe's theory seem weak. Family atmosphere has proven difficult to define and measure. It also seems unlikely that there is just one family atmosphere or that it is the same over time. Person and non-person jobs seems overly simplistic since people can structure many if not most jobs to increase or decrease contact with other people. Of particular relevance to this study, the assumption that a family variable such as emotional concentration (even if it were stable or singular or dominant) leads to one effect, appears now to be an over-simplification. If a person is viewed as an active synthesizer of family processes and an active striver within a family composition of roles, rather than a passive recipient, then it is more likely that a family pattern would involve many possible directions of influence. For example, a neglected child might later enact neglecting others or being neglected. He or she might strive to overcome early patterns of neglect by taking an opposing role position of one who nurtures or is nurtured. Or neglect might be disregarded as one enacts other family dramas. According to the present thesis there is no simple cause-effect relationship between a family pattern and an

outcome. Rather, a person acquires a repertoire of roles and dramatic compositions to be enacted, and a person will strive to enact those that are perhaps more esteemed and more realistic and compatible with self-definition.

(b) The Extent to Which Children Follow the
Same Occupations as Their Parents

Jensen and Kirchener (1955) and Werts (1968) found that college males tend to follow their fathers' general type of occupation especially in the medical, social science and physical science fields. Jensen and Kirchener (1955) suggested that when this did not happen, sons tended to move up the occupational ladder. This finding was supported by Hanson (1965), and Mowesian, Heath and Rothney (1966) who found that high school students who had made an occupational choice, had occupational preferences which were significantly higher than either their mothers' or their fathers' occupational levels.

These data provide evidence that children tend to aspire towards occupations that are similar to a parent's occupation in field and level. However, since the participants were students and thus reported probable occupation, we do not know if the parents' influence is as great when compared to the child's actual occupation. In addition, the data shed no light on how or why this transfer occurs.

From the present thesis, these hypotheses are too strongly framed. A child might be attracted to occupations that offer scope for a meaningful dramatic enactment learned in the family, but this does not preclude occupations that diverge from a parent's occupation. The esteem

placed on family roles is apt to influence level of occupational aspiration, but not to the exclusion of other possibilities. There are many roles within a family repertoire of roles which a child, for various reasons, might strive to adopt.

(c) Identification With Parents

Brunkan (1965) and Hollander (1972) examined whether occupational interests were influenced by parents. Brunkan (1965) stated that it appeared that males identify more with their fathers than with their mothers. Hollander (1972) elaborated on this finding and suggested that the maternal influence may be more significant for high school students while the paternal influence may be more significant in college. Brunkan (1965) concluded by hypothesizing that parental attitudes may influence an individual's choice of occupational function more than choice of field. This might explain the more subtle influence a family has on occupational choice. This relationship may be obscured if we search for an exact matching of parents' with childrens' occupations.

In three separate studies undertaken to investigate the modeling effect, Jackson (1974), Grandy and Stahmann (1974) and Basow and Howe (1979) hypothesized that: (1) psychological identification helps children learn appropriate social roles through modeling the behavior of significant adults; and (2) identification plays an important role in the occupational aspirations and decisions of adolescents. It was found (Jackson, 1974) that high identification adolescent males had higher levels of aspiration, more self-confidence and greater satisfaction with their high school experiences than did low identification

males. Grandy and Stahmann (1974) reported that sons' personality types resembled those of their fathers but not their mothers. For daughters, relationships existed both between mother-daughter and father-daughter.

Basow and Howe (1979) agreed that parents were the most influential model on both sexes but stated that females were significantly more affected by female models than were males.

Since a parent's role is apt to be high in the family esteem system, and more likely perhaps to be encouraged, it seems plausible that children might often be influenced to strive for an occupational role similar to a parent's. However, this is merely a normative expectation rather than a serious account of how family influences occupational role enactment of children.

Role Theory: The Revelation of Self

Through Occupational Choice

This section will be divided into two parts: (a) self-concept; and (b) stability of self-concept.

(a) Self-concept

Vocational development and choice have also been explained with the use of self-concept theory. Super (1963) stated that an individual puts into occupational terminology his idea of the kind of person he is and in entering an occupation seeks to implement a concept of himself. Once a person is established in an occupation, self-actualization is achieved.

Support for Super's personality theory came from studies of men already working in the field. Schutz and Blocher (1961) found that a male's level of occupational choice and aspiration reflects his evaluation of himself, his feelings about his personal worth and his satisfaction with himself. This finding was supported by Oppenheimer (1966) and Hunt (1967) who found that men prefer occupations that are congruent with their self-concepts. Oppenheimer (1966) also found that self-esteem was positively related to the degree of similarity between self-concepts and occupational preferences. This relationship was not linear.

Super's postulates were also supported by Morrison (1962), Healy (1968) and Ziegler (1970) who studied students' incorporation scores (the degree of similarity between self-rating and occupational rating). The studies demonstrated that students identified more with their chosen occupation than with other occupations.

Wheeler and Carnes (1968) extended these studies and reported that the congruency between an individual's self-concept and his occupational stereotype of his probable occupation was significantly greater than the congruency between the individual's self-concept and his occupational stereotype of his ideal occupation. Furthermore, the ideal self-concept was significantly more congruent with the stereotype probable occupation than with the stereotype ideal occupation. This may be because the person sees the probable occupation as a more viable means of achieving self-actualization.

This finding was elaborated by Burgoyne (1979) who suggested that adolescents use the ideal self as a criterion when deciding upon an

ideally preferred occupation. If a person realizes that she/he will not be able to attain the ideal job, she/he may search for a job which will fit what she/he expects to be like. The expected self then serves as a criterion. Burgoyne (1979) noted that Holland and Super need to account for the fact that in making career choices, people have several self-concepts available to them.

In conclusion, it can be seen that Super's theory has received empirical support. Career choice appears to be seen by the chooser as a way to implement his/her self-concept (Osipow, 1973).

Self-conception, whether actual or ideal, is a general form of role conception, and can be treated in the same manner. What is lacking in this type of research is the family context of roles that would enable one to place self-conception within a meaningful context of role enactment.

(b) Stability of Self-concept

O'Hara and Tiedeman (1959) and Isabelle and Dick (1969) found that self-concepts in the areas of interests, aptitudes and general values are clarified as a male matures.

Stephenson (1961), Schuh (1966) and Lee and Doran (1973) extended this finding and found support for the notion of a crystallized self-concept once a person had graduated from college or was ensconced in an occupation.

Fretz (1962) also supported Super's notion of a stable self-concept and argued that since school history and adjustment were the most efficient predictors of career preferences, human characteristics

show remarkable stability.

Again, evidence for the stability of self-conception is valuable but limited. From the present thesis, self-conception is stripped of the context which makes it meaningful. Indirectly, it might be argued that since self-conception is reasonably stable, people rather successfully structure or define life situations (others' roles for instance) in ways that support a particular role enactment. If so, the basis for stability is a successful metaphoric transformation of family patterns to the world.

Role Transformation and Displacement

In an intensive case study of a single woman, Mrs. A., Baas and Brown (1973) showed that political figures were a displacement of family and self roles. Using a 40 item Q-sort, Mrs. A. described self roles (e.g., the kind of person I would like to be, the kind of person my father would like me to be, etc.), family roles or members (mother, father, etc.) and political figures (Governor Wallace, President Nixon, etc.). A principal components analysis with varimax rotation showed that the 30 objects described through Q-sorting could be reduced to just four components or basic patterns of description, each of which contained members from the three domains of self, family and political figures. They concluded that the strong relationships among members of the three domains were consistent with the hypothesis that experiences in the family enable one to relate to the external world. That is, the repertoire of family roles appear to be displaced or transformed to the political domain, and serve as containers or categories for an

understanding of and relating to that domain.

This study is important for the present investigation in two ways. First, it provides direct empirical support for the displacement of family roles onto an external domain. However, it differs in one minor and one major way. Of less importance, Baas and Brown study political figures rather than occupational roles. Of more importance, the political domain in their study involved Mrs. A. like a spectator rather than a participant. In an occupation, not only is one actively engaged with others in occupational roles, but one enacts a role oneself. Second, the intensive design which Baas and Brown employed serves as a paradigm for the present investigation (to be covered in detail later). This section will be divided into two parts: (a) single case studies; and (b) Q-technique.

(a) Single Case Studies

The single case study is an example of an observational standpoint that is intensive in nature (Baas and Brown, 1973). Lasswell (1938) distinguished between observational standpoints that are relatively intensive and those which are relatively extensive. An example of extensive research is the opinion poll where individuals are interviewed briefly and are asked a variety of questions for which simple responses are obtained. Contact between interviewer and respondent tends to be brief and cursory (Brown, 1974). The psychiatric interview where a single person (or a small number of cases) is interviewed in depth over the course of several sessions and where a large number of complex responses are elicited, is an example of the intensive approach (Baas

and Brown, 1973).

Chassan (1979) stated that extensive designs call for normative measurements in which statistical norms are obtained across groups of respondents. The intensive approach uses ipsative measurement that focuses on the within-individual pattern of scores (Chassan, 1979). Shapiro (1966) stated that since the site of the process of change is in an individual organism, observations based on group averages and variances might be misleading. It is suggested (Chassan, 1979) that it is often difficult to narrow down particular individual variables associated with a significant effect in an investigation based upon an extensive model. The significant effect obtained may be a reflection of a true effect in a very few or even in just a single patient (Chassan, 1979).

Brown (1974) stated that the difficulties associated with intensive analysis have centered around problems of prediction, reliability and generalizability. The individual person has become associated with the notion of "case." "The reconceptualization of 'case' to refer to 'the occurrence of a behavioral event' enables us to regard the individual person as a complex configuration of events, and, analogous to the laws of statistical inference across many (extensive), to inquire into the lawfulness of the manifold of events that is the individual (intensive)" (Brown, 1974, p. 5).

This study is interested in discovering the generating rules underlying the displacement of primary group roles onto the world of work. It is therefore a foundational study. These rules may be applied

idiosyncratically (Baas and Brown, 1973). In contrast, Roe (1957) was interested in normative information and prediction.

Some of the confusion concerning intensive designs may arise out of a misconception concerning the type of scientific law with which we are dealing. Herbst (1970) defined a scientific law as "a statement of a specific type of invariance in the conceptual representation of phenomena" (p. 3). He suggested the existence of three types of laws.

1. Type A is invariant in that functions and parameters are constants. It is possible to use sampling techniques and random samples may be taken. Following Herbst (1970), Baas and Brown (1973) cite Boyle's law as an instance ($PV \div T = R$). The parameter R remains constant because of the functional relationships between temperature, volume and pressure. Since gases act homeogeneously, one may use averaging techniques. These types of laws are found in the physical sciences, but only rarely.

2. Type B laws occur when the functional form of the relationship remains constant but the parameters are specific (Baas and Brown, 1973) " $Y = \lambda x$ " might be the relationship between heat (X) and length of Rod (Y) where (λ) is the heat salient characteristic specific to each metal. In order to correctly analyze the phenomena, one would have to use single case analysis since averaging all metals together would mask the existence of Type B laws. Only those metals with the same heat salient characteristic (λ) could be averaged together. Baas and Brown (1973) suggest that this type of law is found infrequently in the social sciences.

3. In Type C laws, Baas and Brown (1973) suggest that the functional relationships and parameters are both specific but the generating rules for demonstrating possible functional relationships are constant. Lasswell (1960) stated in his formula for political man that private motives (p) become displaced (d) onto the public arena, through a transformation process ($\{$) and are rationalized (r) in terms of the common good. In this case, averaging procedures should not be used since private motives vary, displacements are idiosyncratic and there may be many rationalizations, however $p\{d\}r$ may be universally applicable idiosyncratically: "...the only things which can be said to be invariant from case to case are the rules according to which the lawful behavior can be demonstrated" (Baas and Brown, 1973, p. 174). In the social sciences, laws tend to take the Type C form and as such, intensive analysis may be the preferred method.

Intensive analysis "...is best equipped to analyze intensively those single cases which present themselves--to begin determining the outer limits and internal workings of functional relationships, to find out the possible symbolic meanings of various objects, and the different ways in which objects can be used in relating to 'the world outside.' Tasks such as these do not require large numbers of respondents at the outset, but properly come prior to actuarial inquiries" (Baas and Brown, 1973, p. 183).

For example, one of Roe's (1957) theoretical hypotheses is that people who are reared in loving, protecting, and demanding homes will become person oriented rather than non-person oriented. This, if con-

firmed, would be a Type A law. That extremely loving, protecting, and demanding homes lead one defensively to become non-person oriented merely changes the form of the relationship from linear to non-linear. However, when she (Roe and Seigelman, 1964) suggests that abilities might determine orientation more than family climate and need fulfillment, then she is moving toward a Type B law. For instance, like different metals, people with different abilities might manifest different forms of the same curve. In this case, random sampling is no longer appropriate for it would camouflage the discovery of such a law.

By contrast, in this study, it is only assumed that a pattern of family roles and relationships will be displaced onto work roles and relationships. A dominating father might be displaced as a domineering or submissive work figure. In relation to this role, a person's role might be equally domineering or submissive. If people with a domineering father were averaged, as in a random sample, this Type C law would be missed. However, this study is more complicated than this as families offer ranges of roles and relationships. It is assumed that a person will displace some roles and relationships rather than others, perhaps due to projection, preference, or the nature of the work situation. But families offer a large number of possibilities and it is only assumed that work roles and relationships will be a re-enactment of a subset of family roles and relationships. As an exploratory inquiry, this study is intended not only to explore this hypothesis but to provide more specific formulations for future studies.

(b) Q-Technique

Stephenson (1953), who pioneered the use of the Q-methodology, or Q-technique, stated that the "Q-technique provides a systematic way to handle a person's retrospections, his reflections about himself and others, his introjections and projections, and much else of an apparent subjective nature" (p. 86).

The Q-technique is a sophisticated form of rating and rank ordering stimuli and is an ipsative measurement. Means and standard deviations are the same for all individuals (Brown and Brenner, 1972). It is used when the emphasis is on the measurement of the characteristics of single individuals. The Q-technique enables one to make complex comparisons of sets of measures within the data of one individual and helps point toward alternative theoretical views as well as possibilities for further research (Brown and Brenner, 1972). The Q-sort is one of a variety of methods included in Q-methodology.

In Q-sorting, a person, for example, Mr. Jones, can demonstrate his overall view of some object or person, say Miss Brown, by ranking a sample of adjectives or traits from "most like Miss Brown" to "most unlike Miss Brown." The ranking usually ranges from +5 (most like) to -5 (most unlike) (Baas and Brown, 1973). The traits that are to be sorted are operational expressions of the aspects of the theory in which the investigator is interested (Brown and Brenner, 1972). The traits are distributed in a quasi-normal distribution; those at the extremes of the distribution are most significant (positively and negatively) while those in the centre are less salient (Stephenson, 1953).

"Mr. Jones" can perform a Q-sort description of each of his primary-secondary objects, and the resulting Q-sorts, as cycle 1 transformations of Mr. Jones' thoughts and feelings can then be recycled (retransformed) in terms of the rules governing the statistical operations of correlation and inverted factor analysis" (Baas and Brown, 1973, p. 178).

Correlations provide a description of relations which reflect subjective meaning while factor analysis reduces the data gathered to one or more containers or types. Both these statistical operations are likely to be relatively stable (Hilden, 1958).

The Q-technique has commonly been assumed to be a reliable measure (Fairweather, 1981) and also has been found (Livson and Nichols, 1955; Frank, 1956; Hilden, 1958; and Fairweather, 1981) to be a reliable method. Reliability can be defined as whether a measuring instrument consistently measures whatever it is supposed to be measuring (Fairweather, 1981). Determining reliability using alternate forms, matched items or split halves is not possible when using the Q-technique since in the usual Q-sort experiment, a person indicates the degree to which each item of a group describes or corresponds to the object or value being examined (Hilden, 1958). "In its broadest sense, reliability is not to be conceived of simply as the correlation between two applications of the same instrument. The concept of reliability is embraced in a most fundamental sense when there is consistency between unbiased samples from a clearly defined universe and between these samples and the universe" (Hilden, 1958, p. 47).

In summary, a variety of studies provide indirect support for the hypothesis that a person's occupational role will be strongly related to family roles (which include oneself). However, there is presently no empirical support for the hypothesis that occupational roles within the context of a person's occupational role will be related to family roles. In general, the evidence suggests that family influences occupational role, but it is unclear how the influence takes place. Cochran's rationale provides one testable account of how it might be explained.

CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

Description of Subjects

In contrast to extensive designs where a sample of people with a given characteristic is required, the single case intensive design requires examples, that is, test cases, and thus diversity becomes an important criterion for selection (Brown, 1974). Through contacts, 10 adults, 5 men and 5 women, ranging in age from 23 to 62, were recruited for participation in this study. All had a minimum of at least one year's experience in their present job. Subjects were selected to represent a diverse range of occupations from parking checker and hairdresser to lawyer and artist. The experimenter is unaware of any possible factors that might suggest that the subjects were in any way unusual or different from the general population.

Q-Sorts

A study involving Q-sorts requires two types of sampling. First, what will be the subjects or objects of judgments, using Q-sort items? Second, what will constitute the Q-sort items that are used in judging subjects or objects?

Subjects for Q-sorts

Following Baas and Brown (1973), three domains were sampled: the self domain, the primary objects domain (family of origin), and the secondary objects domain (in this case, work). For the self domain,

three subjects of judgment were selected for this study on the basis of relevance to the research question: myself, ideal self, and self as son or daughter. For the primary objects domain, two subjects of judgment (mother and father) were supplied and the rest were elicited. For the secondary objects domain, two subjects of judgment were supplied (ideal work role and self as work role) and the rest were elicited.

While it is possible to rather exhaustively elicit the people involved in one's family and work, such a procedure would include many people who are rather unimportant. In accordance with the aim of this study, family members and work-related roles were selected on the basis of relevance and salience. In one to two interviews, subjects discussed their families and work relations. These interviews were guided by one central question: who is important to you and why? While all people considered important to a person were included, the experimenter also included roles that were highly relevant. For example, a hair-dresser might place importance on co-workers to the neglect of customers. However, customers were included simply because they are such a prominent part of that job. In each case involving a general role such as customers, the subject would select one particular customer to Q-sort, who seemed to best represent what a customer meant to him or her.

In this way, each subject generated an idiosyncratic list of people to Q-sort. There is reasonable assurance that these lists include people who were relevant and important (either positively or negatively) to the subjects.

Q-Sort Items

The unique and most challenging task of Q-sort construction is to define a universe of items and to select a representative sample of items from that universe. The universe of items for this study is composed of all traits that describe people. In the largest effort to catalogue this population, Allport and Odbert (1936) listed 17,963 words or phrases describing traits of people, which indicates how unwieldy this universe of items really is. Various attempts have been made to reduce this universe to manageable proportions, the most notable of which resulted in the Sixteen Personality Factors Test (Cattell, Elser, and Tatsuoka, 1970). However, while it might have proved suitable for this study, the relevance of items to vocational concerns is not entirely clear. Accordingly, a manageable universe of items was sought among theorists of career development.

In the psychology of career development, one of the most comprehensive and distinguished theories is that of John Holland (1973). While there are many distinguished, competing theorists, none offer as complete or well-defined a universe of descriptions as Holland. According to Holland, there are six major personality types: realistic, investigative, artistic, social, enterprising, and conventional. People can be described by varying combinations of these ideal types. In his book (1973) and his manual for the Vocational Preference Inventory (1978), Holland has thoroughly described each type and listed characteristic adjectives that would apply to each type.

In this type of study, one does not randomly sample a population of people but rather samples a universe of items.

From these descriptions, a comprehensive sample of 46 items were selected which characterized the six personality types. Some descriptions were altered to remove social desirability bias, and some items were modified to be more broadly applicable or to be phrased in more ordinary language that would be understood by subjects. Additionally, the first subject used a Q-sort of 48 items which included the adjectives of masculine and feminine. These two were dropped since they were confused with male and female, and consequently lacked adequate scope. That is, men were judged masculine and women were judged feminine automatically on the basis of sex rather than personality. Last, items were selected to be positive or at least rather neutral to avoid a halo effect and to promote more discernment. The 46 items are listed in Table 1.

It should be noted (Baas and Brown, 1973) that these adjectives are not measures of the values in the scaling sense; they are used as rough criteria so that the individual can use them during the Q-sorting sessions. Each trait is then typed on a small card for use in sorting. Instructions were as follows:

- (1) Take the deck of cards, read each card separately and put it down on the table in front of you. Spread out the cards and try to form a general impression of the attributes stated on the cards.

Table 1
Traits Used in the Q-Sort of the Study

practical	hard headed	independent
realistic	intellectual	introverted
conventional	rational	intelligent
blunt	ambitious	precise
responsible	extroverted	active
persistent	self-controlled	pleasure seeking
sociable	conforming	artistic
idealistic	orderly	creative
trustworthy	status-oriented	expressive
mature	flexible	emotional
caring	dominant	imaginative
affectionate	enthusiastic	sensitive
understanding	appealing	self-insightful
helpful	adventurous	competitive
moral	persuasive	masculine*
deliberate	spontaneous	feminine*

* Dropped after first participant.

- (2) Now pick up the cards, make a deck and shuffle the cards in the deck.
- (3) Now (for example) sort these cards to describe your mother, as you see your mother today, ranging from those that are most like your mother to those that are least like your mother.
- (4) Place the cards into roughly three equal piles as follows: most like; doubtfully like; and least like.
- (5) Sort the cards as follows: 2 3 5 8 10 8 5 3 2.
- (6)
 - (a) Start with pile one (those most like your mother).
 - (b) Place the two most like cards to your far left.
 - (c) Place the three next most like cards next to the last.
 - (d) Place the next five most like cards next to it.
 - (e) Place the next eight most like cards next to the last three.
 - (f) Repeat with pile three (those most unlike your mother).
 - (g) Place the doubtfully like cards (10) in the middle.

Note: If necessary it is possible to draw cards from the middle pile.
- (7) Check the sorting and make any changes you wish but retain the required number in each category.

Procedure

Each participant performed the Q-sorting in two to three sessions lasting from one hour to two hours, depending upon the number of roles to be sorted. At the beginning of each session she/he was interviewed to discover which roles were applicable to each domain and why. The

participant was then asked to rate each role on the Q-sort using the 46 traits drawn from Holland (1978). For example: "Sort these cards to describe yourself as you see yourself today, ranging from those that are most like you to those least like you."

The same procedure was followed for each role to be sorted. Following each Q-sorting, the participant and interviewer engaged in a dialogue about his/her rationale for Q-sorting the way he/she did. Any comments were noted down. The cards were then shuffled before the next Q-sort.

Method of Analysis

After the Q-sorting was completed, the Q-scores were assembled into patterns of sorting corresponding to different roles for each person. The roles were then intercorrelated to obtain the intercorrelation matrix of roles for each participant. The correlation matrices are found in Appendix B. Each role has 46 ratings of traits and it is these that are correlated. A correlation coefficient indicates the degree to which two subjects of judgment correspond.

The matrix of intercorrelations was then submitted to factor analysis. A principal components axis solution was first obtained, and then the principal components structure was submitted to varimax rotation (Boldt, 1980). On this basis, a factor or type represents a grouping of roles around a common pattern of sorting the items (Boldt, 1980). A component or factor, in this sense, represents a type of person. The factor matrix structure for each individual is in Chapter Five.

Once the types were obtained, roles on the rotated factor matrix were examined to see if they exceeded a $\pm .45$ cutoff criterion. In many cases, the arbitrary criterion of $\pm .30$ is used by many factor theorists. The use of $\pm .45$ exceeds this minimum cutoff criterion (Child, 1970). The coefficients or loadings in the rotated factor solutions may be viewed as each role's correlation with each of these types (Boldt, 1980). The roles which exceeded $\pm .45$ were listed under that type.

In the final part of the analysis, Griffiths' (1974) Q-analysis program was used. This program produces arrays of trait Z scores for each factor (factor arrays). The Q-sort traits can be ordered in terms of acceptance and the program is useful for describing each type or factor. For the purpose of this study, the focus was on factor solutions rather than on the factor arrays. Interested readers may check Appendix C for a listing of each participant's trait Z scores.

Validation Interview

Once the data was analyzed, the validation interview was undertaken so that the participants could subjectively validate and elaborate the meaning of the quantitative portrait that was drawn from the data. Before the results were given, each individual was asked three questions:

- (1) Who do you take after personally? In a job?
- (2) Who in your family most resembles the people you work with?
- (3) Who at work most resembled yourself personally? In a job self?

These questions were asked in order to start the participants thinking about family and work relationships and to see whether in fact they were consciously aware of how they construed family and work roles.

At this point, the experimenter began to offer a verbal portrait of the quantitative results, which was unique for each participant. For example, you seem to take after mother in your work role. Throughout the verbal portrait, the experimenter paused after a comment to allow the participant to react, and through the active listening techniques of reflection and empathic responses, encouraged the participant to elaborate the meaning of each correspondence of comment. The experimenter did not press for confirmation or disconfirmation but instead was interested in the subjective meaning of the results for each participant. The spirit of each interview was an exploration of meaning, not a testing of hypotheses. In most instances the participants directly confirmed the results by stating "yes, that's the way it is" or "I'm surprised at how true the results are." In some instances however, participants disagreed with certain findings. In these instances, it was found that as the individual elaborated on their disagreement, they contradicted their direct statement of disbelief and in fact verified the result. Toward the end of each interview, deeper parallels were offered for comment such as: self is to brother as work self is to co-worker. After each parallel, the experimenter once again paused for the participant's reaction and asked the participant to elaborate the meaning. Each interview was tape recorded for use in case studies.

CHAPTER FOUR

Results

In the enactment of occupational roles, do people re-enact family roles? This question can be explored in a variety of ways with the present data. In this chapter, group results are examined from two over-lapping angles. In the next chapter the question will be explored in case studies.

Correlations Among Roles

For each subject, the Q-sort for each role was correlated with every other role. A correspondence between any two roles was accepted if there was a significant correlation between them. On the basis of testing the hypothesis that the population correlation coefficient is 0, using Fisher's Z transformation, it was concluded that a correlation coefficient of $\pm .30$ or higher is statistically significant at the .05 level (Glass and Stanley, 1970).

A .05 level of confidence was used to determine significance which is conservative enough given the exploratory nature of the study and the relatively low N. If the alpha level is too small (i.e., .01), there is a greater chance of making a Type II error (Ferguson, 1981) (correlations between roles are given in Appendix B).

First, do co-workers correspond to family members? For the ten subjects, 46 co-workers were elicited. For 41 of these co-workers, there was a correspondence to at least one member of one's family (see Appendix A, Table 2). The correlations ranged from mild to very strong,

in which a co-worker was a virtual re-embodiment of a family member. It appears that the majority of co-workers can be construed as variants of a prior family member. This suggests the possibility that people act toward co-workers as if they were family members, but in a radically different context.

Second, do co-workers correspond to a variant of oneself? While this question is less crucial, it is important in the following sense. If people incorporate others as aspects of self, then the external drama of family or work parallels an internal drama within self. Co-workers become objectifications of self. For 34 of the 46 co-workers, there was a significant correlation with at least one self role (see Appendix A, Table 2). The majority of co-workers appear to be variant aspects of self. Part of the meaning of one's relationship to co-workers then appears to involve or to be reflected in relations within oneself.

Third, does self-as-job correspond with other selves (i.e., self, self as son or daughter, ideal self)? When enacting a work role does a person partially enact other self roles? Since some subjects rated themselves in more than one work role, there were 16 selves-as-job. All 16 work selves correlated significantly with at least one other self role (see Appendix A, Table 3). The enactment of a work role does not appear to be an isolated phenomena, but rather is intimately related to other enactments.

Fourth, does self-as-job correspond to family members? In enacting a work role, is one also partially enacting a role model from the family? For 15 of the 16 work selves, there was a significant

correlation with at least one family member (see Appendix A, Table 3). The one exception (see the case study of Lou in the next chapter) is interesting, since he supports the major research question in a different way than expected. As the second oldest son in a family of four children, Lou decided at an early age that he would be different from his family. Once he was able to find financial support, he left home at age 15, completed a university education and started his career as an artist, a career as different from his father's longtime job of milkman as possible. To this day, Lou maintains tenuous ties with his family and prides himself on being distinct from his family. In this sense, he is re-enacting a drama of the family, but one that results in low correlations, low commonality with others. Overall, however, people do seem to re-enact in work roles their role models from the family, although there is great diversity in the family members selected as models.

While correlations are limited in the subtlety with which they can capture the ways that work is a re-enactment of family drama, the evidence is supportive. There are direct correspondences between co-workers and family members, co-workers and self roles, self-as-job and self roles, and self-as-job and family members. While the domains involve quite different contexts, they appear to be strongly interrelated.

Principal Components

A principal component analysis was conducted on each individual set of Q-sorts separately, in order to reduce each set of roles to clusters of roles or types of roles. A standard and well recommended

criterion for determining the number of principal components (Harman, 1967) is that the latent roots have a value greater than one. For Q-sorts, a principal components analysis clusters roles into types which share a common theme or meaning. Griffiths' (1974) Q-analysis program can then be used to determine the adjectives which characterize each type (see Appendix C).

With regard to this study, the interest in components or role types is to determine whether, and the extent to which, these role types are mixed with self roles, family members, and co-workers. While the previous section showed that diverse roles are significantly inter-related, it is still possible that family roles, for instance, are more strongly interrelated, and would consequently form a role type composed only of family roles. A component is termed pure if it contains roles of only one of the three domains (self, family, work). A component is partially mixed if it contains roles from two domains. A component is totally mixed if it contains roles from all three domains. A component loading of $\pm .45$ was established as criterion for the inclusion of a role in a component.

First, the first principal component (unrotated) was assessed. It is of importance since it is formed in accordance with a maximization of variance accounted for. The first component accounts for more variance in a set of roles than any other linear combination. The results indicate that of 10 unrotated first components, all ten were totally mixed, with high loadings from self, family and work roles.

Child (1970) suggests that most factor analysts agree that direct factor solutions are often not sufficient "...adjustment to the frames of reference improves the interpretation by reducing some of the ambiguities which often accompany the preliminary analysis" (Child, 1970, p. 51).

Therefore, the components for each set of Q-sorts were then subjected to a varimax rotation which is intended to "purify" a cluster. That is, a varimax rotation is designed to maximize the loadings of a cluster of roles while minimizing the loadings of other roles. The results indicate that 37 of the 42 rotated components were partially mixed, and that 14 of the 42 were totally mixed (see Appendix A, Table 4). Of the six pure types, one contained only one role, which is more purity by default than by integration.

The components were mixed on the standard principal components analysis and were also largely mixed when the clusters were purified. It appears then that personal typologies do not separate roles into separate domains involving self, family and work, but rather mix them in many different ways. The following chapter provides individual descriptions of the various ways the three domains were interrelated.

CHAPTER FIVE

Results: Case Studies

The quantative data presented in the previous chapter provide support for the notion that people re-enact the drama of their family in their work settings. However, it is general and more specific portraits of individuals which are important to provide further support.

In this chapter, three further types of evidence will be discussed. First, an individual portrait can be developed using the components yielded by the principal components analysis. All roles under each component which exceed the $\pm .45$ cutoff criterion are included. From this pattern, there emerges a portrait of the drama of a person's life. The central question here is whether or not the quantitative portrait makes sense. Is it plausible?

Second, the portraits may be validated by the subjective reactions of the participants. That is, is the portrait sensible to the participant?

This form of validation depends on both verbal agreement and commentary as well as on participant reactions such as laughing, crying or gasping. These reactions bear on the question of whether the portrait is meaningful to the individual.

The last way the research question may be further substantiated is by a participant's ability to subjectively elaborate the portrait. This expands the correlations among the people into a drama and gives the correlations a human context and sensibility.

Before proceeding to the case studies, it is important to mention both how the results were presented to the participants and the format the case studies will take.

As mentioned previously, each person was asked three questions before the results were presented:

- (1) Who do you take after personally? In a job?
- (2) Who in your family most resembles the people you work with?
- (3) Who at work most resembles yourself personally? In a job self?

The results were read to the participants, one finding at a time. The individual was then asked to comment and/or elaborate. Reactions were noted by the interviewer.

Second, each case study follows the following format. The principal components or types are listed and under each are placed the significant roles and their loadings on that type.

The quantative picture is followed by some brief background information about the person. The portrait which was extracted from the quantative data is then presented. This is followed by the individual's subjective reaction and elaboration. A brief interpretation is provided to conclude each case.

IRIS

Present Occupation: Secretary

First Occupation: Girl Friday

Table 5

Significant Roles and Factor Loadings for Each Factor or Type

Roles	Loadings on Each Type
<u>Type 1</u>	
father	(-.78)
supervisor	(.68)
self as secretary	(.65)
self	(.46)
<u>Type 2</u>	
daughter	(.84)
ideal self	(.81)
co-worker	(.76)
brother	(.73)
ideal secretary	(.72)
ideal girl Friday	(.65)
2nd youngest sister	(-.58)
self	(.54)
self as secretary	(.46)
graduate assistants	(.46)

Continued ...

Roles	Loadings on Each Type
<u>Type 3</u>	
office manager	(.89)
salesman	(.78)
ideal girl Friday	(.66)
<u>Type 4</u>	
graduate assistants	(.68)
students	(.71)
2nd oldest sister	(.48)
2nd youngest sister	(.46)
<u>Type 5</u>	
2nd oldest sister	(.80)
mother	(.73)
self as girl Friday	(.60)
<p>* Iris's intercorrelation matrix of roles has been factor analyzed and five factors or types were obtained according to the criterion mentioned previously. These factors are referred to above as types of roles. Only those roles which exceed $\pm .45$ are given in the table. These factor loadings are to be seen as intercorrelations of the roles with the factor.</p>	

Iris is a 26 year old married woman with a grade 12 education who has been working in the clerical field for seven years and specifically as a secretary for the past five. The youngest of 11 children, Iris was raised on welfare as her father was constantly sick and in and out of sanitariums with tuberculosis. Iris described her father, who died

when she was in her early teens, as ruling with an iron fist and said "he taught me everything I didn't want to be."

The results indicate that Iris' present supervisor and her self as secretary are similar while these two as well as her real self are seen as being totally opposite from her father. It appears that she is approaching her personal ideal in work, particularly in her current job. Iris' ideal self and self-as-daughter are very similar. While she resembles her mother somewhat (not her father) Iris is most like her oldest brother. In her current job as secretary, she acts most like her brother and extremely unlike her second youngest sister. As a girl Friday Iris acted more like her second oldest sister and her mother. The co-worker at that job was seen as being similar to Iris and her brother. The present supervisor seems like the opposite of Iris' father, he is more ideal. Students and assistants at the current job resemble somewhat Iris' second oldest and second youngest sisters.

The parallels presented to Iris were:

- (1) Daughter is to ideal father as self as secretary is to supervisor.
- (2) Girl Friday is to secretary as less ideal is to more ideal or as more conflictful family is to a more harmonious one.

Iris agreed emphatically that she and her present supervisor were similar and totally opposite to her father. "Definitely, my father was a jerk. My father never seemed to care about his kids, only about himself and the consequences they'd make and how he'd have to handle them. Present supervisor and I consider the other person first. He's caring,

a gentleman; all things you'd like to see in a father."

Iris was surprised that she was approaching her personal ideal at work but then confirmed the finding. "...the contact with people is good, as far as atmosphere it's great, easy going, harmonious, take it as it comes...but there's never any visible accomplishment. I get frustrated with this. It fulfills me emotionally, for a secretarial job it's great."

That herself-as-daughter and ideal self were similar caused Iris to exclaim "I consider myself not a very good daughter. I don't consider us (mother and Iris) close but guess she does. I'll do anything to please and in that way I'm close to my ideal. I'll say anything to make someone happy. I can't be honest about Mom with Mom. I take care of people's feelings."

Iris agreed that she and her mother were somewhat alike and said this about her brother, "yes, I've patterned myself after him and yet I hardly know him. He's such a strong figure, he could have been my father age-wise. I always wish he was, I could have gone so far with him as a father. I've always taken him as a father image. He's firm in what he believes; he's fun, enjoyable, musical--I am too--has belief in God and stuff. When he was out recently we could have opened our mouths at the same time and said the same thing; we're that alike. When I was 16 he gave me a talk about boy friends. It was a talk a father should have had. I remember everything about him when it's him and I."

Obviously then it's not surprising that Iris believed she was like her brother in her current job and unlike her second youngest

sister. "Two people so different have never been seen. I'll do the opposite of what she does, she's the negative influence. She was quite like my father although they never got along."

Iris agreed that she was more like her second oldest sister and mother during the period of her first job. "It was her (sister) that drove me to work every day. I was 19, she was 32. I was riper for the influence. I was wishy washy like my mother and didn't know what I was doing. Since we're (mother and Iris) alike it makes sense."

The fact that her first co-worker was sorted as being similar to Iris and her brother did not evoke any surprise. "She's like me...we seemed to be able to talk. She was always tolerant and never wanted to hurt others."

Iris simply said that she saw her supervisor with so much more respect than her father.

That students and assistants resembled her sisters caused Iris to laugh. "Yeah--the dumb one is my second youngest sister. She's like the students. The assistants, on the whole, are like my second oldest sister. There are some assistants who remind me of my brother."

The parallel: daughter is to ideal father as self-as-secretary is to supervisor caused Iris to say "Yes I can see that. I pictured my boss as a father image, what I'd like as a father."

The second parallel: girl Friday is to secretary as less ideal is to more ideal or as more conflictful family is to a more harmonious one drew a more lengthy response. "Yeah, family fits very well. When I started the first job, the office manager said 'we're all just one

big happy family and then you find out everybody can't stand anybody else. On the surface, it's fine. I avoid my family. That fits together. When my family gets together it's fun but if it's for more than two hours, there'd be a fight. You can avoid who you don't like in your family but if you had to be together all the time like in a job, we'd fight. Now my job is more harmonious, everyone gets along. There's usually one black sheep but that's so in a family. Generally we try to cooperate."

There are several items of note. First, Iris picked models of how to be and how not to be and began patterning her life after them. It's interesting that although she spent very little time with her brother and he lives 2,000 miles away--she feels in such close contact with him and orders her life in a way she sees as being consistent with the way he lives. Also, the male supervisor she has, fits easily into the container of ideal father whereas she sees assistants and students as sisters. Interesting also is the move from the conflictful job environment to the harmonious one--as if Iris was seeking a more harmonious family environment, one she really never had. Finally Iris made a thought provoking comment at the end of the interview. "Once you've been around a job for a little too long, it gets more identical to my family. You start finding out the truths."

In conclusion then, the workplace may represent for Iris the harmonious family she's been searching for.

CARLY

Present Occupation: Teacher

First Occupation: Teacher

Table 6

Significant Roles and Factor Loadings for Each Factor or Type

<u>Roles</u>	<u>Loadings on Each Type</u>
<u>Type 1</u>	
grade 11 and 12 students	(.77)
co-worker	(.68)
principal 1	(.64)
ideal teacher 1	(.54)
ideal teacher 2	(.52)
<u>Type 2</u>	
mother	(.83)
daughter	(.74)
uncle	(.74)
self as teacher 1	(.64)
self	(.57)
<u>Type 3</u>	
vice principal	(.85)
self as teacher 2	(.76)
counsellor	(.70)

Continued ...

Roles	Loadings on Each Type
grade 6 student	(-.66)
youngest sister	(.65)
self	(.57)
principal 1	(.49)
<u>Type 4</u>	
cousin	(.88)
principal	(.65)
grade 6 student	(.49)
<u>Type 5</u>	
ideal self	(.91)
ideal teacher 2	(.72)
ideal teacher 1	(.69)
youngest sister	(.59)
principal 2	(-.55)

Carly is a 31 year old single woman who has been teaching for nine years. She holds a B.A. and B.Ed. She is from a small town on the prairies and is the second oldest of six girls. Her father has a history of emotional disturbances and for most of Carly's childhood was a practicing alcoholic.

The results showed that personally, Carly takes after her mother more than her father (Carly is closest to being like her mother when

she is in the role of daughter). This is so particularly in her first job as a teacher and less so currently. She is more herself in her present job than in her first, but both fall short of her personal and work ideals. The teacher, senior students and first principal come closest to Carly's job ideal while her youngest sister approaches not only these, but her personal ideal also. The principal at Carly's current job is negative, having much in common with her cousin and the grade 6 student.

The youngest sister is similar to Carly personally and in her current job (but not in her first job). And she is similar to the vice-principal, counsellor, and first principal; the opposite of the grade 6 student.

Overall in Carly's job role change, she has switched from being more like her mother to more like her youngest sister, and less like her father. She has become more herself.

Carly's uncle was more of a male influence than her father.

Two parallels were gleaned from the data:

- (1) Self as job₁ is to self as job₂ as mother is to sister.
- (2) Self is to cousin as job self is to current principal.

These results were heard with great joy by Carly, who confessed that she'd been working very hard to change from being like her mother. "I am a funny combination of Mom and Dad. My interests, recreation, education and intellect come from Dad, the way of dealing with the world comes from Mom but I know I deal with it so differently than I used to."

She laughed in delight upon hearing that she'd become more herself in her present job although it fell short of personal and work ideals. "That's wonderful! I'm planning to change my career. I've learned how my mother deals with the world, how I deal with the world and how that all fits together. It's only been the last few years that I've learned this."

Carly agreed that the teacher, senior students and first principal were positive influences but focused on her youngest sister in discussion. "I like her practical, real way of approaching things, I spent many years fence sitting...not being definite. She was always definite from very little. I always admired the people in the family who could fight back but she did it in a different way. Those closest to my age were lippy and mouthy. I'd decided I wasn't going to be like that but my youngest sister said 'I feel like this, so respect me' and she got respect. Withdrawing, which I did, was like my mother."

The fact that she'd sorted her cousin as being similar to the current principal and the grade six student, both negative influences, was surprising to Carly. But as she talked the relationship emerged. "She (cousin) spoke up for what she wanted. I admired that. She was demanding but not respectful, powerful to the point of being belittling. The principal is too. The grade six student would change a lot from nice to nasty without warning. That's the way Dad keeps power over us; nice guy, nice guy, then pow he turns mean and later feels rotten about it."

Carly agreed that her sister was very like the vice principal, counsellor and first principal. They all share a steadiness, a practicality, and all deal with their emotions.

The fact that Carly has emulated her younger sister brought a sigh of pleasure and then hearing that she'd become more herself brought a wide grin. "This substantiates it. It's me taking charge of my life."

When presented with the finding that her uncle was more of a male influence than her Dad, Carly said: "I can see that. I liked spending time with him. Dad was the outsider, we were a family of girls--he was the enemy almost. Uncle popped in, he took good care of his wife and children, Dad didn't. On the surface, it all looked so wonderful. My Mom told me that my aunt prayed every day at mass for a good husband and so when he arrived, she knew he was a good husband. I was really small (when I was told this) and awed by all this. I might have set him up as wonderful."

The parallel: mother is to youngest sister as first job is to current job evoked total agreement. "Yeah, how Mom deals with the world and how my sister deals with it. Mom's so afraid, not willing to see things as they are, Mom tried hard to make things right even when they weren't right underneath. In my first job, I did too. I liked my class to look good, the quality of teaching had to look good on the outside. Now I don't care, I know what's going on. If it's rotten, I can say--it's a rotten day."

Self is to cousin as self-as-teacher is to current principal caused Carly to readjust her thinking as she'd previously consciously considered her cousin to be a fairly positive influence. "I must have painted the cousin as a negative sort. I understand the principal but don't like him dumping on me and being intimidating. Although I haven't seen her (cousin) in years, I have the image of her being very capable. She dumped on me with her comments...I felt like I didn't measure up."

In conclusion, the interview brings home again the consistent pattern each participant has had of construing people in the work place as being similar to family members. Carly provided an interesting perspective on the choices people make of which model to follow--should I be lippy (like other sisters), withdraw (like mother), or be assertive (like youngest sister)? Carly's case also demonstrates the possibilities for change in adulthood. But again, it's fascinating to note that change is from being like mother to being like another family member (youngest sister). The other finding of note is the way people construct ideals. Carly is told at a young age of divine intervention in her aunt's receiving a good husband and is almost primed to see her uncle as being close to perfect even though she consciously says "Maybe I was set up." She still feels that her uncle can do no wrong. As an addendum to this, seeing the uncle as her major male influence helped Carly transcend the problems she had with her own father and exposed her to a positive experience. The drama Carly re-enacts is through emulation of family members; first mother and uncle, then youngest sister--Carly strives for self-development.

BLAKE

Present Occupation: Photolab Technician

First Occupation: Photolab Technician

Table 7

Significant Roles and Factor Loadings for Each Factor or Type

<u>Roles</u>	<u>Loadings on Each Type</u>
<u>Type 1</u>	
son	(.76)
self	(.71)
general manager	(.66)
assistant supervisor	(-.65)
salesman	(-.47)
<u>Type 2</u>	
ideal photolab technician 1	(.84)
ideal photolab technician 2	(.82)
self as photolab technician 1	(.72)
self as photolab technician 2	(.69)
<u>Type 3</u>	
supervisor 2	(.81)
supervisor 1	(.81)
co-worker	(.72)
brother	(.61)

Continued ...

Roles	Loadings on Each Type
<u>Type 4</u>	
grandfather	(.85)
ideal self	(.81)
mother	(.54)
<u>Type 5</u>	
father	(.87)
mother	(.46)

Blake is a 33 year old male with grade 12 and three years attendance at an art college. He lives common-law and has one child. Blake has been a photolab technician for the past three years. The fourth oldest in a family of 11, Blake's dad owned a service station and his mother was a housewife. Due to the fact that his father was an alcoholic and in Blake's eyes did not live up to his potential, Blake sees his father as a somewhat negative figure. His father is deceased.

It seems that as a person, Blake is neither like his mother nor his father. Nor is he like them as a photolab technician although his grandfather is close to an ideal while his mother is less so. Blake just seems rather distinct. However, if he were more like his ideal, he would resemble his family more, particularly his grandfather and mother.

Blake sees himself-as-son and his present self as being similar.

At his first job he had little in common with the general manager and was opposite to the assistant supervisor and the salesmen. As a photolab technician, however, Blake is distinct, particularly in his present job. His two present supervisors and co-worker seem more like Blake's brother and they are somewhat less than ideal. Blake's actual job self and ideal job self in both jobs are somewhat similar.

The parallel which was drawn from the data was: self is to brother as self is to supervisors.

Blake was somewhat surprised to hear that he was quite distinct from his parents. He believed that he took after his father physically as well as sharing the traits of stubbornness, anger and curiosity. However, when he elaborated further, it turned out in fact that he did see himself as being distinct. "Since I'd hoped to have changed myself, I kind of like that. I wasn't overly crazy about my Dad, and my mother I didn't know that well."

He agreed that his grandfather was close to an ideal and said, "I made him into an ideal since I never really knew the man but I remember I turned him into what I wanted a grandfather to be." As for his mother also being an ideal, Blake said "There was a quietness about her, a silent presence in the room. She was the centre. As for childhood, she was our pal and our mother. That affected me a lot because my pals at the time didn't do that especially with their mothers. She was like my grandfather because she was distant. I never really knew her. There was never physical affection or an emotional bond between us. Since there were so many of us she was spread thin. Like my grandfather,

that separation, I idolized."

Blake agreed that he was distinct in his family. "I never really felt part of the family, always felt outside it, maybe because I was a middle child. I was distinct from my family but also the neighbourhood. I never enjoyed being a Maritimer or talking with a funny accent."

Blake talked about becoming more congruent when presented with the statement that self and self-as-son are similar. "I always thought I never grew any past 17 years old; but change has been reflected in my being more congruent as a person."

Blake agreed that he was opposite to the assistant supervisor and salesmen, "I see myself as being the opposite of everybody."

The theme of distinctiveness arose again when he was told that he was distinct at his present job. "I even try and work to be distinct; it makes me feel special. I don't want to be part of the crowd which you can't help but be in a large family."

Blake said that the supervisors and his brother shared the trait of being conformists. "I don't want to conform."

He was not surprised to hear that the actual and ideal photolab technicians were sorted similarly. "What I do in my job is the way someone should do the job, somewhat detached but concerned. I keep it separate and don't get emotional. I get emotional about other things."

Blake initially disagreed with the parallel: self is to brother as self is to supervisors saying, "My brother, I avoided contact and detached myself. With supervisors, I made an attempt to make contact

in order to get along with them." In the next breath, however, he confirmed the parallel saying "But then I had a choice with my brother. They are the same kinds of people, he's more extreme, they are going towards it. I can break down the barriers with them."

The overwhelming theme which arises again and again is how Blake strives to be distinct in all areas of his life. Seeing his father and brother as examples of how not to be, he set out to create his own persona. His grandfather with whom he had little contact, he construed as an ideal and to a lesser extent he did the same with his mother. Blake re-enacts his family drama at work, by being detached, doing the job and living for his other activities. As was consistent with his family, he sees himself as distinct from his co-workers. Again and again, Blake as the loner at both work and home strives for distinctiveness in a crowd.

IRMA

Present Occupation: Hairstylist

Table 8

Significant Roles and Factor Loadings for Each Factor or Type

Roles	Loadings on Each Type
<u>Type 1</u>	
aunt	(.90)
daughter	(.88)
co-worker	(.84)
mother	(.79)
brother	(.76)
father	(.64)
supervisor	(.55)
ideal self	(.52)
<u>Type 2</u>	
ideal hairstylist	(.92)
self as hairstylist	(.89)
self	(.64)
supervisor	(.62)
ideal self	(.58)
father	(.50)
brother	(.48)

Continued ...

Roles	Loadings on Each Type
Type 3	
client	(.94)

Irma is a 23 year old married woman with a grade 12 vocational diploma who has been working in her present job for four years. She's the oldest of three children and has a brother who is two years younger than her and a sister who is eight years younger. Her parents are both alive and she describes her family as being warm and close, one of the few interviewees who said that.

The results show that as a daughter, Irma is most like her aunt, mother and co-worker, but as a worker, she seems to take more after her father and her brother to some extent. But this is just a matter of degree as she seems to have so much in common with her mother, father, brother and aunt. They also seem to have a lot in common with both the supervisor and the co-worker. The only one that seems different is the client. There is little split between how Irma sees the ideal hair-stylist and how she sees herself. She also sees herself and her supervisor as being quite similar to her ideal self. This is also true to a lesser degree for her father and brother. While Irma is not quite herself in a work role, there is considerable overlap between herself as a person and herself as a work role. The parallel which was found based on this data was: self is to family as self is to work place (excluding client).

Irma was very matter-of-fact about the results and did not seem surprised by them at all. She agreed that as a daughter she is like her aunt, mother and co-worker as well as being like her father and brother as a worker. "Very good, I think that's pretty close. They're all people that sort of make you. I'm like my father because he's very outgoing and I'm a social person who likes to be around people most of the time. I keep amused by people rather than watching T.V. In another way, I'm like my mother; she's more of a responsible person that's trying to, how can I put it, get somewhere in life, whereas my dad isn't. My mom and my supervisor are both go-getters, getting things accomplished."

As for being like her brother and father at work--Irma agreed wholeheartedly especially in being sociable. When asked why she was like her brother she said "We're close in age, we've been close, caring for one another. We're not a lot the same but different personalities attract. He's ambitious too and definitely a hard worker."

Irma agreed that her immediate family was very similar but saw her other relatives as being very different. She was not surprised to hear that she saw herself, her co-worker and supervisor as being similar--that evoked a simple "That's what I thought." Although the supervisor is my boss, we're friends, she's a lot like me and is definitely independent. My co-worker is like my aunt too; caring and emotional. She would give you anything she had and is more than willing to help. Anything you give her, is too much."

When asked to explain why the client would be so different, Irma replied "Usually the client that comes to you (because this place works on referrals), tends to be attracted to your personality. This client in particular stood out because she's wealthy, demanding, always talks about herself so that it seems like no-one else is important. She lives in another world but you can sort of relate but she is so different from me."

Again there was no surprise over seeing how close the way she is as a hairstylist and the ideal hairstylist were. Irma laughed and said "Yeah, I'm pretty conceited. I'm doing well and it's proving itself quite fast."

She agreed that her father and brother were close to her ideal in some ways. "Like I said, my father's outgoing, he's a fun person to go out with but he's not the type of person who worries about his future, like he worries about today. That's not like my ideal self."

Irma nodded vigorously to the statement that she was not quite herself in her work role but that there was considerable overlap. "When you're in public, you can't bring your total self out because people don't want to listen to that. You sort of have to be a neutral and be able to take whatever the client believes in. You can't just say I don't believe in that or you probably wouldn't have very many clients. You have to sort of push away that part of yourself and not let it get to you."

When presented with the parallel: self is to family as self is to workplace (excluding client), Irma replied unequivocally "Yes I am.

We are one big family. We are a very unique salon. I can compare this to other places I worked in briefly, this is really unique. It's like a big family."

In conclusion, it can be stated that Irma left her other unharmonious families (jobs) in order to work in a place that reminded her very much of her own family. Mother and supervisor are seen as very similar and co-worker is like Irma as daughter. In this environment, she is able to work towards her ideals of getting ahead, working hard (like mother and supervisor), as well as fulfilling the sociable, outgoing aspects of her personality that are like father. Irma's lack of surprise and total agreement with the results seem to indicate that she's found a close fit between work and domestic family. In other words, work seems to be a reproduction of a harmonious family.

DAVE

Present Occupation: Parking Checker

First Occupation: Rental Agent

Table 9

Significant Roles and Factor Loadings for Each Factor or Type

Roles	Loadings on Each Type
<u>Type 1</u>	
self	(.86)
son	(.83)
ideal self	(.82)
customer	(-.56)
mother	(.51)
field supervisor	(.48)
<u>Type 2</u>	
self as parking checker	(.87)
self as rental agent	(.79)
ideal parking checker	(.74)
father	(.62)
<u>Type 3</u>	
field supervisor	(.76)
co-worker	(.73)
ideal rental agent	(.71)

Continued ...

Roles	Loadings on Each Type
mother	(.59)
ideal parking checker	(.47)
<u>Type 4</u>	
sister	(.92)

Dave is a 28 year old male with a grade 12 education who has worked at a variety of jobs since he graduated from high school. He has been at his present job for one year. He has one older brother and a younger sister. His father works as a salesman and his mother is a housewife. Dave talks of his upbringing and mother warmly but feels he has little in common with his father.

The results indicate that personally, Dave takes after his mother. Professionally, as a parking checker he seems to take after his father. Customers seem to be everything that he and his mother are not. Dave seems to see the co-worker from his first job, and his present field supervisor as being more like his mother, and to some extent like his personal self. It appears as if there is little relationship between the way Dave is as a person and the way he is in a work role. However he does see himself, his self-as-son and his ideal self as being extremely similar. The parallel which emerged from the data was: father is to mother as self is to co-workers.

When presented with these results, Dave appeared to be pleased and commented several times that it was gratifying to work towards

being a certain way and then find out that you have in fact accomplished that.

Dave stated that he was very fond of his mother and saw himself as being very similar emotionally to her. He also saw many of her physical mannerisms in himself and was delighted that the results showed them sharing the attributes of sensitivity, trustworthiness and caring.

The field supervisor (who has the same first name as Dave's mother) reminds Dave of both his mother and himself in being easy-going, practical and approachable. "The field supervisor is like me, a very don't make waves person. You're here, you put in your eight hours, you can cuss and swear behind backs all you want but while you're here, you just put up with it. You need a job--we both understand that. She gives off neat vibes. My mom would do that too."

Dave was very surprised to hear that he took after his father in his work role since he'd "Never even considered doing anything like my father as far as work goes. The jobs I'll do I can see my mother doing and I can't see anyone else in my family doing them except maybe my brother who is very much like my mother too in a lot of ways." Dave prides himself on being very different than his father whom he sees as a sports fanatic with whom he has little in common. However, on further reflection, Dave said that both he and his father share the attributes of being responsible and mature on the job. Both are easy-going and both dislike making waves. Again it's interesting to note that on further elaboration, the result is confirmed by the participant.

Dave was not surprised that his work self was separate from his actual self since he dislikes working and would prefer to do other things. This would parallel what his mother does, that is, remaining active but not working. On the job, Dave voluntarily suppresses parts of himself since he does not want most of his co-workers to know him. "The pleasant right-on, nothing fazes me kind of person emerges at work, whereas my personal self is just where I happen to be at the time. On the job there are only a few people with whom I can be my real self." On the present job the field supervisor would be one of the few who gets to know Dave personally.

Dave was not surprised to hear that he had sorted customers as being opposite to himself and his mother. "They were all pushy, you're there to serve them and they don't care about you. You're just a person that's going to provide them with a service that they're entitled to and that's the arrogance they give off. And I'm not like that at all."

The parallel: father is to mother as self is to co-workers, was initially rejected by Dave who said that he was unlike his father. Once he thought about it, however, Dave said that the pleasant temperament both he and his father use when dealing with people, had been an example he'd always striven to emulate. "My Dad has to do the same with Mom because she could drive you crazy after living with her for 35 years. The calming effect he has over people is one I also use with my co-workers."

In summary then, it can be seen that the results did not surprise Dave at all. He immediately understood why he'd liked his supervisor and co-worker so well since they reminded him of his mother. The importance of early role models--in Dave's case, how his father handled his mother--reappear for Dave in his dealing with co-workers. Once again what we learn from our families seems to be re-enacted in the work world. For Dave we see that his family environment and the work environment appear to be reproductions of one another. Dave confides in his mother and field supervisor but allows others like father and unimportant co-workers no access to his real self.

LOU

Present Occupation: Artist

First Occupation: Restaurant Worker

Table 10

Significant Roles and Factor Loadings for Each Factor or Type

Roles	Loadings on Each Type
<u>Type 1</u>	
self as artist	(.85)
ideal artist	(.85)
self	(.82)
contemporary artist	(.74)
ideal self	(.65)
<u>Type 2</u>	
ideal restaurant worker	(.85)
self as restaurant worker	(.82)
brother	(-.59)
dealer	(.58)
son	(-.48)
customer	(-.47)
<u>Type 3</u>	
manager	(.93)
executive	(.88)
sister	(.53)

Continued ...

Roles	Loadings on Each Type
<u>Type 4</u>	
father	(.84)
customer	(.71)
son	(.60)
ideal self	(-.50)
<u>Type 5</u>	
mother	(.77)
oldest brother	(.70)
dealer	(.52)

Lou is a 32 year old married male with one child who has been working as an artist for the past 10 years. Lou has a Bachelor of Fine Arts degree and is the second oldest in a family of four; 3 males and one female. His sister is the youngest sibling. Lou's father worked as a milkman for 20 years and has spent the last five as a janitor. His mother was a clerk for many years but now works as a bartender.

Lou's Q-sorts in the job domain did not correlate with any members from his family domain. All the other participants' job domains correlated with the family domain. However, Lou has strived since he was 15, to be separate from his family and states that he chose an occupation and lifestyle that were opposite to that of any significant family member, the lack of correlation is not surprising.

From the groupings, it seems that personally, Lou is not like his mother or father. He sees his self-as-artist and the ideal artist as being identical while his real self is seen as very similar to them both. In his present job as artist, Lou is able to be more himself. Currently he has much in common with the contemporary artist who in turn shares many traits with Lou's ideal self. Lou sees the dealer as opposite to his youngest brother, himself-as-son and the customer. The customer is viewed as being similar to his father. This is rather negative. The dealer is somewhat similar to Lou as a restaurant worker and also somewhat like his mother and oldest brother. As a restaurant worker, Lou acted a little bit like his father and unlike his mother and his ideal self. The manager and executive are very similar and Lou's sister shares much in common with them. The striking parallels were: (1) son is to father as self-as-restaurant-worker is to customer; and (2) restaurant worker is to artist as dealer is to contemporary artist and more positive son is to mother and oldest brother.

In the interview Lou stated that he was similar to his father, in that they shared similar bad habits. He painted his father as a rigid, intolerant but charming disciplinarian who was neither rational nor reasonable. But he also stated that he had no real job model although his mother was somewhat artistically inclined.

He laughed at the fact that he saw the ideal artist and himself as artist as being identical and his real self as being similar. "That is a weakness, we all want to be where we should be. I'm nowhere near the ideal artist but the differences may be more subtle than Q-sorting

can figure out. I work at my work and I approach it like an artist because I am one. Nobody does this unless they're prepared to sacrifice...it's not having a job, there's a fulfillment in it, you're always in it. You are it. There's no separation between man and job."

Lou agreed that he shared much in common with the contemporary artist--one of his best friends and that the artist was close to his ideal in some traits. "I'm just a repressed romantic and he's not. Repression comes from having to be partially responsible."

Lou stated that he was a lot like his youngest brother, a felon, when he was in the role of son whereas the dealer is the symbol of Lou's different lifestyle and interests.

He agreed that the customer and his father shared many traits in common. "My father isn't a well educated man and education means a lot to me. I lack respect for my father and most people--especially when you're in a job where you meet them all the time. They're mostly assholes so I'd lump them in the same category."

Lou saw the dealer and himself as being similar as restaurant workers since both worked for the same restaurant chain for about the same amount of time and both quit in disgust. The fact that the dealer was somewhat like his mother and eldest brother did not sit well with Lou at all. This again is not surprising since Lou has striven to widen the distance between his family and himself since the time he left home at age 15. However, he did say "My brother is solidly normal and mother's on the fringes. He (brother) used to be on the fringes, way out there, but now he's in the centre. The dealer is like James

Joyce--an exile figure, never quite a part of what he's doing even though he's meticulous, he never believes in it."

Lou agreed that he did act at a remove from his ideal self and was more like his father in his job at the restaurant. "I needed the dollars, my ideal self would have told 30% of the customers to piss off but I couldn't do it...my father for years has worked dull jobs, mostly because he had four children to support...he was forced to do it, he hasn't had much free choice in his life and when he's had it, he's blown it. When you work for somebody, that's what happens. My mother's a drop-out, a transient, rarely stays in one place for more than six months, is always out drinking and dancing. Basically she ups and moves when things bother her which is unlike my father who's never been able to do that and unlike me when I feel responsible."

There was no surprise that the manager and executive were seen as being similar. "They're both jocks." When his sister was included in the equation Lou stated "They're all manipulative. The two restaurant fellows were semi-intelligent, my sister's not too bright but they all know how to manipulate for different purposes."

When presented with the first parallel: son is to father as self-as-restaurant worker is to customer; Lou immediately said "No that's not true. I always sounded off against my father but didn't with the customer." When more probing was done, Lou said "There were rules set down in both cases that I had to follow to a certain extent, more so as an employee than as a son. A further parallel would be that when I couldn't take the job anymore, I got out of it. When I was 15

and found a way to get some money, I got out of the house. I flee from unpleasant things." It can be seen that far from disagreeing with this parallel, Lou in fact verifies it.

Lou did not like the next analogy: job 1 is to job 2 as dealer is to contemporary artist and more positive son is to mother and oldest brother. However, on further reflection he said "Yeah, that's sound. On one side you've got a restrained approach and the other side is wide open. As an artist I can go and do what I feel. A dealer has more restrictions than a contemporary artist. My mother is like the artist, my oldest brother is coming back to centre but he was like my mother. The positive son has restrictions too, so it fits."

In conclusion then, it can be stated that from age 15 at the latest, Lou consciously set out to be distinctive from his family and has rejected many of their attributes. The family provided a model for what he didn't want to be. In particular his father whom Lou sees as being trapped provided Lou with a model for obtaining a job that did not curtail one's freedom. The so-called bohemian lifestyle of his mother has also had an influence on Lou and while he acknowledges her "conventional" artistic sense, he rejects the excesses of her transient lifestyle by being a homeowner, paying bills, and perhaps being the middle class person he thinks his mother wants to be in her heart of hearts. It seems in many ways as if the contemporary artist and the dealer have become Lou's new positive, harmonious family.

ELIZABETH

Present Occupation: University Professor

Table 11

Significant Roles and Factor Loadings for Each Factor or Type

<u>Roles</u>	<u>Loadings on Each Type</u>
<u>Type 1</u>	
ideal self	(.88)
self as professor	(.87)
self	(.84)
ideal professor	(.82)
Dean	(-.80)
student	(.78)
aunt	(.52)
<u>Type 2</u>	
father	(.82)
aunt	(.73)
cousin	(.72)
colleague	(.63)
<u>Type 3</u>	
mother	(.83)
daughter	(.80)

Roles	Loadings on Each Type
<u>Type 4</u>	
brother	(.78)
colleague	(.52)

Elizabeth is a 45 year old married woman with a Ph.d. who has been a professor for 15 years. She is the oldest of two children and has one brother. Both her parents worked when she was growing up; her father as a railroad executive and her mother as a public health nurse. They are retired at present.

The results indicate that Elizabeth does not really take after her mother or her father but her aunt to some extent. Both Elizabeth and her aunt seem to be just the opposite of the Dean. While it appears as if she has some commonality with students, her colleague seems more like her aunt and cousin and to some extent, like her father. The colleague also has some features in common with her brother. Elizabeth seems to have most in common with her mother when she is acting as a daughter, but when she acts this way, she is acting quite a ways from her ideal. It seems as if she is really being herself in her work role and that there is little split between her ideal and real self. The parallel which emerged was: self is to father as self is to colleague.

When interviewed, Elizabeth appeared to be somewhat moved by some of the results, had tears spring to her eyes and repeatedly mentioned how gratifying it was to hear that what one was trying to do

in life and be in life was in fact reflected in the Q-sort.

She said that it was good for her to hear that she was more like her aunt than her mother and stated that the aunt was extremely caring and fun. "She was a very good 'mother-hen,' gave fun parties for us all as children and was characteristically positive. I'm like my aunt in that in my job I like to keep things moving as smoothly as possible. I like to see people working with me go as far as they can and sometimes that's in conflict with what I'm told I have to do. My aunt was lots of fun and making sure that people who go through all this have some fun. I think that's important."

The fact that both she and her aunt were opposite of the Dean brought a laugh and a comment "That's neat. He tends to focus on things that go awry." He is seen as providing little support, tends to operate on assumption and seemingly does not take the time to check out factual data with the person it directly concerns. This is in direct conflict with what both Elizabeth and her aunt do.

The fact that her father, as well as her colleague, were seen as being similar to her aunt and cousin evoked some emotion and Elizabeth's eyes welled up with tears and she cleared her throat. Elizabeth said "I like hearing that. If that's true I'd really be pleased because it means fairness and fun and helping people to the place they want to be."

Colleague and brother were seen as sharing the characteristic of "little boy impulsivity. The colleague would differ in having the maturity as well as the impulsiveness. He provides me with honestly critical support." Her brother, in contrast, was described in terms

characteristic of a child. His distinctive mood is seen as cranky and belligerent while other salient traits include tantrums, inability to finish things, low self-concept and dependency on Elizabeth in particular.

Elizabeth agreed that she was similar to her mother when in the daughter role. "It means the things I say I know are often hurtful and I know if I had to repeat them the next day I would bury them--they just fly out. That's only typical of me in my daughter role with whomever would be bringing that out. Yes, I'm acting quite a way from my ideal then." Elizabeth stated that she feels that reflects some of the traits she doesn't like in her mother most particularly when she's upset. She described her mother as being extremely independent and said that she encouraged her daughter to be that way--however, when Elizabeth followed that pattern her mother was not pleased. This incongruity still causes Elizabeth some pain. Since her mother's distinctive mood was cranky and occasionally whimsical, Elizabeth became even more attracted to her aunt's pleasant motherliness as a model.

The fact that real and ideal self were similar and that Elizabeth's work and real self have little split brought a fervent "God I hope so. Your timing is wonderful."

The parallel which emerged between family and work roles (self is to father as self is to colleague) caused Elizabeth to remark, "That would fit. I guess in terms of sorting I would hope that would fit in fun, fair, honesty and helping people do what they want to do." Her father is seen as being always steady and helpful. "Everyone trusts him and no one dislikes him. He is, however, weak about taking a

stand." The colleague with his helpfulness, fairness and pleasantness is reminiscent of Elizabeth's father.

In conclusion then, it can be seen that the results fit the person's conception of their world. Elizabeth, disliking aspects of her mother, found another role model in her aunt and shaped her life after her in many ways. Mother and brother became models of how not to be and these models are used when others act in ways that remind Elizabeth of maternal or fraternal stances. Father became an important role model for work and those individuals who are seen as resembling aunt, cousin or father became important at the work site.

Thus Elizabeth's main theme is becoming as caring, funloving and mother-henning at work as her aunt was in the family, and associating with those colleagues and students who remind her of the positive aspects of her father and brother.

KATE

Present Occupation: Lawyer

Table 12

Significant Roles and Factor Loadings for Each Factor or Type

<u>Roles</u>	<u>Loadings on Each Type</u>
<u>Type 1</u>	
partner	(.88)
judge	(.84)
self as lawyer	(.77)
ideal lawyer	(.72)
colleague	(.53)
<u>Type 2</u>	
ideal self	(.86)
brother	(.78)
client	(.52)
colleague	(.46)
ideal lawyer	(.46)
<u>Type 3</u>	
father	(.91)
sister	(.87)
<u>Type 4</u>	
mother	(.82)

Roles	Loadings on Each Type
daughter	(.78)
oldest brother	(.78)
self	(.70)
client	(.53)

Kate is a 30 year old married lawyer who has been in her profession for four years and holds a B.A. and LLB. She is the youngest of four children, the closest in age being a sister who is eight years older. Her other two siblings are brothers. Her father, who is deceased, was a lumber inspector and mill worker. Kate's father, second oldest brother and sister were all alcoholics, although her siblings are now recovered. In addition, her second oldest brother has a history of mental instability. Her oldest brother is a born again Christian.

The results are as follows: both personally and as a lawyer, Kate seems to take after her mother and not her father. It seems that she resembles her oldest brother most of all. Her ideal lawyer seems rather different than her personal ideal. However, as a personal ideal, her brother is closest, as to some extent are client and colleague. Her father and sister seem similar, yet distinct from the others. As professionals, Kate, the partner, her colleague and the judge all seem similar and closer to her professional ideal. The two parallels which were drawn from the data are: (1) self is to mother and oldest brother as self as lawyer is to partner and judge; and (2) self is to brother as self is to ideal self.

Kate agreed that she took after her mother in terms of temperament, in particular being stable and steady rather than unreliable and unsteady like her father. She also said that she and her mother both controlled their emotions.

The fact that she was like her oldest brother did not surprise Kate at all. "He was a surrogate father to me when I was little. We both were not able to easily express emotions, we've both progressed but we're not like my other brother and sister--where everything is right out in the open, they're always having some crisis. We always were more calm, and held things in--like my mother. He was very good to me."

The fact that her personal ideal and her ideal lawyer differed fit well for Kate. She smiled and said "Sometimes I think I'm in the wrong profession. There is that constant struggle with law in that the qualities it wants from a person are different than the qualities I admire: ideal things like being really creative, flamboyant and emotional, that's not me...some of the qualities of lawyers are more close to me. It's the intellectual, rational that has been developed. The one part of being a lawyer that isn't like me is the steadiness, you can't be super emotional yet sometimes I go over the edge and get too emotional which I admire. So there's a tension there. The other tension is around competency and confidence whereas lots of times I don't feel like that...but that would be my ideal too."

Kate was surprised to hear that her second brother was close to her ideal. "He's artistic and creative, basically kind, sensitive and

quiet. There's a whole side to him that I certainly want to be like. However, the emotional instability that he has, has allowed him to get a lot of attention, along with my sister, so there's a love/hate thing there because of that."

She was pleased that the client showed traits of her ideal since "I liked her idealism, her politics and her dedication to that." The colleague is ideal in the sense that he's "warm, friendly and gregarious, down to earth, natural, easy to get along with and gets along well with people."

Kate expressed surprise that her sister wasn't more like her ideal. She agreed that her father and sister were similar in being fairly self-centered and having emotional mood swings. "Both my father and sister are intelligent people although not terribly well disciplined. My dad, second oldest brother and sister are all alcoholics so they all have some similar qualities. That's always been recognized in the family."

Kate seemed pleased that the work roles she'd sorted on appeared in one type with her ideal lawyer and self-as-lawyer. "We all strive for an ideal if you're going to be a good lawyer. I've been really working on that. Now I feel like I'm getting there."

When given the analogy: self is to mother and oldest brother as self-as-lawyer is to partner and judge, Kate said that that was true for her. "The qualities my mother and brother have are similar to what the judge and lawyer have. Both groups of people have the rational ability to think things through, stability and also the sense of what

the ethical responsible thing to do is. I'd like to be less like my mother and oldest brother and want to emulate the partner and judge."

The second analogy: self is to brother as self is to ideal, caused Kate to remark that "Only the positive qualities he has are close to my ideal. That also says I feel a lot warmer to him than I'd realized."

In conclusion, it appears that there is a split in Kate's family between rational/unstable and controlled/out of control. Kate, her mother and oldest brother took on the rational roles while her father; sister and brother were able to take on the unstable roles. It is interesting to note that both sides are equally divided in terms of the children's gender. It would appear then that Kate continues to play out the rational role in her choice of profession and in her choice of whom she admires at work but still idealizes the emotional and flamboyant as represented by her brother on the other side of her family.

The theme of Kate's drama is reproducing at work the rational part of her family while continuing to attempt personally her ideal of creative, flamboyant emotionalism.

CARL

Present Occupation: School Counsellor

First Occupation: Teacher

Table 13

Significant Roles and Factor Loadings for Each Factor or Type

Roles	Loadings on Each Type
<u>Type 1</u>	
uncle 2	(.88)
principal 1	(.82)
mother	(.66)
father	(.58)
ideal self	(.57)
co-worker 1	(.47)
<u>Type 2</u>	
self	(.83)
ideal counsellor	(.79)
self as counsellor	(.74)
self as teacher	(.70)
son	(.66)
ideal teacher	(.58)
ideal self	(.54)
student	(-.47)

Roles	Loadings on Each Type
<u>Type 3</u>	
grandmother	(.75)
principal 2	(.74)
parent	(.72)
student	(.51)
<u>Type 4</u>	
co-worker 2	(.81)
uncle 3	(.74)
client	(.68)
father	(.52)
co-worker 1	(.49)
<u>Type 5</u>	
uncle 1	(.82)
sister	(.61)

Carl is a 37 year old married male with two children. He has a B.A., M.Ed. and has been working as a counsellor for the past eight years. Carl had one twin sister who was schizophrenic and is now deceased. His father is a sales person and his mother was an occupational health nurse for many years--she is now also a sales person. One of the most memorable events in his childhood was his parents' separation when Carl was 13. At that time, he and his sister stayed with his

bachelor uncle and grandmother and also lived with another uncle who lived two doors down the street.

The results show that Carl is pretty much himself in his work roles, particularly in the current one as counsellor, which is somewhat similar to mother, father and other relatives. However, as a person, Carl is rather distinct although his personal ideal somewhat resembles his mother and father.

Carl's second uncle in particular, and mother and father somewhat resemble the first principal Carl worked for. His grandmother resembles his current principal and parent, and just slightly the student. More aptly, the student is opposite to Carl, and other relatives such as his first uncle. Client and present co-worker are similar to the third uncle. Carl's father and co-worker in his first job are somewhat similar.

The first uncle and Carl's sister share some attributes in common.

The parallels which emerged are: (1) grandson is to grandmother as self is to current principal and parent; and (2) nephew is to uncle as self is to present co-worker and client and son is to father.

In the interview Carl agreed that in some ways he was like his parents at work. "...in terms of interpersonal reaction with people. Both of them, that's the kind of thing they always did, always people connected and I'm doing the same thing in a different area. One was a nurse and my father's a salesman and they're both good at it."

Carl agreed that he was a distinct person and mentioned his father's drive to improve things, his sociability and his energy, as positive ideals.

The fact that his second uncle and his parents somewhat resembled his first principal, intrigued Carl. "It's probably because of their outgoing nature, they're fairly flamboyant, and enjoy a good party, a good time." In addition, second uncle and principal share the attribute of dependability.

Initially Carl said that his grandmother did not particularly resemble his current principal and the parent. But after further thought he said they "...resemble one another in that both tend to say things without giving thought to how it would affect the other person and they may realize it after, what they did."

That the student is the opposite of himself and his relatives evoked a quick "Yes, okay, the insensitivity, lack of consideration made her the opposite to us."

Carl said that client and present co-worker were similar to the third uncle in "Some mannerisms in terms of facial, body mannerisms come to mind. Also they were all energetic, active, hyper, go do things. That's consistent. Also, all were nice people."

He was not able to see any similarities between his sister and first uncle.

The first parallel: grandson is to grandmother as self is to current principal and parent caused Carl to comment "I don't remember. It's different contexts." He did say "the principal is similar to my

father so I learned to deal with him as I do my father, i.e., what do I do when my father reacts this way."

Carl said that the parallel: nephew is to uncle as self is to co-worker and client and son is to father made sense "because the traits they have are similar so I relate to them in a similar way. The energy and the humorousness."

It seems that once again family roles are displaced onto the world of work. Carl followed a family line in being a teacher, like his uncles and grandmother and then branched out but into a similar area. He seems to act at work with co-workers and others as he does with his family.

FRANK

Present Occupation: Divisional Manager (Business Executive)

Table 14

Significant Roles and Factor Loadings for Each Factor or Type

<u>Roles</u>	<u>Loadings on Each Type</u>
<u>Type 1</u>	
mother	(.88)
son	(.86)
self	(.81)
father	(.78)
ideal self	(.72)
self as divisional manager	(.72)
trader	(.61)
ideal divisional manager	(.53)
<u>Type 2</u>	
executive vice president	(.85)
brother	(-.69)
ideal divisional manager	(.67)
trader	(.47)
vice president	(.46)
ideal self	(.45)

Frank is a 62 year old divorced male with a grown family who has been working at his current job for the past 17 years. The oldest of

two boys, his brother died many years ago, an alcoholic on skid row. His father was a lawyer and later became a provincial judge. His mother was a housewife. His father is still alive. Frank is a chartered public accountant and has one year university.

The results indicated that roles fell into one of two types during Frank's sorting. It appears that Frank takes after both his mother and father, both personally, and in a work role. The trader seems more like Frank as a job self than Frank's real self more so than the vice president or the executive vice president. The executive vice president seems almost the opposite of his brother, and to a lesser degree, so are the vice president and the trader. The trader and vice president share some common traits with Frank's ideal self. In addition, Frank sees himself, his self-as-son, his job self and his ideal self as being similar.

The data based parallel is: family (including self) is to an ideal brother (opposite of actual) as self is to executive vice president.

In the interview Frank agreed that he was a blend of both parents. He saw himself as being like his mother in being concerned or at least conscious of other people's opinions of him whereas his father was less concerned about other's opinions. However, Frank noted that while he has the calm exterior of his father, he also has the more emotional interior of his mother.

He found the fact that he was more similar to the trader than the vice president or the executive vice president very interesting.

"Although I certainly don't identify with the trader, we have a couple of characteristics in common but he's more extreme than I am. He has a very tough exterior much more than mine, but he's a marshmallow inside when it comes to someone with a problem, he's much more of a marshmallow than I am. He's a person I have a soft spot for."

Frank agreed readily with the statement that his brother was almost the opposite of his co-workers but cleared his throat and had misty eyes when this statement was read. "I can't see that there's even any emotional resemblance. These fellows, whether or not they have internal difficulty socializing, can do it at least superficially without stress, however they rationalize it. My brother was certainly unable to do that. It was very stressful for him. One of the reasons he took to alcohol was because it eased the problem for him."

The fact that the trader and vice president share some traits in common with his ideal self caused Frank to demur initially. "I don't see the trader and the vice president as having almost anything in common." On further reflection however, he said "Certainly the vice president is precise and is as tough as I feel I should be and the trader is as precise as I'd like to be. He's very well organized which I never feel I am, regrettably." Thus the finding was validated.

When faced with the similarity among self roles Frank appeared pleased but was surprised that he saw himself as son as being similar to his other selves since "I viewed my role as a son as being totally different and apart from the world I live in today."

The parallel: family (including self) is to an ideal brother (opposite of actual) as self is to executive vice president, caused Frank to pause and then to say "I guess almost as much as anybody. Certainly not the other two (co-workers) whom I like and respect. Executive vice president...yeah. I hadn't thought about it, I guess I'm surprised you came up with it." The executive vice president is like an ideal brother in taking "an interest, concerned interest, without overdoing it. He has compassion but also the ability in the event of any disagreement to bring it out front, without animosity. He's a person that you could count on but who wouldn't necessarily expect that that was a favour that had to be returned, who could be demanding without it being threatening (choked voice) in spite of day-to-day needs of having to deal with each other firmly, he could also be a friend."

It appears then that Frank has internalized the role models of both mother and father and while rejecting certain aspects of their personality, feels very warmly towards both of them. Although his brother was intellectually brilliant, he did not realize his potential and ended his life tragically. Although Frank visited with his brother regularly, his parents were unable to accept his condition and attempted to ignore it. Frank still feels grief over the demise of his brother and perhaps sees in his executive vice president the brother he wished he had.

In summary then, Frank became much like his parents and found in the workplace, the ideal brother he may have wished he had.

Conclusion

It would appear then that although each drama and how it is enacted, is idiosyncratic, the finding that people re-enact family roles in the enactment of occupational roles proves to be a possible Type C law (Herbst, 1970). The participants provided subjective validation of the quantitative data by their almost total agreement with the results as well as by their reactions of laughter and tears. In addition, all elaborated on each finding and thus further fleshed out the correlations.

The last chapter discusses the practical and theoretical implications of these findings.

CHAPTER SIX

Discussion

The results indicate substantial interrelationships among members of the self, family and work domains. Further, subjects strongly confirmed these interrelationships both by direct affirmation and by indirect emotional response. Also, they were able to elaborate relationships in a meaningful way, elevating them, at least partially, into a drama of living first learned in the family and later enacted at work. These findings are consistent with the general theoretical proposition that family experience serves as a metaphor for the world. Family roles appear to be displaced onto the work arena, through some unknown process of transformation, where they serve as types or containers for understanding and relating within that domain. In this way, the study replicates and extends the initial work of Baas and Brown (1973) and provides a unique and original framework for conceptualizing how the family influences the occupational domain.

There was little consistency in the displacement of roles. For example, father might be a salient type in work or not salient at all. Father might be a self model at work or a negative model to avoid. Through other workers, one might enact a relation with a substitute father or create a more ideal father one never really had. What exactly is displaced and made a salient part of one's work drama appears to be idiosyncratic. This pattern of evidence is not consistent with either a Type A or Type B law. It is consistent with a Type C

law (Herbst, 1970). That is, relationships and parameters appear to be specific rather than general, but the generating rules are constant. Actually, the generating rule phrased at the level of role correspondence is not constant (e.g., the case of Lou). However, phrased generally as a metaphoric transformation of one's family drama onto the work domain, the rule appears to be constant in these data. What is constant from case to case is that in working, a person re-enacts a drama from one's family of origin.

Delimitations and Limitations of the Study

Correlations are limited in both their subtlety in capturing the ways work is a re-enactment of the family drama and in their ability to uncover complex causes (Glass and Stanley, 1970). However, since family exists prior to work, a direction of influence is at least suggested. This study does not assert that family roles cause work roles or relations and does not show how the transformation occurs; it simply indicates that a Type C regularity exists (Herbst, 1970).

A second delimitation is that in exploring the general proposition that people re-enact family roles at work, the subject has been reduced to correspondences between roles. The two propositions are not the same although role correspondences are a reasonable way to explore dramas. However, correspondences are also a limited form of exploration, as was made apparent in the case of Lou.

The strategy of this research was to explore a theoretical proposition through diverse individual studies. It is not possible to generalize from single cases to a population. However, following

Chassan (1979), who discusses this issue thoroughly, what is found true for one person is apt to hold true for some others. There is little in the present research to discourage the notion that many others are apt to show this pattern since the participants can be said not to diverge significantly from the general population.

Theoretical Implications

The present research provides support for the hypothesis that occupational roles within the context of a person's occupational role will be related to family roles. Several theoretical implications follow.

Influence of family on occupational choice. Roe (1957) and other psychoanalytical thinkers believe that family structure and member interaction help determine the kinds of interactions that the child will learn to develop. This study tends to support this theoretical hypothesis, but extends it by illustrating the idiosyncratic fashion in which individuals choose role models from both the nuclear and extended family. The drama one re-enacts need not be restricted to an actual family pattern, but may also include dramas of fulfillment which were only experienced as potentials previously. As a result, Adler's notion of the child as a creative decision-maker seems to be closer to describing what actually happens (Ansbacher and Ansbacher, 1979).

Thus, contrary to Roe's (1957) theory of family atmosphere where children are seen as passive spectators affected in a one-way fashion by their parents, people seem to be active synthesizers of experience. The participants in the present study provided support for the notion

that people choose role models both while they are young and then later on in life. They then seem to make decisions to be like that model, sometimes irrespective of the length of time they have spent with the significant person. Therefore it would seem that a person acquires a repertoire of roles and dramatic compositions to be enacted, and a person strives to enact those that are more esteemed, more realistic or more compatible with self-definition. However, it must be stressed that the ways roles and dramas are selected is currently unknown.

In conclusion then, the present study supports the hypothesis that the family shapes and continues to determine the course and outcome of its members' lives (Bratcher, 1982).

Although vocational theorists agree that the family is an important determinant of occupational choice, they have seemed to be unable to account for the family's more specific influences (Osipow, 1973). The present research shows how the family influences its members by providing role models. It is important to note that people are also able to enact dramas which were not available to them in their family.

Identification of children with parents. Although it was suggested previously that it seemed plausible that children might often be influenced to strive for an occupational role similar to a parent's since a parent's role tends to be high in the family esteem system, such was not the case in this study. Eight of the ten participants exceeded their parents' educational level, one received less education and one received the same. None of the participants were in the same or similar occupations as their parents. Four participants had similar

status jobs as their parents, five exceeded their parents' status and one has a lower status job than his parents. Thus the normative expectation does not account for how a family influences the occupational role enactment of children. However, what did emerge from the study is the idiosyncratic way participants identified with their parents in enacting a drama. Six people exceeded their parents' socioeconomic status and became more educated. Iris exceeded her parents' status by working full-time and marrying an accountant. Carl followed a family pattern set by his grandmother and uncles of being a teacher before he became a school counsellor. Irma incorporated her mother's strong ambitions and chose a job where she could work for herself, make an excellent salary, and realize ambitions quickly. Dave followed his mother's pattern of not being interested in working but since it is economically necessary for him to work is employed in a job that he can see his mother doing. Frank did not achieve the educational level of his father, a judge, but as an accountant and divisional manager in a large corporation has attained a similar level of success and socioeconomic status.

Self-concept. This research did not investigate self-conception directly, but rather stressed a perspective in which a self role (or conception) is meaningfully placed within the context of family members. Self-concept research in relation to careers might be conducted too narrowly in focusing so exclusively upon how a person construes self. For example, the stability of self-concept might involve a successful metaphoric transformation of family to the world, since people structure

life situations (other roles, for instance) in ways that support a particular role enactment. As another example, the meaning of a particular self-concept is not apparent until it is linked with significant family members, and potentially just significant figures in one's life. This study showed how interrelated the various self roles were and how they are placed in the context of a family drama. A self concept does not appear to be an isolated thing in itself, but rather to be an adoption or combination of roles from a wider repertoire.

Practical Implications

The findings have direct relevance to counselling practice in at least three ways.

Self-awareness. In therapy, a therapist may interview the client to discover which roles are significant to him/her and why they are significant. This may help the individual to understand him/herself more fully by providing some insight into core beliefs and operating principles.

For example, Carly learned that she had modeled the way she lived very closely to the way she perceived her mother and uncle lived. When she realized this several years ago, she decided on some level that there were drawbacks to their approach to the world. This realization enabled Carly to gradually switch to a more assertive stance, that of her youngest sister. The results of the Q-sort brought into awareness and underscored the changes she has undergone, provided her with positive reinforcement and made her conscious of her personal power.

It can be seen, therefore, that insight into how significant others are and how they affect us, may provide an opportunity for an individual to decide whether or not to alter some behavior. Many of the participants in the present study found this learning to be a powerful, almost cathartic experience.

Finally, the use of the Q-sort provides the therapist with valuable information about how people structure their world. This information can be useful in devising therapeutic interventions.

Career counselling. Traditionally in the general trait-factor model (e.g., Tolbert, 1980), the immediate aim is one of matching a person to a suitable job. In contrast, but not in direct opposition, the developmental model initiated largely by the work of Super (1957) aims to promote development. Within this context, the present study is not concerned with matching as traditionally conceived. Rather, it is concerned with a re-enactment of a drama from one's family of origin that is apt to take place in work. Whether one matches well or ill, a drama, it is assumed, will still unfold. A counsellor's concern would be to heighten awareness of which drama is being staged for enactment, and whether it is really a worthwhile one to perform. In this sense, this work contributes to the developmental model of career counselling. However, since setting is important for staging, matching would be an important aspect as well.

Work adjustment. Once a person has learned how he/she operates in the world and exactly which work figures remind him or her of significant others, she/he can learn new strategies for coping with

problematic bosses or co-workers. This self-awareness may also be an aid in discovering when one has found a compatible work atmosphere. One can then choose to enact different and more fulfilling dramas than before. As a result, job and self satisfaction may increase. Minimally, the topic of this study would appear to be a rich area of exploration in helping a person to make work more fulfilling.

Implications for Future Research

- (1) One of the most challenging problems concerns selection from a repertoire. Presumably, a person has a variety of dramas that might be enacted and a variety of types to adopt for oneself or to altercast to others. Very probably, selection (if it may be called that) takes place largely beyond awareness, but how? Are there principles of order which influence selection such as self-esteem?
- (2) How does the actual transformation process work? Surely, there are difficulties in making a metaphorical transformation into an actuality. For example, other people will not necessarily cooperate. What skills, steps, or conditions are involved?
- (3) How do settings limit dramatic enactments? For example, a person entering a job might be situated with three people. While projection is undoubtedly powerful, there are limits. Among other things, they are still three different persons and not just variants of family members. Do different situations cue different dramas?

- (4) Since co-workers tend to correspond to variants of oneself as well as family members, the external drama parallels an internal drama within oneself. What is involved in this internal drama? What outcomes are sought? What is its significance?
- (5) This research hinges upon the notion of a drama. From interviews, it was clear that people re-enact dramas in different ways. Most seem to portray co-workers as family members, leading to the inference that they act toward them as if they were substitute family members. However, Lou enacted a drama of distinctiveness. To be special, one must stand out as different. How many other ways are there? As well, are there a limited number of dramatic types or plots?
- (6) Career change, particularly in mid-life, is an important topic of research at the present time. When people change, do they break away from a family drama or try to more faithfully recreate one? What is the significance of a career change from the perspective of one's family of origin? Beneath the many practical considerations might be a deeper symbolic meaning.
- (7) It appears that some people adopt different role models from the family at different periods. For example, Carly began work enacting her mother's position and later switched toward an emulation of her sister. What is the nature of the qualities that draw one to a role model? How does this change? How do others become significant to us in living our own lives? Are people most open to this influence at certain times?

- (8) In single case generalization, one generalizes to those who are similar to a case in which a certain pattern is evident. For example, Iris partially enacted a more ideal relationship to a more ideal father in work. To predict who else would follow this pattern requires criteria. One criterion would be a negatively viewed father, but other criteria are not apparent. To be able to predict, much work is required to determine the similarity of people manifesting a pattern.
- (9) Last, intuitively it would seem that some dramas are central; they involve core meanings of a life. Other dramas are more peripheral, involving a diminished sense of meaning. What determines or influences the enactment of central rather than peripheral dramas? This question is extremely important both theoretically and practically. A related question involves how dramas from one's family of origin facilitate and hinder living a meaningful, satisfying, and productive life?

Conclusion

The present study examined the theoretical proposition that family experience serves as a metaphor for the world. It found that family roles through a process of transformation appear to be displaced onto the work arena where they serve as containers for understanding and relating within that domain.

Ten individuals, five men and five women, ranging in age from 23 to 62 were recruited through contacts, for participation in the study. All had a minimum of at least one year's experience in their present job.

Participants were selected to represent a diverse range of occupations ranging from parking checker and hairdresser to lawyer and artist.

The single case design was used and each subject was asked to Q-sort roles from self, family of origin and work domains using 46 traits selected from Holland's (1978) Vocational Preference Inventory which characterizes six personality types.

Each participant's results were intercorrelated in order to obtain a correlation matrix of roles. The matrix of intercorrelations was then submitted to factor analysis. A principal components solution was first obtained and was then submitted to a varimax rotation (Boldt, 1980). Participants were given the results and were interviewed in order to provide subjective validation of the findings.

The results indicated substantial interrelationships among roles. In addition, participants strongly confirmed the findings both by direct affirmation, indirect emotional responses, and their ability to elaborate and give meaning to the role relationships.

References

- Allport, G.W. and Oldbert, H.S. Trait-names, a psycholexical study. Psychological Monographs, 1936, 47 (1, whole No. 211).
- Adler, A. Superiority and social interest. Edited by Ansbacher, H.L. and Ansbacher, R.R. New York: W.W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1979.
- Baas, L.R. and Brown, S.R. Generating rules for intensive analysis: The study of transformations. Psychiatry, 1973, 36, 172-183.
- Basow, S.A. and Howe, K.G. Model influence on career choices of college students. Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 1979, 37, 239-243.
- Bem, D.J. and Funder, D.C. Predicting more of the people more of the time: Assessing the personality of situations. Psychological Review, 1978, 85, 485-501.
- Bion, W.R. Transformations. New York: Basic Books, 1965.
- Boldt, W.B. Q-methodology in education. Presentation in Ed 571 on the application of a Q-methodology to problems of practice in education, November, 1980.
- Bratcher, W.E. The influence of the family on career selection: A family perspective. American Personnel and Guidance Journal, October, 1982, 87-91.
- Brown, S.R. Intensive analysis in political research. Political Methodology, 1974, Winter, 1-25.
- Brown, S.R. and Brenner, O.J. (eds.) Science, Psychology and Communication. New York: Teachers College Press, 1972.

- Brunkan, R.J. and Cortes, J.O. An inventory to measure the parental attitudes variables in Roe's theory of occupational choice. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1964, 11, 3-11.
- Brunkan, R.J. Perceived parental attitudes and parental identification in relation to problems in vocational choice. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1965, 12, 39-47.
- Burgoyne, P.H. Concepts of present self, expected self and ideal self in vocational preferences and expectations. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1979, 14, 134-144.
- Byers, A.P., Forrest, G.G. and Jaccasia, J.S. Recalled early parent-child relations, adult needs and occupational choice: A test of Roe's theory. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1968, 15, 324-328.
- Cattell, R.B., Elser, H.W. and Tatsuoka, M.M. Handbook for the Sixteen Personality Questionnaire. Illinois: Institute for personality and ability testing, 1970.
- Chassan, J.B. Research Design in Clinical Psychology and Psychiatry. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1979.
- Childs, D. The Essentials of Factor Analysis. London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Ltd., 1970.
- Cochran, L. Construct systems and the definition of social situations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1978, 36, 733-740.
- Fairweather, J.R. Reliability and validation of Q-method results: some empirical evidence. Operant Subjectivity, 1981, 5, 2-16.

- Ferguson, G.A. Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education.
New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1981.
- Frank, G.H. Note on the reliability of Q-sort data. Psychological Reports, 1956, 2, 182.
- Fretz, B.R. Predicting career preference from preadolescent development. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1972, 19, 286-291.
- Freud, S. The Complete Introductory Lectures in Psychoanalysis.
Edited by Strachey, J. New York: W.W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1966.
- Glass, G.V. and Stanley, J.C. Statistical Methods in Education and Psychology. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.
- Goldenberg, I. and Goldenberg, H. Family Therapy: An Overview.
Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole, 1980.
- Grandy, T.G. and Stahmann, R.F. Types produce types: An examination of personality development using Holland's theory. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1974, 5, 231-239.
- Green, L.B. and Parker, H.J. Parental influences upon adolescents' occupational choice: A test of an aspect of Roe's theory. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1965, 12, 379-383.
- Griffiths, S.J. An investigation of the goals of the laboratory programme in secondary school chemistry courses in British Columbia. Unpublished Master's Thesis, 1974.
- Grigg, A.E. Childhood experience with parental attitude: A test of Roe's hypothesis. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1959, 6, 153-156.

- Hagen, D. Careers and family atmosphere: A test of Roe's theory. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1960, 7, 251-256.
- Hanson, J.T. Ninth grade girls' vocational choices and their parents occupational level. Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 1965, 13, 261-264.
- Harman, H.H. Modern Factor Analysis. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.
- Healy, C.C. Relation of occupational choice to the similarity between self-ratings and occupational ratings. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1968, 15, 317-323.
- Herbst, P.G. Behavioral Worlds: The Study of Single Cases. London: Tavistock, 1970.
- Hilden, A.H. Q-sort correlation: Stability and random choice of statements. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1958, 22, 45-53.
- Holland, J.L. Making vocational choices: A theory of careers. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973.
- Holland, J.L. Vocational Preference Inventory. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc., 1978.
- Hollander, J. Differential parental influences on vocational interest development in adolescent males. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1972, 2, 67-76.
- Hunt, R.A. Self and other semantic concepts in relation to choice of vocation. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1967, 51, 242-246.
- Isabelle, L.A. and Dick, W. Clarity of self-concepts in the vocational development of male liberal arts students. The Canadian Psychologist, 1969, 10, 20-31.

- Jackson, R.M. Father identification, achievement, and occupational behavior of rural youth: One year follow-up. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1974, 4, 349-356.
- Jensen, P.G. and Kirchener, W.K. A national answer to the question, do sons follow their father's occupations? Journal of Applied Psychology, 1955, 39, 419-421.
- Kinnane, J.F. and Pable, M.W. Family background and work value orientation. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1962, 9, 320-325.
- Lasswell, H.D. Intensive and extensive methods of observing the personality-culture manifold. Yenching Journal of Social Studies, 1938, 1, 72-86.
- Lasswell, H.D. Psychopathology and Politics. New York: Viking Press, 1960.
- Lee, G.L. and Dovan, W.J. Vocational persistence: An exploration of self-concept and dissonance theories. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1973, 3, 129-136.
- Livson, N.H. and Nichols, T.F. Discrimination and reliability in Q-sort personality descriptions. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1956, 52, 159-165.
- Maddi, S.R. Personality Theories. Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1976.
- McCall, G.J. and Simmons, J.L. Identities and Interactions. New York: The Free Press, 1978.
- Medvene, A.M. Occupational choice of graduate students in psychology as a function of early parent-child interactions. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1969, 16, 385-389.

- Morrison, R.L. Self-concept implementation in occupational choices. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1962, 9, 255-260.
- Mowesian, R., Heath, B.R.G. and Rothney, J.W.M. Superior students' occupational preferences and their fathers' occupations. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1966, 45, 238-242.
- Nachmann, B. Childhood experience and vocational choice in law, dentistry and social work. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1960, 7, 243-250.
- O'Hara, R.P. and Tiedeman, D.V. Vocational self concept in adolescence. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1962, 9, 255-260.
- Oppenheimer, E.A. The relationship between certain self constructs and occupational preferences. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1966, 13, 191-197.
- Osipow, S.H. Theories of Career Development. New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1973.
- Roe, A. Early determinants of vocational choice. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1957, 4, 216.
- Roe, A. The Psychology of Occupations. New York: Wiley, 1956.
- Roe, A. and Siegelman, M. Origin of Interest. APGA Inquiry Studies - No. 1. Washington, D.C.: American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1964.
- Schuh, A.J. Use of the semantic differential in a test of Super's vocational adjustment theory. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1966, 50, 516-522.
- Schutz, B.A. and Blocher, D.H. Self-satisfaction and level of occupational choice. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1961, 39, 595-598.

- Shapiro, M.B. The single case in clinical-psychological research.
Journal of General Psychology, 1966, 74, 3-23.
- Stephenson, R.R. Occupational choice as a crystallized self-concept.
Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1961, 8, 211-216.
- Stephenson, William The Study of Behavior. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953.
- Super, D.E. The Psychology of Careers. New York: Harper and Row, 1957.
- Super, D.E. Career development: Self-Concept Theory. New York: CEEB Research Monograph No. 4, 1963.
- Switzer, D.K., Grigg, A.E., Miller, J.S. and Young, R.K. Early experiences and occupational choices: A test of Roe's hypothesis.
Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1962, 9, 45-48.
- Tolbert, E.L. Counseling for Career Development. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1980.
- Utton, A.C. Recalled parent-child relations as determinants of vocational choice. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1962, 9, 49-53.
- Werts, C.E. Parental influence on career choice. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1968, 15, 48-52.
- Wheeler, C.L. and Carnes, E.F. Relationships among self-concepts, ideal self-concepts and stereotypes of probable and ideal vocational choices. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1968, 15, 530-535.
- Zeigler, D.J. Self-concept, occupational member concept and occupational interest area relationships in male college students.
Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1970, 17, 133-136.

Ziegler, D.J. Distinctive self and occupational member concepts in different occupational groups. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1973, 3, 53-60.

Reference Note

1. Cochran, L. Position and Personhood. Book in preparation, 1983.

APPENDIX A

A Qualitative Description
of Role Correspondences for Each Participant

Table 2

Does Each Work Role Relate to Selves/Family?

		Selves	Family
Business Executive Frank:			
	trader	yes	yes
	vice president	yes	yes
	executive	yes	yes
Teacher Carly:			
	vice president (present job)	yes	yes
	principal (present job)	yes	yes
	counsellor (present job)	yes	yes
(teacher)	principal (first job)	yes	yes
	grade 6 student (first job)	yes	yes
	grade 12 student (first job)	yes	yes
Lawyer Kate:			
	partner	yes	yes
	judge	yes	yes
	colleague	yes	yes
	client	yes	yes
Hairdresser Irma:			
	supervisor	yes	yes
	co-worker	yes	yes
	client	no	no
...			

		Selves	Family
Parking Checker Dave:			
	field supervisor (present job)	yes	yes
	(rental agent) co-worker (first job)	no	yes
	client (first job)	yes	no
Professor Elizabeth:			
	student	yes	yes
	colleague	yes	yes
	Dean	yes	yes
Photolab Technician Blake:			
	supervisor (present job)	no	yes
	assistant supervisor (present job)	yes	no
	co-worker (present job)	no	yes
(photolab technician)	manager (first job)	yes	yes
	supervisor (first job)	no	yes
	salesman (first job)	yes	yes
Artist Lou:			
	dealer (present job)	yes	yes
	artist (present job)	yes	yes
(restaurant assistant manager)	manager (first job)	no	yes
	executive (first job)	yes	yes
	customer (first job)	yes	yes
Secretary Iris:			
	supervisor (present job)	yes	yes
	graduate assistants (present job)	yes	yes
			...

	Selves	Family
students (present job)	no	yes
office manager (first job)	no	no
co-worker (first job)	yes	yes
salesman (first job)	no	no
Counsellor Carl:		
client (present job)	yes	yes
parent (present job)	no	yes
co-worker (present job)	yes	yes
principal (present job)	no	yes
principal (first job)	yes	yes
co-worker (first job)	yes	yes
student (first job)	yes	yes

Table 3
Does Self as Job Correlate With Selves/Family?

	Selves	Family
Frank	yes	yes
Carly	yes	yes
Kate	yes	yes
Irma	yes	yes
Dave	yes	yes
	yes	yes
Elizabeth	yes	yes
Blake	yes	yes
	yes	yes
Lou	yes	no
	yes	yes
Iris	yes	yes
	yes	yes
Carl	yes	yes
	yes	yes

APPENDIX B

Significant Correlations Between Roles for Each Participant

Table 4
 The Extent to Which Role Types are Mixed
With Self Roles, Family Roles and Work Roles After Varimax Rotation

	Varimax	First Component
Frank	2 of 2 mixed	mixed
	2 of 2 totally mixed	
Carly	5 of 5 mixed	mixed
	3 of 5 totally mixed	
Kate	3 of 4 mixed	mixed
	0 of 4 totally mixed	
Irma	2 of 3 mixed	mixed
	2 of 3 totally mixed	
Dave	3 of 4 mixed	mixed
	1 of 4 totally mixed	
Elizabeth	4 of 4 mixed	mixed
	1 of 4 totally mixed	
Blake	4 of 5 mixed	mixed
	0 of 5 totally mixed	
Lou	5 of 5 mixed	mixed
	2 of 5 totally mixed	
Iris	5 of 5 mixed	mixed
	2 of 5 totally mixed	
Carl	4 of 5 mixed	mixed
	1 of 5 totally mixed	

IRIS

First Occupation: Girl Friday

Present Occupation: Secretary

Roles Elicited From the Participant for Each Domain

<u>Self</u>	<u>Family</u>
self	mother
ideal self	father
self as daughter	second oldest sister
	brother
	second youngest sister
<u>Job 1</u>	<u>Job 2</u>
ideal girl Friday	ideal secretary
self as girl Friday	self as secretary
office manager	supervisor
co-worker	graduate assistants
salesmen	students

<u>Roles</u>	<u>Roles</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
self:	ideal self	.70
self:	daughter	.57
self:	mother	.35
self:	second oldest sister	.45
self:	brother	.61
self:	ideal girl Friday 1	.32
self:	self as girl Friday 1	.54

self:	co-worker 1	.56
self:	ideal secretary 2	.52
self:	self as secretary 2	.75
self:	supervisor 2	.75
self:	graduate assistants 2	.65
self:	students 2	.37
ideal self:	self as daughter	.70
ideal self:	mother	.47
ideal self:	second oldest sister	.40
ideal self:	brother	.68
ideal self:	ideal girl Friday 1	.47
ideal self:	self as girl Friday 1	.35
ideal self:	co-worker 1	.78
ideal self:	ideal secretary 2	.60
ideal self:	self as secretary 2	.65
ideal self:	supervisor 2	.60
ideal self:	graduate assistants 2	.63
self as daughter:	mother	.41
self as daughter:	brother	.54
self as daughter:	second youngest sister	-.57
self as daughter:	ideal girl Friday 1	.53
self as daughter:	self as girl Friday 1	.34
self as daughter:	co-worker 1	.65
self as daughter:	ideal secretary 2	.55

self as daughter:	self as secretary 2	.49
self as daughter:	supervisor 2	.33
self as daughter:	graduate assistants 2	.32
mother:	second oldest sister	.56
mother:	brother	
mother:	second youngest sister	-.36
mother:	self as girl Friday 1	.36
mother:	co-worker 1	.50
mother:	ideal secretary 2	.38
mother:	self as secretary 2	.39
father:	co-worker 1	-.31
father:	supervisor 2	-.33
father:	graduate assistants 2	-.36
second oldest sister:	brother	.49
second oldest sister:	self as girl Friday 1	.36
second oldest sister:	self as secretary 2	.33
second oldest sister:	supervisor 2	.44
second oldest sister:	graduate assistants 2	.37
second oldest sister:	students 2	.39
brother:	second youngest sister	-.41
brother:	ideal girl Friday 1	.52
brother:	self as girl Friday 1	.47
brother:	co-worker 1	.63

brother:	ideal secretary 2	.64
brother:	self as secretary 2	.49
brother:	supervisor 2	.54
brother:	graduate assistants 2	.50
second youngest sister:	self as girl Friday 1	-.35
second youngest sister:	ideal secretary 2	-.33
ideal girl Friday:	office manager 1	.58
ideal girl Friday:	co-worker 1	.56
ideal girl Friday:	salesman 1	.52
ideal girl Friday:	ideal secretary 2	.75
ideal girl Friday:	self as secretary 2	.32
ideal girl Friday:	graduate assistants 2	.40
self as girl Friday:	co-worker 1	.40
self as girl Friday:	ideal secretary 2	.49
self as girl Friday:	self as secretary 2	.54
self as girl Friday:	supervisor 2	.49
office manager 1:	salesman 1	.53
co-worker 1:	salesman 1	.33
co-worker 1:	ideal secretary 2	.67
co-worker 1:	self as secretary 2	.62
co-worker 1:	supervisor 2	.54
co-worker 1:	graduate assistants 2	.50

salesman 1:	ideal secretary 2	.35
salesman 1:	self as secretary 2	.38
salesman 1:	graduate assistants 2	.39
ideal secretary:	self as secretary 2	.56
ideal secretary:	supervisor 2	.40
ideal secretary:	graduate assistants 2	.37
self as secretary:	supervisor 2	.65
self as secretary:	graduate assistants 2	.42
supervisor 2:	graduate assistants 2	.39
graduate assistants 2:	students 2	.55

CARLY

First Occupation: Teacher

Present Occupation: Teacher

Roles Elicited From the Participant for Each Domain

<u>Self</u>	<u>Family</u>
self	mother
ideal self	father
self as daughter	cousin
	uncle
	youngest sister
<u>Job 1</u>	<u>Job 2</u>
ideal teacher	ideal teacher
self as teacher	self as teacher
principal	vice principal
grade 6 student	principal
grade 11 and 12 students	counsellor
co-worker	

<u>Roles</u>	<u>Roles</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
self:	ideal self	.40
self:	self as daughter	.57
self:	mother	.41
self:	uncle	.54
self:	youngest sister	.60
self:	ideal teacher	.42

self:	self as teacher 1	.39
self:	principal 1	.53
self:	grade 6 student 1	-.34
self:	ideal teacher 2	.39
self:	self as teacher 2	.59
self:	vice principal 2	.56
self:	counsellor 2	.60
ideal self:	father	-.30
ideal self:	uncle	.35
ideal self:	youngest sister	.46
ideal self:	ideal teacher 1	.71
ideal self:	principal 1	.37
ideal self:	grade 11 and 12 students 1	.32
ideal self:	co-worker 1	.46
ideal self:	ideal teacher 2	.71
ideal self:	principal 2	-.44
ideal self:	counsellor 2	.36
self as daughter:	mother	.64
self as daughter:	uncle	.53
self as daughter:	ideal teacher 1	.33
self as daughter:	self as teacher 1	.46
self as daughter:	principal 1	.47
self as daughter:	grade 6 student 1	-.34
self as daughter:	grade 11 and 12 students 1	.41

self as daughter:	self as teacher 2	.43
self as daughter:	vice principal 2	.56
self as daughter:	counsellor 2	.40
mother:	uncle	.56
mother:	self as teacher 1	.52
mother:	principal 1	.45
mother:	grade 11 and 12 student 1	.34
mother:	vice principal 2	.33
mother:	counsellor 2	.30
father:	youngest sister	-.47
father:	ideal teacher 1	-.53
father:	principal 1	-.40
father:	co-worker 1	-.34
father:	ideal teacher 2	-.38
father:	self as teacher 2	-.33
father:	principal 2	.39
uncle:	youngest sister	.30
uncle:	ideal teacher 1	.34
uncle:	self as teacher 1	.36
uncle:	principal 1	.38
uncle:	ideal teacher 2	.30
uncle:	self as teacher 2	.33
uncle:	counsellor 2	.36

youngest sister:	ideal teacher 1	.52
youngest sister:	principal 1	.54
youngest sister:	grade 6 student 1	-.32
youngest sister:	co-worker 1	.42
youngest sister:	ideal teacher 2	.45
youngest sister:	self as teacher 2	.63
youngest sister:	vice principal 2	.42
youngest sister:	principal 2	-.38
youngest sister:	counsellor 2	.57
ideal teacher 1:	self as teacher 1	.32
ideal teacher 1:	principal 1	.69
ideal teacher 1:	grade 11 and 12 students 1	.59
ideal teacher 1:	co-worker 1	.61
ideal teacher 1:	ideal teacher 2	.88
ideal teacher 1:	self as teacher 2	.43
ideal teacher 1:	vice principal 2	.34
ideal teacher 1:	principal 2	-.45
ideal teacher 1:	counsellor 2	.57
self as teacher 1:	principal 1	.55
self as teacher 1:	grade 11 and 12 students 1	.38
self as teacher 1:	co-worker 1	.34
self as teacher 1:	self as teacher 2	.46
self as teacher 1:	counsellor 2	.35

principal 1:	grade 11 and 12 students 1	.68
principal 1:	co-worker 1	.56
principal 1:	ideal teacher 2	.65
principal 1:	self as teacher 2	.65
principal 1:	vice principal 2	.65
principal 1:	vice principal 2	.77
grade 6 student 1:	self as teacher 2	-.40
grade 6 student 1:	vice principal 2	-.60
grade 6 student 1:	principal 2	.32
grade 6 student 1:	counsellor 2	-.44
grade 11 and 12 students 1:	co-worker 1	.49
grade 11 and 12 students 1:	ideal teacher 2	.54
grade 11 and 12 students 1:	self as teacher 2	.38
grade 11 and 12 students 1:	vice principal 2	.36
grade 11 and 12 students 1:	counsellor 2	.36
co-worker 1:	ideal teacher 2	.58
co-worker 1:	self as teacher 2	.50
co-worker 1:	counsellor 2	.45
ideal teacher 2:	self as teacher 2	.41
ideal teacher 2:	principal 2	-.46
ideal teacher 2:	counsellor 2	.64
self as teacher 2:	vice principal 2	.64
self as teacher 2:	counsellor 2	.66

132

vice principal 2:	counsellor 2	.69
principal 2:	counsellor 2	-.37

BLAKE

First Occupation: Photolab Technician

Present Occupation: Photolab Technician

Roles Elicited From the Participant for Each Domain

<u>Self</u>	<u>Family</u>
self	mother
ideal self	father
self as son	brother
	grandfather
<u>Job 1</u>	<u>Job 2</u>
ideal photolab technician	self as photolab technician
self as photolab technician	ideal photolab technician
general manager	supervisor
supervisor	assistant supervisor
salesman	co-worker

<u>Roles</u>	<u>Roles</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
self:	self as son	.48
self:	self as photolab technician 1	.36
self:	general manager	-.38
ideal self:	mother	.33
ideal self:	brother	-.46
ideal self:	grandfather	.69
ideal self:	self as photolab technician 1	.40

ideal self:	general manager 1	-.40
ideal self:	salesman 1	-.42
ideal self:	self as photolab technician 1	.34
ideal self:	ideal photolab technician 1	.34
ideal self:	assistant supervisor 1	-.30
son:	self as photolab technician 1	.45
son:	salesman 1	-.37
son:	self as photolab technician 2	.34
son:	assistant supervisor 2	-.33
mother:	grandfather	.32
mother:	salesman 1	-.30
mother:	self as photolab technician 1	.36
brother:	supervisor 1	.46
brother:	salesman 1	.31
brother:	supervisor 2	.40
brother:	co-worker 2	.33
grandfather:	self as photolab technician 1	.32
grandfather:	self as photolab technician 2	.32
ideal photolab technician:	self as photolab technician 1	.39
ideal photolab technician:	self as photolab technician 2	.42
ideal photolab technician:	ideal photolab technician 2	.64
self as photolab technician 1:	salesman 1	-.30

self as photolab technician 1:	self as photolab technician 2	.65
self as photolab technician 1:	ideal photolab technician 2	.44
general manager 1:	salesman 1	.63
general manager 1:	assistant supervisor	.63
general manager 1:	co-worker 2	.48
supervisor 1:	self as photolab technician 2	.38
supervisor 1:	supervisor 2	.53
supervisor 1:	assistant supervisor 2	.31
supervisor 1:	co-worker 2	.44
salesman 1:	supervisor 2	.36
salesman 1:	assistant supervisor 2	.52
self as photolab technician 2:	ideal photolab technician 2	.52
self as photolab technician 2:	co-worker 2	.37
supervisor 2:	co-worker 2	.48
assistant supervisor 2	co-worker 2	.36

IRMA

Present Occupation: Hairstylist

Roles Elicited From the Participant for Each DomainSelf

self

ideal self

self as daughter

Family

mother

father

brother

aunt

Job

ideal hairstylist

self as hairstylist

client

supervisor

co-worker

Roles

self:

self:

self:

self:

self:

self:

self:

self:

Roles

ideal self

self as daughter

mother

father

brother

aunt

ideal hairstylist

self as hairstylist

Correlation
Coefficient

.56

.38

.44

.60

.40

.32

.56

.46

self:	supervisor	.53
self:	co-worker	.42
ideal self:	self as daughter	.61
ideal self:	mother	.63
ideal self:	father	.61
ideal self:	aunt	.56
ideal self:	ideal hairstylist	.61
ideal self:	self as hairstylist	.49
ideal self:	supervisor	.68
ideal self:	co-worker	.46
self as daughter:	mother	.77
self as daughter:	father	.62
self as daughter:	brother	.80
self as daughter:	aunt	.79
self as daughter:	ideal hairstylist	.50
self as daughter:	self as hairstylist	.46
self as daughter:	supervisor	.65
self as daughter:	co-worker	.75
mother:	father	.67
mother:	brother	.80
mother:	aunt	.73
mother:	ideal hairstylist	.50
mother:	self as hairstylist	.53

mother:	supervisor	.67
mother:	co-worker	.65
father:	brother	.76
father:	aunt	.64
father:	ideal hairstylist	.50
father:	self as hairstylist	.53
father:	supervisor	.67
father:	co-worker	.65
brother:	aunt	.71
brother:	ideal hairstylist	.58
brother:	self as hairstylist	.64
brother:	supervisor	.63
brother:	co-worker	.61
aunt:	ideal hairstylist	.33
aunt:	self as hairstylist	.33
aunt:	supervisor	.59
aunt:	co-worker	.70
ideal hairstylist:	self as hairstylist	.86
ideal hairstylist:	supervisor	.68
ideal hairstylist:	co-worker	.34
self as hairstylist:	supervisor	.60
supervisor:	co-worker	.56

DAVE

First Occupation: Rental Agent

Present Occupation: Parking Checker

Roles Elicited From the Participant for Each Domain

<u>Self</u>	<u>Family</u>
self	father
ideal self	mother
self as son	sister
<u>Job 1</u>	<u>Job 2</u>
ideal rental agent	ideal parking checker
self as rental agent	self as parking checker
co-worker	field supervisor
customer	

<u>Roles</u>	<u>Roles</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
self:	ideal self	.65
self:	self as son	.78
self:	mother	.53
self:	customer 1	-.31
self:	field supervisor 2	.51
ideal self:	self as son	.60
ideal self:	mother	.44
ideal self:	self as rental agent 1	.31
ideal self:	field supervisor 2	.51

self as son:	mother	.50
self as son:	sister	.34
self as son:	self as rental agent 1	.34
self as son:	customer 1	-.40
self as son:	field supervisor 2	.31
mother:	ideal rental agent 1	.36
mother:	co-worker 1	.31
mother:	field supervisor 2	.72
father:	self as rental agent 1	.31
father:	self as parking checker 2	.36
ideal rental agent 1:	self as rental agent 1	.64
ideal rental agent 1:	co-worker 1	.34
ideal rental agent 1:	ideal parking checker 2	.59
ideal rental agent 1:	self as parking checker 2	.40
ideal rental agent 1:	field supervisor 2	.66
self as rental agent 1:	co-worker 1	.30
self as rental agent 1:	ideal parking checker 2	.60
self as rental agent 1:	self as parking checker 2	.66
self as rental agent 1:	field supervisor 2	.37
co-worker 1:	field supervisor 2	.38
customer 1:	field supervisor 2	-.33

ideal parking checker 2:	self as parking checker 2	.55
ideal parking checker 2:	field supervisor 2	.31

LOU

First Occupation: Restaurant Worker

Present Occupation: Artist

Roles Elicited From the Participant for Each Domain

<u>Self</u>	<u>Family</u>
self	mother
ideal self	father
self as son	oldest brother
	sister
	brother
<u>Job 2</u>	<u>Job 1</u>
self as artist	self as restaurant worker
ideal artist	customer
dealer	manager
contemporary artist	executive

<u>Roles</u>	<u>Roles</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
self:	ideal self	.50
self:	executive	-.33
self:	self as artist	.60
self:	ideal artist	.59
self:	contemporary artist	.55
ideal self:	father	-.46
ideal self:	sister	-.42

ideal self:	customer 1	-.56
ideal self:	ideal artist 2	.66
ideal self:	dealer 2	.56
ideal self:	contemporary artist 2	.46
son:	mother	.46
son:	father	.33
son:	sister	.36
son:	brother	.41
son:	self as restaurant worker 1	.41
son:	ideal restaurant worker 1	-.45
son:	customer 1	.55
son:	contemporary artist 2	.32
mother:	oldest brother	.32
mother:	sister	.47
mother:	brother	.30
mother:	self as restaurant worker 1	-.34
mother:	customer 1	.32
mother:	contemporary artist 2	.38
father:	customer 1	.45
father:	ideal artist	-.33
father:	contemporary artist 2	-.31
oldest brother:	manager 1	.42
oldest brother:	executive 1	.33

oldest brother:	dealer 2	.32
oldest brother:	contemporary artist 2	.34
sister:	manager 1	.58
sister:	executive 1	.41
sister:	customer 1	.45
brother:	ideal restaurant worker 1	-.32
brother:	dealer 2	-.32
self as restaurant worker 1	ideal restaurant worker 1	.72
self as restaurant worker 1	contemporary artist 2	-.44
ideal restaurant worker 1	customer 1	-.41
ideal restaurant worker 1	dealer 2	.39
manager 1:	executive 1	.74
executive 1:	self as artist 2	-.38
customer 1:	dealer 2	-.45
self as artist 2:	ideal artist 2	.67
self as artist 2:	contemporary artist 2	.48
ideal artist 2:	dealer 2	.40
ideal artist 2:	artist 2	.76

ELIZABETH

Present Occupation: Professor

Roles Elicited From the Participant for Each DomainSelf

self

ideal self

self as daughter

Family

mother

father

brother

cousin

aunt

Job

self as professor

ideal professor

student

colleague

Dean

<u>Roles</u>	<u>Roles</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
self:	ideal self	.71
self:	self as daughter	.51
self:	aunt	.50
self:	self as professor	.83
self:	ideal professor	.56
self:	student	.55
self:	colleague	.41
self:	Dean	-.69

ideal self:	brother	-.36
ideal self:	aunt	.60
ideal self:	self as professor	.76
ideal self:	ideal professor	.82
ideal self:	student	.74
ideal self:	Dean	-.60
self as daughter:	mother	.45
self as daughter:	self as professor	.59
self as daughter:	student	.32
father:	cousin	.44
father:	aunt	.52
father:	colleague	.40
brother:	ideal professor	-.32
brother:	student	-.33
cousin:	aunt	.39
aunt:	self as professor	.53
aunt:	ideal professor	.43
aunt:	student	.36
aunt:	colleague	.54
aunt:	Dean	-.44
self as professor:	ideal professor	.69
self as professor:	student	.62

self as professor:	Dean	-.65
ideal professor:	student	.82
ideal professor:	Dean	-.45
student:	Dean	-.44

KATE

Present Occupation: Lawyer

Roles Elicited From the Participant for Each DomainSelf

self

ideal self

self as daughter

Family

mother

father

sister

oldest brother

brother

Job

self as lawyer

ideal lawyer

law partner of firm

colleague

judge

client

<u>Roles</u>	<u>Roles</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
self:	ideal self	.46
self:	self as daughter	.75
self:	mother	.50
self:	sister	.40
self:	oldest brother	.69
self:	self as lawyer	.75
self:	ideal lawyer	.48

self:	partner	.39
self:	colleague	.60
self:	judge	.40
self:	client	.60
ideal self:	self as daughter	.44
ideal self:	mother	.36
ideal self:	brother	.49
ideal self:	self as lawyer	.36
ideal self:	ideal lawyer	.54
ideal self:	colleague	.49
ideal self:	client	.55
self as daughter:	mother	.61
self as daughter:	oldest brother	.63
self as daughter:	self as lawyer	.63
self as daughter:	ideal lawyer	.45
self as daughter:	partner	.32
self as daughter:	colleague	.50
self as daughter:	judge	.38
self as daughter:	client	.60
mother:	oldest brother	.52
mother:	self as lawyer	.33
mother:	ideal lawyer	.31
mother:	colleague	.46
mother:	client	.52

father:	sister	.66
sister:	self as lawyer	.33
sister:	colleague	.40
oldest brother:	self as lawyer	.63
oldest brother:	ideal lawyer	.34
oldest brother:	partner	.53
oldest brother:	colleague	.47
oldest brother:	judge	.53
oldest brother:	client	.53
brother:	judge	-.32
brother:	client	.35
self as lawyer:	ideal lawyer	.66
self as lawyer:	partner	.75
self as lawyer:	colleague	.65
self as lawyer:	judge	.59
self as lawyer:	client	.59
ideal lawyer:	partner	.46
ideal lawyer:	colleague	.54
ideal lawyer:	judge	.56
ideal lawyer:	client	.59
partner:	colleague	.55
partner:	judge	.72
partner:	client	.37

colleague:	judge	.36
colleague:	client	.60
judge:	client	.40

CARL

First Occupation: Teacher

Present Occupation: Elementary School Counsellor

Roles Elicited From the Participant for Each Domain

<u>Self</u>	<u>Family</u>
self	mother
ideal self	father
self as son	uncle 1
	uncle 2
	uncle 3
	sister
	grandmother
<u>Job 1</u>	<u>Job 2</u>
self as teacher	self as counsellor
ideal teacher	ideal counsellor
principal	client
co-worker	parent
student	co-worker
	principal

<u>Roles</u>	<u>Roles</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
self:	ideal self	.50
self:	self as son	.50
self:	uncle 1	.37
self:	sister	.34

self:	grandmother	.33
self:	self as teacher 1	.44
self:	student 1	.40
self:	self as counsellor 2	.60
self:	ideal counsellor 2	.68
ideal self:	mother	.42
ideal self:	father	.44
ideal self:	uncle 1	.32
ideal self:	uncle 2	.50
ideal self:	uncle 3	.40
ideal self:	self as teacher 1	.53
ideal self:	ideal teacher 1	.60
ideal self:	principal 1	.37
ideal self:	co-worker 1	.38
ideal self:	self as counsellor 2	.60
ideal self:	ideal counsellor 2	.73
ideal self:	co-worker 2	.45
self as son:	uncle 1	.46
self as son:	sister	.53
self as son:	self as teacher 1	.38
self as son:	student 1	-.39
self as son:	self as counsellor 2	.42
self as son:	ideal counsellor 2	.50

mother:	father	.59
mother:	uncle 1	.38
mother:	uncle 2	.64
mother:	grandmother	.34
mother:	ideal teacher 1	.48
mother:	principal 1	.47
mother:	co-worker 1	.36
mother:	self as counsellor 2	.46
mother:	ideal counsellor 2	.36
mother:	parent 2	.37
father:	uncle 2	.66
father:	uncle 3	.60
father:	ideal teacher 1	.50
father:	principal 1	.46
father:	self as counsellor 2	.32
father:	ideal counsellor 2	.32
father:	client 2	.40
father:	parent 2	.32
father:	co-worker 2	.54
uncle 1:	sister	.42
uncle 1:	student 1	-.49
uncle 1:	self as counsellor 2	.37
uncle 1:	ideal counsellor 2	.45

uncle 2:	uncle 3	.49
uncle 2:	ideal teacher 1	.56
uncle 2:	principal 1	.71
uncle 2:	co-worker 1	.48
uncle 2:	self as counsellor 2	.41
uncle 2:	ideal counsellor 2	.39
uncle 2:	co-worker 2	.31
sister:	self as teacher 1	.33
sister:	student 1	-.33
sister:	ideal counsellor 2	.38
uncle 3:	self as teacher 1	.36
uncle 3:	ideal teacher 1	.46
uncle 3:	co-worker 1	.42
uncle 3:	client 2	.31
uncle 3:	co-worker 2	.63
grandmother:	self as counsellor 2	.42
grandmother:	parent 2	.43
grandmother:	principal 2	.32
self as teacher 1:	ideal teacher 1	.62
self as teacher 1:	principal 1	.37
self as teacher 1:	co-worker 1	.35
self as teacher 1:	student 1	-.32
self as teacher 1:	self as counsellor 2	.49

self as teacher 1:	ideal counsellor 2	.66
ideal teacher 1:	principal 1	.54
ideal teacher 1:	co-worker 1	.49
ideal teacher 1:	student 1	-.33
ideal teacher 1:	self as counsellor 2	.66
ideal teacher 1:	ideal counsellor 2	.69
ideal teacher 1:	client 2	.33
ideal teacher 1:	co-worker 2	.43
principal 1:	co-worker 1	.49
principal 1:	self as counsellor 2	.34
principal 1:	ideal counsellor 2	.44
co-worker 1:	client 2	.33
co-worker 1:	co-worker 2	.38
student 1:	ideal counsellor 2	-.48
student 1:	principal 2	.52
self as counsellor 2:	ideal counsellor 2	.73
self as counsellor 2:	parent 2	.34
client 2:	co-worker 2	.37
parent 2:	co-worker 2	.30
parent 2:	principal 2	.38

FRANK

Present Occupation: Business Executive

Roles Elicited From the Participant for Each DomainSelf

self

ideal self

self as son

Family

mother

father

brother

Job

self as divisional manager

ideal divisional manager

trader

vice president

executive vice president

<u>Roles</u>	<u>Roles</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
self:	ideal self	.53
self:	self as son	.64
self:	mother	.64
self:	father	.53
self:	self as divisional manager	.54
self:	ideal divisional manager	.34
self:	trader	.49
ideal self:	self as son	.67
ideal self:	mother	.57

ideal self:	father	.60
ideal self:	self as divisional manager	.54
ideal self:	ideal divisional manager	.80
ideal self:	trader	.53
ideal self:	executive vice president	.31
self as son:	mother	.75
self as son:	father	.65
self as son:	self as divisional manager	.59
self as son:	ideal divisional manager	.51
self as son:	trader	.57
mother:	father	.73
mother:	self as divisional manager	.51
mother:	ideal divisional manager	.40
mother:	trader	.42
mother:	vice president	.30
father:	self as divisional manager	.46
father:	ideal divisional manager	.44
father:	trader	.49
father:	vice president	.32
brother:	executive vice president	-.42
self as divisional manager:	ideal divisional manager	.48
self as divisional manager:	trader	.47

ideal divisional manager:	trader	.56
ideal divisional manager:	vice president	.43
ideal divisional manager:	executive vice president	.48
trader:	vice president	.43
trader:	executive vice president	.40
vice president:	executive vice president	.33

APPENDIX C

Distinguishing Attributes
and Significant Z Scores for Each Participant

IRIS

Significant Roles for Each Factor or Type

Type 1	Type 2	Type 3	Type 4	Type 5
father supervisor self as secretary self	daughter ideal self co-worker brother ideal secretary ideal girl Friday 2nd youngest sister self self as secretary graduate assistants	office manager salesmen ideal girl Friday	students graduate assistants 2nd oldest sister 2nd youngest sister	2nd oldest sister mother self as girl Friday

Top Five and Bottom Five Distinguishing Attributes and Significant Z* Scores for Each Factor or Type

Type 1	Z Score	Type 2	Z Score	Type 3	Z Score	Type 4	Z Score	Type 5	Z Score
sociable	2.03	mature	2.19	competitive	2.01	intelligent	2.28	caring	2.04
self-controlled	1.72	intelligent	1.86	status oriented	1.69	ambitious	2.28	helpful	1.95
appealing	1.63	realistic	1.29	ambitious	1.60	appealing	1.54	self-insightful	1.68
conventional	1.47	responsible	1.27	orderly	1.38	expressive	1.31	understanding	1.60
independent	1.31	self-insightful	1.20	practical	1.19	creative	1.31	sensitive	1.11
artistic	-1.35	competitive	-1.47	flexible	-1.19	precise	-1.37	adventurous	-1.35
introverted	-1.44	emotional	-1.53	spontaneous	-1.73	introverted	-1.49	blunt	-1.60
intellectual	-1.66	blunt	-1.55	emotional	-1.79	affectionate	-1.54	precise	-1.62
sensitive	-1.75	idealistic	-2.09	affectionate	-2.14	orderly	-1.76	intellectual	-1.86
precise	-1.78	hard headed	-2.28	introverted	-2.40	self-controlled	-1.94	hard-headed	-2.11

* Z scores exceeding ± 1.00 were significant.

CARLY

Significant Roles for Each Factor or Type

Type 1	Type 2	Type 3	Type 4	Type 5
grade 11 and 12 students co-worker principal 1 ideal teacher 1 ideal teacher 2	mother daughter uncle self as teacher 1 self	vice principal self as teacher 2 counsellor grade 6 student youngest sister self principal 1	cousin principal 2 grade 6 student	ideal self ideal teacher 2 ideal teacher 1 youngest sister principal 2

Top Five and Bottom Five Distinguishing Attributes and Significant Z Scores for Each Factor or Type

Type 1	Z Score	Type 2	Z Score	Type 3	Z Score	Type 4	Z Score	Type 5	Z Score
trustworthy	2.14	responsible	2.16	realistic	2.31	caring	2.11	enthusiastic	1.85
sociable	2.08	helpful	1.80	understanding	2.04	sensitive	1.92	creative	1.64
appealing	1.56	idealistic	1.74	trustworthy	1.74	practical	1.73	self-insightful	1.55
understanding	1.51	caring	1.50	responsible	1.45	intellectual	1.58	spontaneous	1.46
helpful	1.45	emotional	1.44	helpful	1.44	idealistic	1.43	sensitive	1.37
competitive	-1.45	self-insightful	-1.31	status-oriented	-1.32	artistic	-1.36	dominant	-1.30
precise	-1.50	realistic	-1.32	imaginative	-1.36	flexible	-1.36	conventional	-1.57
independent	-1.59	expressive	-1.32	adventurous	-1.38	extroverted	-1.43	conforming	-1.83
ambitious	-1.69	pleasure seeking	-1.63	dominant	-1.76	independent	-2.11	hard-headed	-1.85
status-oriented	-1.72	independent	-2.28	artistic	-1.88	realistic	-2.41	competitive	-2.11

BLAKE

Significant Roles for Each Factor or Type

Type 1	Type 2	Type 3	Type 4	Type 5
son self general manager assistant supervisor salesman	ideal photolab technician 1 ideal photolab technician 2 self as photolab technician 1 self as photolab technician 2	supervisor 2 supervisor 1 co-worker brother	grandfather ideal self mother	father mother

Top Five and Bottom Five Distinguishing Attributes and Significant Z Scores for Each Factor or Type

Type 1	Z Score	Type 2	Z Score	Type 3	Z Score	Type 4	Z Score	Type 5	Z Score
independent	2.18	intelligent	2.21	emotional	2.20	mature	2.04	appealing	2.06
competitive	1.95	orderly	2.13	sensitive	2.10	understanding	1.93	intelligent	2.06
emotional	1.51	independent	2.12	conforming	1.68	caring	1.56	extroverted	1.54
ambitious	1.46	creative	1.62	self-insightful	1.61	affectionate	1.46	hard-headed	1.54
persistent	1.28	self-controlled	1.26	hard-headed	1.49	sensitive	1.36	realistic	1.03
adventurous	-1.45	ambitious	-1.18	realistic	-1.23	introverted	-1.55	spontaneous	-1.54
intellectual	-1.65	intellectual	-1.23	dominant	-1.36	pleasure seeking	-1.64	persuasive	-1.54
artistic	-1.72	dominant	-1.30	artistic	-1.63	hard-headed	-1.67	understanding	-1.54
realistic	-1.78	emotional	-1.33	mature	-1.70	ambitious	-1.70	artistic	-2.06
persuasive	-1.97	idealistic	-1.59	intellectual	-2.36	competitive	-2.04	affectionate	-2.06

IRMA

Significant Roles for Each Factor or Type

Type 1	Type 2	Type 3
aunt	ideal hairstylist	client
daughter	self as hairstylist	
co-worker	self	
mother	supervisor	
brother	ideal self	
father	father	
supervisor	brother	
ideal self		

Top Five and Bottom Five Distinguishing
Attributes and Significant Z Scores for Each Factor or Type

Type 1	Z Score	Type 2	Z Score	Type 3	Z Score
trustworthy	1.90	intelligent	2.08	self-insightful	2.06
affectionate	1.74	independent	1.97	pleasure seeking	2.06
caring	1.70	artistic	1.62	dominant	1.54
sensitive	1.42	sociable	1.48	sociable	1.54
understanding	1.29	self-controlled	1.54	persistent	1.54
introverted	-1.44	dominant	-1.24	imaginative	-1.54
deliberate	-1.55	deliberate	-1.77	adventurous	-1.54
dominant	-1.57	blunt	-1.91	practical	-1.54
hard headed	-2.01	hard headed	-1.92	active	-2.06
blunt	-2.21	introverted	-2.30	introverted	-2.06

DAVE

Significant Roles for Each Factor or Type

Type 1	Type 2	Type 3	Type 4
self	self as parking checker	field supervisor	sister
son	self as rental agent	co-worker	
ideal self	ideal parking checker	ideal rental agent	
customer	father	mother	
mother		ideal parking checker	
field supervisor			

Top Five and Bottom Five Distinguishing Attributes and Significant Z Scores for Each Factor or Type

Type 1	Z Score	Type 2	Z Score	Type 3	Z Score	Type 4	Z Score
sensitive	1.94	responsible	1.92	helpful	1.98	sensitive	1.86
emotional	1.93	mature	1.89	sociable	1.65	independent	1.86
trustworthy	1.78	trustworthy	1.67	feminine	1.60	hard headed	1.86
caring	1.58	masculine	1.44	understanding	1.52	emotional	1.39
responsible	1.58	<u>self-controlled</u>	1.40	<u>appealing</u>	1.37	<u>adventurous</u>	1.39
status oriented	-1.52	emotional	-1.54	competitive	-1.41	dominant	-1.39
competitive	-1.55	competitive	-1.60	deliberate	-1.57	status oriented	-1.39
introverted	-1.60	feminine	-1.83	masculine	-1.79	expressive	-1.86
dominant	-1.64	sensitive	-1.93	dominant	-1.98	orderly	-1.86
feminine	-2.16	affectionate	-2.14	introverted	-2.29	masculine	-1.86

LOU

Significant Roles for Each Factor or Type

Type 1	Type 2	Type 3	Type 4	Type 5
self as artist ideal artist self contemporary artist ideal self	ideal restaurant worker self as restaurant worker brother dealer son customer	manager executive sister	father customer son ideal self	mother oldest brother dealer

Top Five and Bottom Five Distinguishing Attributes and Significant Z Scores for Each Factor or Type

Type 1	Z Score	Type 2	Z Score	Type 3	Z Score	Type 4	Z Score	Type 5	Z Score
intelligent	1.95	helpful	2.04	persuasive	2.06	hard headed	2.53	adventurous	2.52
creative	1.86	orderly	1.67	sociable	1.87	blunt	2.01	sociable	2.25
imaginative	1.51	caring	1.62	competitive	1.54	dominant	1.79	extroverted	1.89
independent	1.38	self-controlled	1.51	enthusiastic	1.46	persistent	1.72	pleasure seeking	1.62
expressive	1.24	intelligent	1.45	persistent	1.46	moral	1.38	status oriented	1.62
sociable	-1.12	emotional	-1.45	responsible	-1.27	self-insightful	-1.44	conventional	-1.19
competitive	-1.35	independent	-1.56	mature	-1.34	sensitive	-1.44	conforming	-1.36
dominant	-1.38	idealistic	-1.70	trustworthy	-1.45	affectionate	-1.49	realistic	-1.36
conforming	-1.78	blunt	-1.73	idealistic	-1.73	understanding	-2.18	affectionate	-1.42
status oriented	-2.39	self-insightful	-1.84	moral	-2.07	flexible	-2.24	rational	-1.46

KATE

Significant Roles for Each Factor or Type

Type 1	Type 2	Type 3	Type 4
partner judge self as lawyer ideal lawyer colleague	ideal self brother client colleague ideal lawyer	father sister	mother daughter oldest brother self client

Top Five and Bottom Five Distinguishing Attributes and Significant Z Scores for Each Factor or Type

Type 1	Z Score	Type 2	Z Score	Type 3	Z Score	Type 4	Z Score
responsible	2.43	creative	2.36	sociable	2.02	responsible	2.38
trustworthy	2.07	sensitive	1.77	enthusiastic	1.68	caring	2.19
practical	1.49	intelligent	1.69	emotional	1.57	helpful	1.71
intelligent	1.37	caring	1.40	extroverted	1.56	practical	1.67
realistic	1.36	expressive	1.32	expressive	1.46	trustworthy	1.55
pleasure seeking	-1.16	dominant	-1.40	flexible	-1.46	intellectual	-1.35
adventurous	-1.70	conforming	-1.47	artistic	-1.60	artistic	-1.36
introverted	-1.95	deliberate	-1.55	introverted	-1.68	adventurous	-1.55
affectionate	-2.10	status oriented	-1.91	self-controlled	-1.79	competitive	-1.72
artistic	-2.31	conventional	-1.99	intellectual	-1.80	status oriented	-1.81

ELIZABETH

Significant Roles for Each Factor or Type

Type 1	Type 2	Type 3	Type 4
ideal self	father	mother	brother
self as professor	aunt	daughter	colleague
self	cousin		
ideal professor	colleague		
Dean			
student			
aunt			

Top Five and Bottom Five Distinguishing Attributes and Significant Z Scores for Each Factor or Type

Type 1	Z Score	Type 2	Z Score	Type 3	Z Score	Type 4	Z Score
intelligent	2.16	trustworthy	1.95	emotional	2.41	idealistic	2.06
moral	2.12	helpful	1.85	active	1.80	hard headed	2.06
rational	1.78	caring	1.75	hard headed	1.75	sensitive	1.54
trustworthy	1.78	moral	1.64	social	1.53	emotional	1.54
intellectual	1.50	responsible	1.52	responsible	1.53	status oriented	1.54
introverted	-1.31			realistic	-1.20	orderly	-1.54
ambitious	-1.46	blunt	-1.64	self-insightful	-1.26	mature	-1.54
conventional	-1.70	competitive	-1.67	conventional	-1.75	rational	-1.54
conforming	-1.82	dominant	-1.95	introverted	-2.08	responsible	-2.06
status oriented	-2.00	artistic	-2.09*	self-controlled	-2.13	independent	-2.06

* Only four attributes were significant below the Z score -1.00.

CARL

Significant Roles for Each Factor or Type

Type 1	Type 2	Type 3	Type 4	Type 5
uncle 2 principal 1 mother father ideal self co-worker 1	self ideal counsellor self as counsellor self as teacher ideal self student	grandmother principal 2 parent student	co-worker 2 uncle 3 client father co-worker 1	uncle 1 sister

Top Five and Bottom Five Distinguishing Attributes and Significant Z Scores for Each Factor or Type

Type 1	Z Score	Type 2	Z Score	Type 3	Z Score	Type 4	Z Score	Type 5	Z Score
extroverted	2.11	understanding	2.09	caring	2.08	expressive	1.88	introverted	2.35
sociable	1.95	caring	1.83	intelligent	2.00	extroverted	1.84	intelligent	1.76
caring	1.48	flexible	1.75	responsible	1.51	emotional	1.65	intellectual	1.53
enthusiastic	1.39	sensitive	1.40	practical	1.46	sensitive	1.43	trustworthy	1.43
pleasure seeking	1.31	imaginative	1.39	dominant	1.38	enthusiastic	1.42	independent	1.34
intellectual	-1.44	moral	-1.55	flexible	-1.76	conforming	-1.44	sociable	-1.43
dominant	-1.73	blunt	-1.68	idealistic	-1.84	creative	-1.48	extroverted	-1.50
introverted	-2.10	status oriented	-1.72	introverted	-1.93	moral	-1.59	hard headed	-1.69
blunt	-2.10	dominant	-1.73	pleasure seeking	-2.04	status oriented	-1.65	blunt	-1.76
hard headed	-2.10	hard headed	-2.06	spontaneous	-2.38	introverted	-1.89	dominant	-2.18

FRANK

Significant Roles for Each Factor or Type

Type 1	Type 2
mother	executive vice president
son	brother
self	ideal divisional manager
father	trader
ideal self	vice president
self as divisional manager	ideal self
trader	
ideal divisional manager	

Top Five and Bottom Five Distinguishing
Attributes and Significant Z Scores for Each Factor or Type

Type 1	Z Score	Type 2	Z Score
caring	2.26	enthusiastic	2.23
mature	1.92	persuasive	1.90
responsible	1.66	hard headed	1.54
persistent	1.52	mature	1.34
trustworthy	1.33	realistic	1.34
dominant	-1.36	idealistic	-1.67
moral	-1.38	adventurous	-1.77
precise	-1.39	self-insightful	-1.86
hard headed	-1.97	pleasure seeking	-1.90
blunt	-2.20	artistic	-2.23