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ABSTRACT

Although psychoanalytic theory can provide a large number of testable hypotheses concerning personality development, scientific psychology has been slow to realize this potential. The concept of character type is one aspect of Freudian theory which merits further investigation. It is believed that certain traits occur together in adult personality because they arise at the same level of psychosexual development. The present study tested the empirical validity of the oral, anal and hysterical character constructs in a normal sample. Relationships between character type and perceptions of parental attitudes and behavior were also explored.

143 psychology students completed a personality questionnaire, which provided scores for traits relevant to the character typology, and the Parental Role Patterns questionnaire (PRP), a measure of adult's perceptions of their own childrearing. Subjects also provided information about birth order, number of siblings, parents' marital status and other demographic variables thought to be relevant to the personality types.
It was hypothesized that those traits which have been attributed to the oral, anal and hysterical types would form correlation clusters. Factor analysis was used to test the nature of these intercorrelations. Several hypotheses concerning relationships between personality and childrearing were also advanced. These were tested by computing correlations between personality factor scores and PRP scores.

For both male and female subjects, factors identifiable as the oral, anal and hysterical emerged, although the results did not support a view of the oral character as a unitary construct. The anal character emerged most clearly. These findings were discussed in relation to published studies in which the same personality questionnaire was used in a psychiatric population.

The majority of the hypotheses pertaining to relationships between personality and childrearing also received support. The oral character was associated with perceptions of low parental warmth and high control, the anal character with high warmth (for females), and the hysterical character with low warmth.
A multivariate analysis of variance performed on groups of subjects typical of one of the three character types failed to indicate significant differences in childrearing perceptions. Since an adequate typology should enable researchers to make predictions on the basis of subject assignment to type, the usefulness of the psychoanalytic character typology remains in question.
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INTRODUCTION

Although psychoanalytic theory can provide a large number of testable hypotheses concerning personality development, scientific psychology has been slow to realize this potential. Sarnoff (1971) suggests that "some experimenters have shied away from such research simply out of sheer reluctance to face the labor of constructing the methodological foundation that this area of experimentation has been lacking. Also formidable is the intellectual task of teasing out systematic semantic definitions and deducing specific hypotheses from the loose fabric of Freudian prose. And one cannot gainsay the attraction of working on concepts whose operational definitions and techniques of manipulation have already enlisted a fair degree of employment among fellow experimenters." (p. 4)

However, while research findings have been slow to accumulate, the recent publication of two books which summarize past research and suggest new directions for investigation in this area provides some indication of continuing experimental interest (Kline, 1972 and Sarnoff, 1971).

One of the major contributions to the study of normal personality provided by psychoanalytic theory is the notion of character type. In general, the hypothesis is that certain personality traits occur together in adult personality because they arise at the same level of
psychosexual development. For example, the "anal triad" (parsimony, orderliness and obstinacy) is associated with the anal stage and conflicts surrounding bowel training. The concept of "type" is an attractive one in the study of personality because typologies are able to impose a degree of order in a very confusing area. They are economical in that, if a person is correctly assigned to a type, predictions can be made on the basis of past experience with similar individuals, who were also members of that type.

Two different strategies have been popular in personality research. First, investigators have obtained measures on a single dimension, and attempted to relate these to behavior in experimental situations or to scores on other discrete variables. While this approach permits elegant experimental design, it may reveal little about persons. At the other extreme, research has attempted to encompass the entire range of personality. This often means that subjects' scores are reported for a large number of measures. This procedure provides more information about persons, but because of the large number of variables involved it may be difficult to conceptualize individual personality.

The type approach represents a compromise solution.
A single label can convey a considerable amount of information and also permits clean experimental design. However, it has been much criticized, especially by Anglo-Saxon psychologists (according to Eysenck, 1970, pp.10-14). Critics have objected that typologies are doomed to failure because psychological dimensions are continuous rather than discontinuous. For example, Mischel (1971, pp.11-23) writes of the fallacy involved in attempting to "pigeonhole" the individual into one of a few categories. Eysenck points out that this kind of criticism indicates a misconception of typing, since typologists have normally been well aware that not all persons can be assigned to one of a small group of types. He quotes a statement of Jung to the effect that everyone possesses both the mechanisms of extraversion and introversion, and that the labels "extravert" and "introvert" merely indicate the relative strengths of these response tendencies. The opponents of typology often prefer to work with traits. Yet, as Eysenck again has pointed out, a type is a group of correlated traits in the same way that a trait is a group of correlated acts or tendencies. Thus, the major difference between the two lies in the level of inclusiveness or organization.

Cattell (1966, pp.289-92) has identified 45 semantic uses for "type". However, he discusses only two of these,
bipolar and species types, because the vast majority of uses cannot be dealt with statistically due to imprecise definition. Bipolar types are essentially groups of extreme scorers on a continuous dimension. One of the best-known examples of this sort of typology is based in the introversion-extraversion dimension. In contrast, species types require that a score distribution be relatively discontinuous. It may be discovered that trait scores have a high frequency at one point (or at several points) along a dimension. In the case of measurement on several variables, people may simultaneously cluster on several characteristics.

The situation is complicated by Cattell's (1952) references to both continuous and discontinuous species types. In the first case, patterns differ but in a continuous way, for example, the artist versus the businessman type. Truly discontinuous types are similar to biological species with the members of one type being qualitatively different from the members of another.

The psychoanalytic types conform fairly well to the continuous species model. One might expect, for example, that the anal type would be relatively distinct from the oral type. An "anal" individual who evidences the traits of parsimony, orderliness and obstinacy is not expected to
be highly aggressive or dependent since the latter are considered to be oral traits. The opposite situation should be found for a person whose personality is basically oral. However, it is not clear to what extent character types are to be considered "pure"; that is, to what extent should we expect individuals belonging to one or another of these types to cluster in multidimensional space? Freud (1931) has stated that mixed rather than unmixed types are more often found. In this situation, it would be an unfair test of psychoanalytic theory to hypothesize that all, or even most, people can be assigned to one or another character type. Instead, the theory of character types in its simplest form merely suggests that certain personality traits should form patterns. This hypothesis lends itself to testing by factor analysis. Recent research which has used this technique will be discussed below. While results have sometimes been promising, much work remains to be done because of inadequacies in research design and difficulties in generalizing research findings. (Measures have often been used exclusively in psychiatric or normal groups, and often data have been obtained for subjects of only one sex.)

As was noted earlier, the character typology is related to early child development. The traditional
hypotheses correlate feeding and cleanliness training, as well as response to the oedipal situation, with later personality organization, but a view now more commonly held is that these events are important mainly as they reflect general attitudes in the parent. The present research was an attempt to relate the character typology to broad childrearing dimensions in developmental psychology.
Descriptions of the Oral, Anal and Hysterical Character Types:

According to Fenichel (1945), character is the "habitual mode of bringing into harmony the tasks presented by internal demands and the external world ... (and is) necessarily a function of the ... Ego" (p. 467). Adult character (or personality) will be determined by the interaction between instinctual demands and the realities of the environment. From the beginning, psychoanalysts stressed the importance of the environment in infancy and early childhood as a determinant of future personality. A fairly large number of character types have been related to variations in the course of psychosexual development; for example, Fenichel describes oral, anal, urethral, phallic, hysterical, narcissistic and other types. The present investigation will involve three of these: oral, anal and hysterical.

1. The anal character:

The anal character was the first to be described, and is also the most clearly defined of the character types. In his original paper concerning anal eroticism, Freud (1908) first noted the regular combination of those traits which have come to be known as the "anal triad" --
orderliness, parsimony and obstinacy — in certain of his patients. Also in this paper, Freud gives the "formula for the formation of the ultimate character from the constituent character traits". According to Freud, "permanent character traits are either unchanged perpetuations of the original impulses, sublimations of them or reaction formations against them". (p. 50) Anal traits arise in the situation of bowel training. Orderliness is a reaction formation against the infantile wish to rebel against the requirements of training. It appears that obstinacy is a continuation of the child's wish not to comply with maternal demands, while parsimony would represent sublimation.

Abraham (1921) expanded on Freud's views, and stressed the notion that the anal character is basically unproductive, because the perseverance typical of this type is often wasted in the observance of fixed forms. Other anal traits discussed by Abraham are the tendency to interrupt ongoing activity, worry over waste of money and time, pleasure in possession, rule-following, systematizing and avoidance of initiative. In a later paper Abraham (1924) notes that some of these traits are useful in that they assist the individual in adjusting to his environment.
Reich (1933) added several traits to the growing list. Among these were strong guilt feelings, indecision, restraint and control, affect-blocking, and circumstantial thinking. The description of the anal character has not been substantially modified since.

Sometimes the anal character is considered to have two aspects: anal-retentive and anal-expulsive. The traits mentioned above belong to the former and are associated with compliance in toilet training, although the inclusion of obstinacy may be questioned. In contrast, anal-expulsive traits are related to a failure to comply with parental demands. Some examples of these traits would be: defiant messiness, lack of punctuality and spendthrift behavior.

2. The oral character:

The oral character was first described by Abraham (1924). He suggested that two different personality patterns are associated with the oral stage -- the "gratified" and "ungratified" types. Optimism, generosity and passivity are associated with the oral-gratified personality, while hostility, parsimony, impatience, clinging, jealousy, and maliciousness are related to
failures of gratification. In general, concern over security is regarded as an oral trait.

In a paper of the same year, Glover (1924) gave another of the classic descriptions of the oral character and its origins. He also notes that the oral-gratified personality will be optimistic and passive. To Abraham's list of oral-ungratified traits, he adds feelings of injustice, envy, a dislike of sharing and lability of mood. It is obvious that both Abraham and Glover considered the ungratified aspect of the oral character to be of most interest. This presumably reflects the concern of psychoanalysts with the abnormal since descriptions of the oral-gratified character appear to involve less pathology. In the case of the anal character, it is also the effects of rigidity and deprivation which are stressed. When writers now discuss the "oral character", it is likely to be the "oral ungratified character", while discussions of the "anal character" rarely deal with traits arising from too lenient parent behavior. They focus primarily on the anal-retentive type.

3. The hysterical character:

Lazare (1971) has attempted to clarify the concept of
the hysterical character by tracing its development. He notes that the most influential description of this character type was that given by Reich (1933). In Reich's view, hysterical patients are fixated at an advanced stage of libidinal development and are thus more amenable to treatment. They are caught in a conflict between intense fear of sexuality, because of repressed incestuous wishes, and strong sexual strivings. He suggests that the most outstanding hysterical trait is an obvious sexual behavior or coquetry. Other traits mentioned are: easy excitability, a tendency to unexpected changes in behavior, suggestibility and vivid imagination.

Marmor (1953) has strongly influenced psychoanalytic thinking about the hysterical character by arguing that oral fixations are of basic importance. He presents a picture of the hysterical person as someone looking for love while appearing to look for sex.

Lazare notes that recent writing about the hysterical personality has emphasized the sickness-health dimension. It now seems agreed that rather than being easy to treat, hysterics may fall anywhere along this dimension. The problems of the "healthy hysteric" revolve around sexual behavior and the oedipus conflict, while in the "sick hysteric" oral concerns are predominant. In this case
there will be an exaggeration of hysterical traits, e.g., exhibitionism becomes more aggressive and sexual provocativeness more crude. There is a tendency to isolate and for the person to view herself as different and superior. Little guilt is experienced and oral aggression and "pouty contrariness" are common. As well, friendships will be of short duration and behavior may be erratic and impulsive.

On the other hand, the healthy hysteric is likely to be energetic, ambitious, competitive and may possess a strict superego. She may maintain friendships over long periods of time, although with occasional emotional storms.

From the above discussion there is reason to expect a mixture of hysterical and oral traits in adult personality. Glover (1924) provided a general statement about purity of types. He states that "the more one attempts to correlate various character traits, the more apparent it becomes that we have to deal with imprints from all stages of ego and libido development" (p. 39). As well, Fenichel (1945) notes that it is difficult to find oral elements "free from later anal admixture". (p. 488) he also states that the oral character is not as clear as the anal, because more oral elements persist as
erotic activities (and are therefore not "converted" to character), and many elements which later become clearly differentiated are integrated in the oral stage.
The Empirical Validity of the Character Typology:

One of the earliest, and also one of the most influential, empirical investigations of character types was reported by Goldman-Eisler (1951). She developed a series of self-report scales designed to measure nineteen traits mentioned by psychoanalytic writers in connection with the oral character. These were administered to a group of middle-class adults. Factor analysis of the data indicated factors of "oral pessimism" and "oral aggression". While this result provided some support for theoretical formulations, it was not expected that aggression would be unrelated to pessimism, since both traits are aspects of the oral-ungratified personality. However, Goldman-Eisler's pessimism factor did show positive loadings on a number of other oral-ungratified trait scales (e.g., aloofness and passivity), and negative loadings on some oral-gratified traits (e.g., optimism, nurturance and sociability).

More recently, Gottheil (1965) devised a questionnaire to measure anal as well as oral traits. In an attempt to validate his scale, he asked a group of psychologists and psychiatrists to indicate the expected response of oral and anal personalities to his items. He was able to report a fairly high level of agreement. The
questionnaire was then administered to a group of army men (Gottheil and Stone, 1968). Factor analysis of the data revealed five factors. Two of these appeared to correspond to the oral and anal characters, but they accounted for only 5.3% of the total score variance. Not surprisingly, the authors concluded that these types were "not the most potent organizing factors" in the data!

Beloff (1957) has also investigated the anal character. She devised a questionnaire measure of fourteen anal trait scales. Data was first collected from a group of undergraduates to obtain information on scale consistency. On this basis the "best" items were chosen for her questionnaire. These were administered to a group of students in a residence (N=120). At the same time peer ratings were gathered. Both sets of scores were subjected to factor analysis and in each case one factor emerged. The scales with the highest loadings on the factor were superiority, desire to dominate, quasi-sadism, irritability, conscientiousness and obstinacy. The "anal triad" accounted for less variance than might have been expected. Kline (1971) notes that Beloff's results cannot be accepted as strong support for the validity of the anal character construct since the emergence of a general factor in this sort of study only provides evidence for scale homogeneity.
Sandler and Hazari (1960) have reported a study of the obsessive personality, and its relationship to obsessive symptoms. They administered a 40-item questionnaire which purported to measure aspects of obsessive thinking and behavior to a group of psychiatric patients. A factor analysis of the data indicated two factors, one which related to traits and the other to symptoms. Kline (1967) replicated their results in a normal population. (It is not surprising that a "symptom" factor should also emerge here since Sandler and Hazari stated that only an exaggerated picture of their symptom factor would represent obsessional neurosis.)

More recently Kline (1968a, 1969) has devised his own paper and pencil measure of the anal character. This scale is unusual in this area in that checks were made on the operation of social desirability and other response sets. Validity data was obtained by subjecting data from the questionnaire to a factor analysis along with scores on the MMPI, 16PF, and the Beloff and Sandler-Hazari scales. In general, results support Kline's conclusion that his scale is a valid measure of the anal character.

1. It appears that the terms "anal" and "obsessive" can be used interchangeably without causing confusion. Ingram (1961) compared descriptions of the anal character and the obsessive personality and found that usage differed only in terms of the traits emphasized.
Several researchers have attempted to provide evidence for the validity of three or more character types in the same investigation. For example, Barnes (1952) administered questionnaires measuring oral, anal and phallic personality traits to a group of over 200 male undergraduates. Twenty-four test scores were included in a factor analysis and eleven factors extracted. Of these only three were consistent with psychoanalytic formulations. One of them appeared to be an anal factor (with high loadings on meticulousness, orderliness, etc.), another reflected "ambivalence over dependency at the end of the oral stage", while the third loaded on the trait of sexual aggression and may have been related to the phallic stage.

The Dynamic Personality Inventory (DPI) (Grygier, 1961) has sometimes been used in studies relevant to the present topic. The DPI purports to measure oral, anal, phallic and other traits. A factor analysis of scores obtained from a sample of college students (Kline, 1968b) provided little evidence for the validity of the character typology, since only the first of eleven factors was in agreement with psychoanalytic theory. This factor loaded on anal traits. Sarnoff (1971, p. 34) notes that the anal scales of the DPI have "produced the most supportive results for the predictions made from them", in comparison
to other DPI scales.

Finney (1961a) reported a study in which he used an inventory made up of MMPI items and the Gough and F scales. These items were administered to a group of 100 neurotic patients, and scores were subjected to factor analysis with oblique rotation. Finney obtained factors which he identified as the "anal compulsive character" with high loadings on orderliness, stinginess, etc., the "hysterical character or repression", which loaded positively on a subtle form of the Hy scale and negatively on the F scale, and "oral aggression or delinquency". This last factor had high loadings on the Pd scale and the Gough-Petersen delinquency scale. High scorers on the latter have been described as demanding and exhibitionistic. Two other factors ("paranoid character or projection", and "conversion") were also reported.

Finally, Lazare, Klerman and Armor (1966) have explored the empirical validity of the oral, anal and hysterical characters. From a review of the literature they arrived at a group of twenty traits relevant to these three types. A questionnaire was constructed to measure these and administered to a group of ninety female psychiatric patients who were selected because their personalities approximated one of the three types in terms
of residents' ratings. Scale scores (20 per subject) were then subjected to factor analysis. Three factors, accounting for 41% of the variance, were extracted. Of these, the "obsessive factor" had a loading pattern closest to that predicted. All of the scales with loadings above .40 on this factor had been considered anal. The "oral" and "hysterical" factors did not emerge as clearly. The latter had loadings on several hysterical traits, but aggression also loaded highly. This result is discussed in relation to recent thinking regarding the hysterical character, especially with respect to Marmor's (1953) notions about oral features in the hysterical character. Loadings on the "oral factor" differed most from predictions. This seems consistent with the fact that the oral character has been the most difficult to delimit theoretically. Specifically, this factor had high loadings on several hysterical and obsessive traits as well as on oral traits.

In a more recent paper Lazare et al. (1970) report a replication of the above procedures. Again the subjects were female psychiatric patients, but this time they were unselected. Three factors accounted for 43% of the variance among test scores. These were very similar to those described above. Rank order correlations for the "oral", "obsessive" and "hysterical" factors in the two
studies were .93, .66, and .94 respectively. Although the correlation for the second factor is lower than the other two, virtually every trait with a high loading on this factor in both studies has been clinically defined as obsessive.

What conclusions can be drawn from the research cited above? First of all, it seems that there is fairly clear evidence for the validity of the anal character construct in both psychiatric and normal populations. Evidence for the oral and hysterical character constructs is considerably weaker. This situation may reflect the fact that the anal character has been more adequately described than the other types. There has also been greater agreement among clinicians with regard to its organization. The weaknesses of many of these studies are all too obvious. There has been little concern with response sets as they affect questionnaire results and few attempts to validate the measures used. Kline (1972) notes that the work of Lazare, Klerman and Armor is not as open to the former criticism as that of others since the emergence of several factors argues against the operation of a response set, which would tend to produce a general factor. As well, their reported pattern of factor loadings provides some evidence for the construct validity of their measure.
The Character Typology and Childrearing Variables:

While a large amount of research has attempted to relate personality development to parental childrearing behavior, only a small number of studies are directly relevant to the psychoanalytic character typology. Of these, several have dealt with the relationship between character type and specific events in early childhood. For example, Goldman-Eisler (1951) tested the hypothesis that oral character traits are associated with early weaning. She was able to report a significant positive correlation. However, since the data on weaning was obtained from the subjects themselves (most of whom were university students), their reliability may be questioned. Goldman-Eisler argues that weaning is only important insofar as it reflects general maternal attitudes, especially degree of nurturance.

The hypothesized relationship between anal traits and rigid bowel training was investigated by Beloff (1957). Information about the age at which bowel training had been completed was obtained from the mothers of her subjects. These data were not significantly related to scores on her questionnaire measure of anal character.

Gottheil and Stone (1968) have reported research dealing with the association between mouth and bowel
habits and the oral and anal characters. They constructed a questionnaire which dealt with both personality traits and several mouth and bowel practices, e.g., smoking, drinking, and concern with regularity. A factor analysis of data collected from a group of army men failed to indicate a preferential relationship between oral traits and habits, or between anal traits and habits.

Kline (1972) has reviewed the research cited above, along with several other reports, and finds that only two studies provide even slight support for psychoanalytic theory. However, in research of this sort it is always possible that psychoanalytic theory has been misinterpreted during the process of deriving testable hypotheses. For example, the notion that a child's age at completion of bowel training is necessarily related to anal traits is somewhat simplistic, since it is obvious that other measures of severity of training could also be used.

Several investigators have provided evidence for childrearing antecedents of oral, anal and hysterical traits which would not be specifically predicted from psychoanalytic theory (although they are not necessarily in contradiction). In the study reported by Beloff (1957) the mothers of the undergraduate subjects also completed
the anal questionnaire. There was a significant positive relationship between the scores of mothers and sons, suggesting that the mothers of children with anal personality traits may also possess these same characteristics. Heatherington and Brackbill (1963) present experimental results in support of this view. Behavioral ratings of obstinacy, orderliness and parsimony for a group of children were positively correlated with questionnaire scores for these traits in the dominant parent. In addition, Adams (1972) has reported that anal traits are conspicuous in the personalities of the parents of obsessional children. He notes emphasis on cleanliness, disapproval of spontaneity, very conventional behavior, etc., in descriptions of the mothers and fathers of children with obsessive symptoms.

It appears that the majority of the research concerning the antecedents of the oral character has focused on the infant feeding situation. However, Finney (1961b) does present evidence for the importance of general level of nurturance in the development of oral traits. He found that clinical ratings of maternal nurturance were significantly related in a negative direction to ratings of pessimism, dependency, anxiety, and passive hostility in the child. The subjects in this study were a group of 31 guidance clinic patients and
their mothers. Finney's results support Goldman-Eisler's opinion that the oral character may be associated with general attitudes of the mother.

Fitzgerald (1948) has suggested that love-deprivation gives rise to hysterical traits, because it creates a habit of "love-craving" from which other hysterical features develop. He speculates that these traits may be more common in females than in males because the disruption of a mother's love is more damaging to the girl since identification is stronger in her case. However, with regard to sex differences in the occurrence of hysterical traits, Forrest (1967) has noted that in a psychiatric population males with behavior and attitudes similar to those of "hysterical" females are likely to be labeled either alcoholic or psychopathic. Thus, it may be that the incidence of hysterical traits is equivalent in males and females, but that labels differ.

Blinder (1966) suggests that the hysterical personality is associated with a poor mother-daughter relationship (at least in a psychiatric population), while Hojer-Peterson (1965) believes that female hysterics identify mainly with their fathers. Although these would appear to be easily tested propositions, apparently they have not been empirically investigated.
Lazare (1971) reports that the "healthy hysteric" (as defined in an earlier section) is often the eldest child, her father's favourite and the most gifted of his children. She often has an unfavourable view of her mother, although this may be quite inaccurate. In contrast, the "sick hysteric" has had a disturbed family life, often with insufficient care from her mother.

In summary, it seems that one of the antecedents of the oral character is lack of nurturance on the part of the mother. This finding is in agreement with the classic formulation of the development of this character type, i.e., oral ungratified traits should be associated with disappointment in the oral phase. The mothers of persons with anal traits have often been described as "anal" themselves. Thus, one would expect them to be rigid and probably restrictive in their approach to childrearing. And finally, hysterical traits in women have been associated with a poor relationship between mother and child. It is possible that this is due to maternal rejection -- or alternately, that maternal behavior is merely construed in this way. It is also possible that the hysterical character is correlated with a close relationship between the child and his or her opposite sex parent, but the proposition has so far received support only from case history material.
Dimensions Of Childrearing Behavior:

Goldin (1969) notes that two main streams of research are evident in the study of parental influences on child development. There has been an attempt (1) to determine the relationship between parental attitudes and child response, and (2) to study children's perceptions from a phenomenological point of view. A number of consistent correlations between parental behavior and child personality have been established, some of which are discussed in the next section. However, the relationship between parental attitudes toward childrearing and concurrent parent behavior, as well as subsequent child behavior, remains unclear.

The measure most often used to study parental attitudes is the Parent Attitude Research Instrument (PARI) (Schaefer and Bell, 1958). Becker and Krug (1965) have reviewed research in which the PARI was used and concluded that the inventory has poor predictive validity. They also found that attitude measures were influenced by educational level and the response set of acquiescence. Perhaps we should not be surprised to learn that parents fail to give reliable information about their attitudes toward childrearing and also concerning their actual behavior. Yarrow (1963) has pointed out that mothers'
interview responses "represent self-descriptions by extremely ego-involved reporters". It is unlikely that any mother, after reading a selection of women's magazines, could be completely unaware of expert opinion in these matters, and the temptation to provide socially desirable responses may be very strong.

Partly for this reason, a considerable number of studies have used children's descriptions of parent behavior. Evidence for the validity of child reports has been provided by Bronson et al. (1959). In their study 100 children provided information about parental authority, affection and involvement. There were highly significant relationships between these descriptions and interviewers' ratings of parental behavior.

Another advantage of collecting data from children is that these responses probably will be more directly related to children's personalities and behaviors, than will actual parent behavior. Two recent studies support this view. In the first, Frydman (1968) obtained measures of children's perceptions of parental acceptance and authoritarianism, as well as observational measures of the parent-child interaction. Although statistical analysis revealed no significant relationship between parents' authoritarianism or accepting behavior and
authoritarianism in children, the latter trait was significantly negatively correlated with children's perceptions of acceptance. In the second study, Cox (1970) reported that ratings of the behavior of young adolescents were more highly correlated with the child's perception of each parent's affectional behavior, than with the parent's own report. It is possible in both of these studies that children's reports were more accurate than those of their parents, but other interpretations are possible.

Probably the most serious concern in using children's perceptions of parental behavior in the study of personality development is not whether parent behavior is accurately perceived, but rather to what extent the perceptions of the child are influenced by his own personality. Only longitudinal research can hope to answer this sort of causal question.

In recent years several inventories have been constructed to deal with children's reports of childrearing practices. Slater (1962) developed a questionnaire for use with adults. The Parental Role Patterns questionnaire (PRP) consists of 50 statements about parents to which the subject is asked to respond according to how characteristic the statements are of his
mother and his father. Slater collected data for a group of 138 male college freshmen. A cluster analysis enabled him to construct two scales which he named "Emotional Supportiveness and Warmth" and "Inhibitory Demands and Discipline". Couch (1960) essentially replicated these scales using a factor analytic procedure, and Palmer (1966) found the two dimensions to be independent in another group of college males.

Similar dimensions emerged from an analysis of Roe and Siegelman's (1963) Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire. This measure was also devised for use with adults, and is made up of 130 items arranged into 10 scales (e.g., protection, demanding, rejecting, neglect, etc.). Factor analysis of scores for a college sample indicated the importance of factors which were labeled "love-rejection" and "casual-demanding".

Siegelman (1965b) has reported a factor analysis of the Bronfenbrenner Parent Behavior Questionnaire (Bronfenbrenner, 1961). Data were collected for a group of fourth to sixth grade children in a low socioeconomic area of New York. Three factors emerged: "loving", "punishing" and "demanding". Siegelman suggests that the punishment factor appears here, but not in his college sample, because children report more ambivalent and
inconsistent behaviors than do adults. That is, children are able to perceive loving and punishing as independent of each other.

Another child report measure has been constructed by Schaefer (1965a) — the Children's Reports of Parental Behavior Inventory. A factor analysis of scores for a group of young adolescents indicated three factors: "acceptance-rejection", "psychological autonomy-psychological control" and "firm control-lax control". These factors were replicated in an independent sample (Renson, Schaefer and Levy, 1968).

Goldin (1969) has reviewed the literature on parent-child relations with special reference to the factor analytic models proposed by Schaefer (1965b) and Siegelman (1965b). While he finds both consistent with experimental research, he considers Siegelman's model superior because of the clear punishment dimension. However, Goldin notes that variables such as consistency of parent behavior, parental sex roles, and age of the child are not handled by these formulations, although they are likely to be relevant to personality development.
Parental Attitudes and Behavior and the Development of Personality:

The relationship between childrearing practices and subsequent personality structure is still far from clear. This is hardly surprising since the dimensions of childrearing noted above are broad and investigators have attempted to measure them in different ways. As well, it is to be expected that many variables other than parental attitudes and behavior will be important in personality development.

There is considerable agreement among developmental psychologists that the most important childrearing dimension is "loving-rejecting". Medinnus and Johnson (1969) cite findings from the Fels studies which indicate that the actively rejected preschool child is characterized by high emotionality and low emotional control. At school age these children show an increase in quarrelsomeness and a great deal of sibling hostility. McCord et al. (1961) found that aggression was associated with rejection in a sample of nine-year-old boys, and Goldin cites a number of studies in which delinquent and "maladjusted" children perceived their parents as rejecting. In an adult group, Slater (1962) found that perceived warmth was positively related to MMPI-derived
measures of ego strength and extraversion. This finding agrees with Siegelman's (1965a) report that anxious introverted males, selected on the basis of 16PF scores, report rejecting parents, while extraverted females describe their fathers as loving. In a later study, Siegelman (1966) found several other relationships between children's perceptions and personality variables. For a group of fourth to sixth grade children there were significant positive correlations between maternal love and measures of dependence and depression in the child. There was also a significant negative correlation, for both parents, between parental love and "withdrawal" in the child.

With respect to the other major dimension in childrearing -- the control continuum, Watson (1957) presented data for children from nursery school to sixth grade. These children were all from "good" homes. Firm control was positively associated with little initiative or spontaneity, dependent behavior, inner hostility, less friendliness, and less cooperation. More recently, Winder and Wiggins (1964) found that dependent boys have parents who show attitudes of high ambivalence, high strictness and high punitiveness. Their sample consisted of 200 elementary school boys, and the dependency measure was derived from a sociometric technique. In adults, Slater
(1962) reported a negative relationship between perceived discipline and extraversion and ego strength.

Hoffman (1960) has emphasized the importance of distinguishing between two types of discipline which he refers to as "love-oriented" and "power-oriented". In the case of the former, the parent controls the child's behavior by either giving or withdrawing love, while for the latter, the child is coerced into doing what the parent wishes by physical force. Love-oriented discipline will result in the internalization of parental standards, but power-oriented techniques are likely to lead to the development of moral orientation based on fear of detection. Becker (1964) cites research reports which indicate that the frequent use of praise -- a love-oriented technique -- is related to high guilt in children.

There is considerable evidence for sex differences in this area. For a group of preschool children, Sears et al. (1953) found ratings of maternal punitiveness, derived from interviews and direct observation, to be positively related to dependency in girls but negatively in boys. Bronfenbrenner (1961) found that boys rated high on responsibility and leadership tended to come from homes in which the mother was warm and nurturant and the father
a moderately strong disciplinarian. For the girls in this study, nurturance was more closely associated with dependence than leadership and strong paternal discipline was associated with irresponsibility. Bronfenbrenner's subjects were in the tenth grade. As well, Schaefer and Bayley (1963) found that a mother's behavior was more closely related to her son's later behavior than to her daughter's.

Research findings concerning childrearing and personality have been organized into a table showing the interaction of the warmth and control dimensions by Becker (1964) (see Table I). This table necessarily presents an oversimplified picture of experimental results.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Warm-Restrictive</th>
<th>Warm-Permissive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>submissive, dependent</td>
<td>active, out-going,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>polite, neat, obedient,</td>
<td>creative, independent,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minimal aggression,</td>
<td>sucessfully aggressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compliant, not friendly</td>
<td>minimal self-aggression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile-Restrictive</td>
<td>Hostile-Permissive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neurotic problems,</td>
<td>delinquency,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quarrelling,</td>
<td>non-compliance,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social withdrawal,</td>
<td>maximal aggression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-aggression</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Adapted from Becker (1964)
Hypotheses:

The present research explored relationships between adult personality, conceptualized in terms of the oral, anal and hysterical character types, and perceptions of childrearing. There were two sets of hypotheses. One set concerned the empirical clustering of the traits attributed to these types by psychoanalytic writers, and the other pertained to the association between the character typology and childrearing dimensions. It is apparent that unless the first hypotheses received at least some support from the data, it would be impossible to test the other hypotheses.

This study followed Lazare, Klerman and Armor (1966) in hypothesizing that the following personality traits are highly intercorrelated: (1) the oral character -- aggression, dependence, oral aggression, parsimony, passivity, pessimism, and rejection of others, (2) the anal character -- emotional constriction, obstinacy, orderliness, parsimony, perseverance, rejection of others, rigidity, self-doubt, and severe superego, and (3) the hysterical character -- dependence, egocentricity, emotionality, exhibitionism, fear of sexuality, sexual provocativeness, and suggestibility.

The literature on children's perceptions of parental
attitudes and behavior, as well as research concerning the relationship between the oral, anal and hysterical types and childrearing variables, suggested the following hypotheses: (1) the oral character is associated with reports of low parental warmth and high parental control; (2) the anal character is associated with high perceived warmth and high control; and (3) the hysterical character is associated with low perceived warmth and low control.
METHOD

Subjects:

143 students (68 males and 75 females) from several undergraduate psychology classes served as subjects in this study. They ranged in age from 16 to 48 years, with a mean age of 22.85 years (s.d. = 5.96).

If subjects failed to answer more than 90% of the questionnaire items their data were dropped from the analysis. This reduced the N to 130 (63 males and 67 females). It should also be noted that, since some subjects were unable to supply ratings for both parents, the n's for some analyses were reduced still further.

Measures used:

The personality inventory used in this study was developed by Lazare, Klerman and Armor (1966) to measure oral, obsessive and hysterical traits. Its construction began with a group of 200 dichotomous response items organized into 20 scales. The majority (70%) of the items were taken from Murray (1938) and Goldman-Eisler (1951). Those items with the lowest item-to-trait correlations
were rejected after an initial administration of the questionnaire to 90 subjects, thus reducing the total number of items to 140 (see Appendix 1). Of these, 80% had item-to-trait correlations greater than .50.

The personality traits which the questionnaire attempts to measure are as follows: aggression, egocentricity, dependence, emotionality, emotional constriction, fear of sexuality, exhibitionism, obstinacy, oral aggression, parsimony, orderliness, passivity, perseverance, rejection of others, pessimism, rigidity, self-doubt, suggestibility, sexual provocativeness, and severe superego.

The Parent Role Patterns questionnaire (PRP) was constructed by Slater (1962) to assess parental attitudes and behaviour as perceived by adult offspring. The measure consists of 50 statements about parents in response to which the subject is asked to indicate how characteristic the item is of his own parents (on a 5-point rating scale). Ratings are done separately for mother and father, and two scores can be derived for each parent. The first, Emotional Supportiveness and Warmth (ESW) reflects the degree to which the parent is viewed as helpful, nurturant, affectionate and rewarding. The second, Inhibitory Demands and Discipline (IDD) reflects
strictness, puritanical attitudes, demanding aggressiveness and punitiveness on the part of the parent.

Slater's PRP was selected for use in the present research for two reasons. Firstly, it was designed for administration to adult subjects which, for example, Schaefer's (1965a) scales were not. And secondly, it is fairly brief. This was an essential requirement as the design called for subjects to complete the personality and childrearing scales at one sitting.

Procedure:

The data were collected from students in four psychology classes. As well as completing the personality questionnaire and the PRP, subjects provided information about age, sex, parents' marital status, length of time during which their mothers and fathers were present in the home, number of siblings, and birth order, and also rated the happiness of their parents' marriage.

Since it was not possible to obtain class time for this research, subjects took questionnaires home with them and returned them during the following class period. Cooperation was strictly voluntary, but return rate exceeded 80%.
Statistical Analysis:

1. Tabulations were done for the demographic variables listed above for the entire group and by sex. Tests for sex differences were performed using Chi-squares.

2. For the personality inventory, frequency distributions by item were computed to check endorsement frequency. Trait scores were then calculated according to the scales developed by Lazare, Klerman and Armor (1966) (see Appendix 1). Means and standard deviations were computed separately for males and females, and t-tests were used to test for sex differences. As a measure of scale homogeneity, item-to-trait correlations were calculated for the 20 scales. The coefficient of skewness (see Snedecor and Cochrane, 1967, p. 86) was used to test the normalcy of scale score distributions.

Finally, a factor analysis (principal components, Varimax rotation) was performed on the scale scores, separately for males and females. This procedure was used to test the hypothesis that traits which had been attributed to the oral, anal and hysterical character types would cluster in multidimensional space. Factor
scores were calculated for all subjects.

3. The PRP was scored according to Slater's scales. It was decided to cross-validate Slater's dimensions in the present sample by performing a factor analysis on the 50 PRP items. This seemed especially desirable since his original group had consisted entirely of males. The results of an initial factor analysis (principal components, Varimax rotation) were unsatisfactory because too few items loaded on each of a large number of factors. For example, there were 13 factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.0 for the "mother" items for male subjects. On the average, fewer than four items had loadings above .40 on any one factor.

By restricting factors to five a better solution was obtained. It was possible to construct eight new scales for males (four for perceptions of each parent) and ten new scales for females (five for each parent). In scale construction, only items with loadings above .30 were considered. These were weighted according to their factor loadings and were sometimes assigned to more than one scale. The usual scale statistics were calculated for the resulting scale scores. Correlation coefficients were computed to assess the relationship between the new scales and Slater's original scales.
4. Correlation coefficients were also calculated to test the association between personality factor scores and scores on the new PRP scales. This was done separately for males and females. To further investigate this relationship, analyses of variance were performed on the childrearing data for groups of subjects with extreme factor scores. (Factor 2 for females was not included in this analysis because it was impossible to interpret in terms of character type). For each factor the "high" group consisted of those subjects whose factor scores were among the top 20%. The "low" subjects had scores in the lower 20% of the factor score distribution. N's varied, with the groups comprising from five to eight subjects.

To test differences between the character types (as reflected in the personality factors) a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed on the groups of high scorers. It was intended that this procedure should indicate whether subjects who exemplified the three character types would in fact have different perceptions of their parent's childrearing attitudes and behavior.

5. Correlations between the demographic variables and personality factor scores and PRP scores were computed.
The results are presented in the same order as that followed in the statistical analysis section. First, a description of the sample in terms of the demographic variables is given. This is followed by test statistics for the personality questionnaire, and the results of the factor analysis of this measure. Descriptions of the childrearing scales constructed in the present study are found in the next section. These are followed by a presentation of significant relationships between personality and childrearing measures. Finally, correlations of the demographic variables with both personality and PRP scales are presented.

Demographic Variables:

Marital status: 70% of the parents of the subjects in the sample were married and 9.2% were divorced or separated. 15.4% of the sample reported one deceased parent and 5.4% reported both parents deceased.

Marital happiness rating: 33.1% of the sample rated their parents' marriages very happy, 38.5% rated them
fairly happy, 14.6%, neither happy or unhappy, 7.7%, fairly unhappy, and 3.8%, very unhappy.

Presence of mother in the home: 87.7% of the subjects reported that their mothers were still present in the home, and more than half of the remaining subjects reported her present until 15 years of age (an additional 8.5%).

Presence of father in the home: On the average, fathers were present for shorter periods. Nevertheless, 76.2% of the sample reported their fathers still present in the home. An additional 16.2% reported him present until they were 15 years of age, and 5.4% until they were 10 years of age.

Number of siblings: 34.6% of the subjects had only one sibling, 26.9% had two siblings and 19.2% had three. 15.5% had four or more siblings.

Birth order: The proportion of subjects in the eldest, middle and youngest child categories was nearly equal (33.8%, 32.3%, and 30.8%). 3.1% of the subjects were only children.

There were no significant sex differences for any of the above variables. This was not unexpected since male and female children should be randomly distributed in
different types of home environment.

Test Statistics: Personality Questionnaire.

Endorsement frequencies for the personality items, expressed as the proportion of "true" responses, ranged from .00 to .99. These were tabulated separately for males and females and appear in Appendix 1. Approximately 44% of the values fell between .40 and .59, with 26% below this range and 30% above. The fear of sexuality and pessimism scales had the most extreme frequencies. Overall there were slightly fewer extreme frequencies for females than for males.

Means, standard deviations and coefficients of skewness for each trait scale appear in Appendix 3. The scales which showed the greatest degree of skew were the fear of sexuality and pessimism measures. In both cases scores were negatively skewed. An inspection of endorsement frequencies for these scales indicates a clear preponderance of false responses for many of the items.

Item-to-trait correlations are presented in Appendix 1. These varied from .09 to .76, but the majority fell between .40 and .70 (approximately 80%). Approximately 14% were below .39 and the remaining 6% of the
correlations exceeded .70. There was a tendency for correlations to be higher for female subjects. For example, in this group 61% of the values exceeded .50 while only 53% of the correlations for males were in excess of this value. These results indicate somewhat lower scale consistency for the present sample than that reported by Lazare et al. (1966) for his female clinical sample where 80% of the item-to-trait correlations exceeded .50. It is possible that this occurred because some of the questionnaire items were not appropriate in a university population. However, Cattell and Tsujioka (1964) found item-to-trait reliabilities of .49 "highly satisfactory" for six-item 16PF scales.

T-tests indicated no significant differences between mean scores for males and females on any of the personality trait scales.

Factor Analysis of Personality Scales.

It was already noted that factor analysis was done separately for male and female subject scores. In the case of the former, four rotated factors had eigenvalues greater than unity. These accounted for 19.4%, 14.6%, 8.9% and 7.5% of the unrotated score variance,
respectively. Table II lists scales with high loadings on these factors. (Complete factor loadings for both sexes appear in Appendix 4.) The first factor is clearly "anal" with high loadings on three anal traits. Factor 2 appears to be a "hysterical" factor, since all of the scales with high loadings reflect hysterical traits. Factor four loads mainly on two oral traits. The most difficult factor to interpret is factor 3 which loads on traits from all three of the character types.

For females, five rotated factors had eigenvalues greater than 1.0. These accounted for 19.3%, 12.9%, 11.5%, 7.7% and 7.6% of the unrotated variance, respectively. It is apparent from Table III that the factors are in general less easily interpretable than the factors which emerged for male subjects. Factor 1 might be labeled "oral", but the hysterical trait of emotionality shows the highest loading on it. Factor 3 is clearly "anal", but the second factor loads on a mixture of oral and anal traits. Factors 4 and 5 also load on trait scales for more than one type.

Factor loadings obtained by Lazare, Klerman and Armor (1970) are reproduced in Table IV. Spearman rank order correlations between these loadings plus the loadings lower than .40 and those obtained in the present study
Table II

Loadings for Personality Factors -- Males

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rigidity</td>
<td>Exhibitionism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superego</td>
<td>Sexual Provocativeness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejection of Others</td>
<td>Dependence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orderliness</td>
<td>Egocentricity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Constriction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passivity</td>
<td>Pessimism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>Dependence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstinacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentricity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Aggression</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>Factor 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionality</td>
<td>Aggression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependence</td>
<td>Obstinacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Constriction</td>
<td>Suggestibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>-.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentricity</td>
<td>Dependence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pessimism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superego</td>
<td>Sexual Provocativeness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigidity</td>
<td>Oral Aggression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perseverance</td>
<td>Rejection of Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibitionism</td>
<td>Exhibitionism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 5</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Doubt</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perseverance</td>
<td>-.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passivity</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table IV

Traits Loading on Lazare et al.'s (1970)
Oral, Obsessive and Hysterical Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hysterical Factor</th>
<th>Obsessional Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>Emotional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.68</td>
<td>Constriction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionality</td>
<td>Orderliness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Aggression</td>
<td>Parsimony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstinacy</td>
<td>Rigidity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibitionism</td>
<td>Superego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentricity</td>
<td>Perseverance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Provocativeness</td>
<td>Sexual Provocativeness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oral Factor</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pessimism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Sexuality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Doubt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentricity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perseverance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
indicate that their "oral" factor is most closely related to factor 5 for females ($r=.58$) and factor 4 for males ($r=.65$). Their "anal" factor is most similar to factor 3 for females ($r=.55$) and factor 1 for males ($r=.57$), and the "hysterical" factor is most highly correlated with factor 1 for females ($r=.68$) and factor 2 for males ($r=.42$). All of these correlations, except the last, are significant beyond the .05 level of significance. This indicates that the factor structure of the questionnaire used has some degree of stability across populations.

Childrearing Scales:

The factor analysis of the childrearing questionnaire, with factors limited to six, indicated clear warmth and control dimensions for males. These accounted for the largest portion of the variance, 14.5% and 8.1%, respectively, for perceptions of mother, and 19.7% and 9.4% for father. The scales constructed for these factors were named Maternal Warmth, and Maternal Control, and Paternal Warmth and Paternal Control. They appear in Appendix 2 along with factor loadings for all items in the scales.

For females, a single control dimension emerged, but
the warmth dimension split into two components. For perceptions of mother, the first factor accounted for 19.6% of the score variance. Inspection of the loading pattern suggested the label Good Mother for this factor, because it presents a picture of the mother as helpful -- trying to do what is "best" for her child. The third factor accounted for only 8.2% of the variance. Items with high loadings indicated that this factor was more nearly the equivalent of the warmth factors for males, since the mother is perceived as being more demonstratively affectionate and emotionally supportive than is the case for factor 1. This factor was thus labeled Maternal Warmth.

In the case of perceptions of fathers by daughters, the first factor accounted for 21.5% of the variance and clearly reflected degree of warmth. However, the fourth factor loaded on similar items. Since many of these concerned praise this label was tentatively assigned to the factor.

For both males and females a factor reflecting gregariousness and interest in social occasions emerged for father. This was labeled Sociable Father. A factor tentatively labeled Dominant Mother was also indicated for both sexes. Another factor which is difficult to
interpret is present for both parents. Substantial loadings on cultural interest, open expression of feelings, help with school work and guidance in career choice, and not-conventional behavior suggested the label Modern Parent.

The warmth and control scales for both sexes are very similar to Slater's ESW and IDD dimensions. This is evidenced by correlation coefficients ranging from .79 to .96 for the relevant scales. In all cases the warmth scales were more highly correlated.

Personality and Perceptions of Childrearing:

Correlations between personality factor scores and the new PRP scales are presented in Table V. It will be noted that there were many more significant relationships for females than for males. In general, both oral and hysterical traits are associated with low perceived warmth and high perceived control, while the anal character is associated with high warmth. However, not all of these relationships are apparent for both sexes, nor do they always hold for perceptions of both mother and father.

The analyses of variance used to test for differences in perceptions of childrearing between subjects who had
**Table V**

Correlations between Personality Factor Scores and PRP Scores

A. Males:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Warmth</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Control</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociable Mother</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.33^1</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Mother</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Warmth</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Control</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.29^1</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociable Father</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Father</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.32^1</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Females:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Warmth</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.25^1</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.25^1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Control</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociable Mother</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.26^1</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Mother</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Mother</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.24^1</td>
<td>-.32^1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Warmth</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.36^1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Control</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.21^1</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociable Father</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.25^1</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Father</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise</td>
<td>-.23^1</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.26^1</td>
<td>-.26^1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. p<.05
very high or very low personality factor scores, indicated only a few significant differences. Males with high scores on factor 3 perceived their mothers to be more dominant than did low scorers (F=7.3, df=1,10, p=.02). For females, high scorers on factor 1 perceived mother as more dominant (F=7.4, df=1,10, p=.02) and father as more sociable (F=9.4, df=1,10, p=.01). High scorers on factor 2 perceived mother to be warmer (F=4.7, df=1,13, p=.05).

No significant differences were found among high factor scorers in the MANOVA performed on the childrearing scores. Insofar as this statistical procedure tested differences among character types, this result indicates that there are no differences in perceptions of childrearing among oral, anal and hysterical character types. In contrast, the analyses of variance described above, indicate that the degree to which a subject is similar to a character type is significantly related to several childrearing measures. That is, a female who is highly "anal" is more likely to perceive his parents as warm people than is a person low on anal traits, however, subjects high on anal traits do not perceive their parents in a significantly different way than do subjects high on oral or hysterical traits.
Relationships involving Demographic Variables:

Significant correlations between demographic variables and personality factor scores are presented in Table VI. Of the group of 32 correlations only four are significant. The direction of the relationship between number of siblings and factor 2 for males indicates that persons with hysterical characters are more likely to have a small number of siblings. Other correlations suggest that the anal character, in females, (factor 3) is more common with increasing age, and that aggression, obstinacy, and independence (factor 2) may be associated with the divorce or separation of parents, and with marital unhappiness.

Table VII presents correlations between demographic and childrearing measures. With increasing age the perceptions of both males and females are less likely to fit the description of the Modern Parent. Perceptions of mother as dominant are not surprisingly more likely in the single parent family, although only for female subjects. Marital happiness is in general associated with high warmth. Finally, a larger number of siblings is positively correlated with perceptions of mother as dominant and father as "modern" for males.
Table VI

Significant Correlations between Personality Factors and Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Males:</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Females:</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Siblings</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marital Happiness</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table VII

Significant Correlations between Childrearing and Demographic Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Males:</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Females:</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Mother</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>Modern Father</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Happiness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Warmth</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociable Father</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>Dominant Mother</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Father</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presence of Father</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant Mother</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>Marital Happiness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Siblings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant Mother</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>Maternal Warmth</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Father</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>Maternal Control</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth Order</td>
<td></td>
<td>Good Mother</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociable Father</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>Paternal Warmth</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


DISCUSSION

Factor analysis provided some evidence in support of the construct validity of the oral, anal and hysterical types. As in earlier research, the "anal" factor emerged most clearly. This factor accounted for the largest portion of the variance for males. For females the anal component was clearly present but did not account for as much of the variance. Possibly this difference indicates that anal traits are of greater importance in male personality.

For both sexes severe superego and rigidity had high loadings on the "anal" factor, while perseverance loaded highly for females. The only member of the anal triad to load significantly was orderliness, which loaded on the male "anal" factor. For both male and female subjects obstinacy loaded on another factor (factor 3 for males and factor 2 for females). It was associated positively with oral traits in males, while for females obstinacy was positively associated with aggression, an oral trait, but negatively associated with dependence, another oral trait, and suggestibility, a hysterical trait.

Hysterical factors were fairly easily identified for
both males and females; these are factors 2 and 4 respectively. This labeling indicates a disagreement with Lazare et al. (1970) since their "hysterical factor" correlated most highly with factor 1 for females. The high loading on this factor for the oral aggression scale may be difficult to interpret in terms of the classic descriptions of the character type but it seems in agreement with the common observation that hysterical personalities are "difficult". Fear of sexuality, which has been considered a defining trait of this character type, failed to load significantly on any of the personality factors. This outcome is probably due to very extreme endorsement frequencies for items in the scale; few subjects gave true responses. The resulting low variance for subject scale scores would prohibit large correlations with other scales.

Results of the present study do not support a view of the oral character as a unitary construct. For males, factor 4 with high loadings on two oral traits -- pessimism and dependence, has the highest relationship with the "oral" factor of Lazare et al. However, factor 3 also loads on several oral traits -- passivity, aggression and oral aggression. Loadings on obstinacy and egocentricity complicate the picture, although an argument could be made for considering egocentricity an oral trait.
It would seem that over-gratification during the oral stage could prevent the development of proper object relations, thus resulting in an egocentric attitude in later life. Factors 3 and 4 are somewhat similar to Goldman-Eisler's (1951) oral aggressive and oral pessimist factors, although only two traits have high loadings on the present "oral pessimist" factor. This similarity to Goldman-Eisler's findings is not surprising since the inventory used contained items from her questionnaire measure.

For females, factor 5 is most similar to Lazare's "oral" factor, however, it loads significantly on only one oral trait -- passivity. The pattern of scale loadings on factor 1 conforms more closely to clinical descriptions of the oral character. Although emotionality has been considered a hysterical trait, Glover (1924) includes lability of mood in his description of the oral character. As was the case with male subjects, the aggression scale failed to load with other oral traits.

In general, fewer trait scales had high loadings on any one factor in this study than in either of the previous studies in which the personality questionnaire was used (Lazare et al., 1966 and 1970). This result may have occurred because the measure has more relevance in a
psychiatric population. It is possible to argue that the character types should emerge more clearly in a clinical sample, since they have been described by clinicians and are based on observations of psychiatric patients. However, the present results are still encouraging. The factor structure of the inventory used appears relatively stable, as evidenced by significant correlations between factors from this and earlier studies, and the factors extracted are generally in agreement with psychoanalytic formulations.

It is not possible to determine to what extent the results of the factor analysis are a function of the specific items which make up the inventory. This measure has yet to be validated against an external criterion, and there were no checks on the operation of social desirability or response sets. An inspection of item endorsement frequencies suggests that social desirability may be a confounding variable. Typically, anal items have a preponderance of "true" responses -- this is the case for the emotional constriction, obstinacy, parsimony, orderliness and superego scales. Only the self-doubt items tend to be answered "false", and it is interesting to note that this scale does not load with other anal scales. None of the oral and hysterical scales have a marked pull for affirmative responses, and several of them
clearly tend to evoke false responses. While this relationship between endorsement frequency and character type measures may explain the separation of anal from oral and hysterical traits, it cannot explain the differentiation between the latter groups. It is clear that the questionnaire should be revised so that trait scales will reflect the same degree of socially desirable behavior, but this may be a difficult task given the negative connotations of many of the traits relevant to the character typology.

It is interesting that there were no sex differences for personality trait scores, or for the demographic variables. However, the importance of treating the sexes separately in personality study is emphasized by the emergence of factor structures which differ for males and females for both personality and childrearing variables. In the latter case, the factor structure for females was more complex than for male subjects. While other interpretations of this finding are possible, one might speculate that females, who are often said to be more person-oriented than males, are more observant of parental behavior, and, therefore, require more dimensions to explain their perceptions.

The hypotheses concerning relationships between
character type and perceptions of childrearing all received some support in the data. It appears that the oral character is associated with low perceived warmth. Thus, males with extremely high scores on factor 3 ("oral aggression") also had higher scores on Maternal Warmth than did low scorers, and there was a negative correlation between scores on factor 1, which also seems to be an oral factor, and the Praise scale. As well, to the extent that factor 5 for females reflects orality, significant negative correlations between scores on this factor and both Maternal and Paternal Warmth also support the hypothesis. The significant positive correlation between factor 3 for males and Paternal Control supports the hypothesis that persons with oral characters will perceive parents as restrictive.

The anal character is associated with high warmth for females. This conclusion is supported by a positive correlation between scores on factor 3 for females and the Maternal Warmth scale. There was no indication that this relationship also holds for males, nor was there evidence that the anal character is associated with perceptions of high parental control.

If personality factor 4 for females is considered "hysterical", the hypothesized relationship between the
hysterical personality and low perceived warmth receives some support from the negative correlations between this factor and the Good Mother and Praise scales, both of which reflect warmth. Contrary to expectation, there was also a positive correlation between scores on factor 4 and Paternal Control. None of the correlations involving the male "hysterical factor" were significant.

In summary, almost all of the significant findings relevant to the hypotheses concerning personality and childrearing were in the expected direction. The oral character was associated with perceptions of low warmth and high control; anal traits were positively correlated with warmth; and hysterical personalities perceived parents as less warm. Contrary to hypotheses, there were no relationships between the anal character and high control, or between the hysterical character and low control. In fact, the latter type was associated with high perceived control. However, it should be noted that it was difficult to determine the relationships between the oral and hysterical characters and the control dimension, because traits belonging to these two types failed to separate clearly in the factor analysis. This problem did not arise with respect to parental warmth because it was hypothesized that both oral and hysterical traits would be associated with low perceived warmth.
The failure of the multivariate analysis to indicate significant differences among character types in terms of the childrearing measures, could be taken as an indication that it is not useful to conceptualize personality according to the oral, anal and hysterical character types. An adequate typology should enable researchers to make predictions on the basis of subject assignment to a type, but the results of the MANOVA suggest that this is not possible in this instance. However, certain limitations in the present study preclude a definite conclusion. As already noted, the measure of character type used was not designed for a university population and remains essentially unvalidated. As well, the factor analysis of the childrearing questionnaire was based on a minimum number of subjects (for males, there were 50 variables and 63 subjects). This may have resulted in somewhat unreliable scales, although high correlations with earlier scales based on the same items (Slater, 1962) would argue against this. Finally, the very small number of subjects included in the MANOVA may have prohibited significant group differences.

The major conclusion which can be drawn from the present study is that perceptions of childrearing are related to measures of character type. However,
differences between types were not demonstrated on childrearing measures. Until classification by type results in significant differences on these, or other measures, the usefulness of the psychoanalytic character typology remains in question.
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Appendix 1. Personality Test Scales.

A. Item-to-trait Correlations:

Aggression:

1. I am considered aggressive by some of my acquaintances.  
Males 
Females
.64 .43

15. I am apt to express my irritation rather than hold it back.  
.76 .67

32. If someone annoys me, I am apt to tell him what I think of him.  
.61 .60

45. If I come across a domineering person I am inclined to put him in his place.  
.46 .58

75. I often let myself go when I am angry.  
.47 .64

105. I get into a fighting mood when the occasion seems to demand it.  
.69 .49

119. I get angry and show it when I am treated with disrespect.  
.43 .43

Egocentricity:

16. I can become entirely absorbed in thinking about my personal affairs, my health, my cares and my relations with others.  
.49 .47

34. I dislike sharing the credit of an achievement with others.  
.61 .42

47. I talk a great deal about myself, my experiences, my feelings and my ideas.  
.26 .32

90. I can easily become wrapped up in my own interests and forget the existence of others.  
.48 .44

107. I feel that I have enough trouble on my hands without worrying about other people's troubles.  
.35 .46
128. I try to get my own way regardless of opposition. 

130. My feelings are easily hurt by ridicule or by slighting remarks.

Dependence:

2. I am easily discouraged when things go wrong.

33. I think of myself sometimes as neglected and unloved.

46. I am apt to complain about my sufferings and hardships.

76. I feel lost and helpless when I am left by someone I love.

106. I feel insecure when I must act on my own responsibility.

120. I think that most people are rather self-centered and heartless.

129. I want sympathy, understanding and affection more than anything else.

Emotionality:

3. My feelings and emotions are easily aroused.

17. I give full vent to my feelings when I am stirred.

48. I am considered somewhat excitable by my friends.

63. I am rather sensitive, impressionable and easily stirred.

77. I have intense likes and dislikes.
91. I display temper when the occasion warrants it. 

121. I find it difficult to control my emotions. 

Emotional Constriction:
5. I am calm and placid most of the time. 
20. I usually express myself with caution and restraint. 
50. I am moderate in my tastes and sentiments. 
65. It takes a great deal to make me angry. 
94. I do things in a leisurely sort of way without worry or irritation. 
110. My emotional life is marked with moderation and balance. 
132. I take pride in my ability to control my emotions. 

Fear of Sexuality:
19. I have had a difficult sexual adjustment. 
36. I have often thought that sexually men are animals. 
49. I find sex distasteful and frightening. (no males responded true to this item) 
79. In considering marriage, I do not, or did not, enjoy thinking about the sexual aspects. 
93. Although my mind is often preoccupied with sexual matters, I have an intense fear of sex.
109. Others have felt that I have been afraid of sex. .56 .48

131. At times I have thought I was sexually frigid (or impotent). .27 .74

Exhibitionism:

4. Sometimes when I am in a crowd I say humorous things which I expect strangers will overhear. .45 .51

18. I often dramatize a story which I am telling and demonstrate exactly how everything happened. .58 .45

35. I have enjoyed flirting. .57 .64

64. I feel pleasantly exhilarated when all eyes are upon me. .67 .65

78. I enjoy holding the floor and performing before a group. .54 .62

92. I often exaggerate my part in an event to make myself appear in a more interesting light. .59 .54

108. I am dissatisfied if I remain unnoticed. .66 .61

Obstinacy:

6. When I have decided how to do a thing I dislike having others make suggestions. .43 .59

21. My ways of doing things are usually worked out better than those of others. .59 .48

37. I have strong opinions on many subjects. .43 .45
51. I do not usually back down from my opinions even when others argue with me. .44 .51
66. I tend to be stubborn about things I consider important. .22 .20
123. I become angry when someone insists upon doing something with which I do not agree. .45 .33
133. I usually stand up for my rights. .42 .42

Oral Aggression:

7. I find myself frequently disagreeing with and contradicting other people. .40 .48
22. I must admit I enjoy swearing. .41 .66
41. I have frequently been told that I have a scornful manner when I argue, especially with people whose ideas I consider inferior to mine. .43 .53
52. I tend to make biting and sarcastic remarks when I criticize other people. .66 .70
80. When in a rage, I tend to physically express my feelings, like stamping my feet, and tearing things, etc. .51 .48
95. I am fond of arguing. .43 .56
134. I find that sarcasm can be a good weapon to defend my point of view. .44 .60

Parsimony:

8. I pride myself on my thriftiness. .55 .70
23. I do not like to waste money. .53 .65
55. I like to collect things. .53 .58
69. I believe in "saving for a rainy day". .57 .53
83. I keep a careful record of money that I spend.  .61  .59

98. I cherish the possessions that I have.  .53  .55

124. I sometimes enjoy going through and looking at my possessions.  .58  .58

Orderliness:

38. I am systematic and methodical in my daily life.  .68  .67

53. I usually get through my work efficiently without wasting time.  .54  .55

67. I organize my daily activities so that there is little confusion.  .68  .72

81. When I have to undertake something difficult I make out a plan of procedure.  .43  .50

96. I like to arrange my life so that it runs smoothly and without conflict.  .61  .55

135. Everything I do must be precise and accurate.  .54  .57

136. I have a tendency to put things off until the last minute.  -.13  -.09

Passivity:

9. Good luck is more help than hard work.  .49  .56

39. Work has no place in paradise.  .44  .58

54. It is better to do nothing than make a mistake.  .31  .35

68. Comfort is necessary for a contented life.  .40  .51

82. I don't like competition, it irritates rather than stimulates me.  .41  .52
97. It is better to play it safe than to take a chance on success and risk failure. .53 .39

111. I would like a life of ease and luxury. .45 .66

Perseverance:

10. I can work at a difficult task for a long time without getting tired of it. .59 .64

24. I am able to keep working, day in, day out, without getting bored or tired. .53 .55

40. I can stand very long periods of exertion. .69 .64

56. I am a horse for work. I am seldom exhausted. .57 .55

70. I can enjoy a long spell of continuous activity. .38 .63

84. I stick to a job even though it seems I am not getting results. .64 .55

99. I find that I enjoy work more than relaxation. .33 .40

Rejection of Others:

12. I get annoyed when my time is taken up with people in whom I am not interested. .58 .75

26. I find the company of dull people completely unbearable. .65 .52

58. I usually keep myself aloof and somewhat hard to approach. .57 .56

71. I avoid closeness and familiarity with other people. .36 .48

86. I am intolerant of people who bore me. .57 .66
101. I often tend to express my resentment against a person by having nothing more to do with him. .50 .47

113. I have always preferred the company of older, talented, or generally superior people. .41 .53

Pessimism:

11. It is misery to be born, pain to live and grief to die. .52 .45

25. Life is a heavy load along a rough and weary road. .52 .56

57. Hope only brings disappointment. .36 .50

85. Hardly anyone cares much what happens to you. .46 .39

100. Selfishness and envy are the most powerful motives of mankind. .51 .51

112. There is sure to be a snag somewhere. .63 .65

137. I feel that people who say that every cloud has a silver lining just aren't being realistic. .45 .56

Rigidity:

27. I prefer to associate with my old friends even though by doing so I miss the opportunity of meeting more interesting people. .37 .48

42. I am usually consistent in my behavior; go about my work in the same way frequent the same routes, etc. .66 .57

59. I find that many of my tastes and sentiments have remained relatively constant. .52 .40
87. I find that a well-ordered mode of life, with regular hours and an established routine is most suited to my temperament.  

102. I respect custom and am therefore somewhat resistant to untested change. 

114. I am a creature of habit; I can even endure monotony without fretting. 

125. I am guided in my conduct by certain principles which I have accepted. 

Self-Doubt: 

13. When suddenly confronted by a crisis I can become inhibited and do nothing. 

29. I am slow to decide on a course of action. 

73. I dislike making hurried decisions. 

88. I do most things slowly and deliberately. 

104. I am poor at quick retorts and snap judgments. 

116. I think much and speak little. 

138. I find it difficult to make decisions. 

Suggestibility: 

14. I am easily swayed by others. 

31. People like me because I usually go along with what they want. 

44. It is difficult for me to stick to my own opinions when someone else insists on theirs. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Scale 1</th>
<th>Scale 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>I am a good follower.</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>I can often be easily convinced.</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>I am usually willing to go along with the opinions of experts.</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Sometimes I feel I have no mind of my own.</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sexual Provocativeness:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Scale 1</th>
<th>Scale 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>I have enjoyed flirting.</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>I have been a &quot;tease&quot;.</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>I enjoy being &quot;carried away&quot; by romantic movies.</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>I spend a good deal of time thinking about sexual matters.</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>I have difficulty controlling my sexual impulses.</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>I have enjoyed leading men (or women) on and then running the other way.</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>I have enjoyed playing the female-male cat and mouse game.</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Superego:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Scale 1</th>
<th>Scale 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I avoid gay and irresponsible pleasure seekers.</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>I am conscientious about telling the truth.</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>I do not allow myself the enjoyment of certain unprofitable pleasures.</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>I carry a strict conscience with me wherever I go.</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
115. I have a strong sense of responsibility about my duties.

125. I am guided in my conduct by certain principles which I have accepted.

126. I think I have a more rigorous standard of right and wrong than most people.
B. Endorsement Frequencies:

Aggression:

1. I am considered aggressive by some of my acquaintances.  
   Males: .40  Females: .36

15. I am apt to express my irritation rather than hold it back.  
   Males: .48  Females: .52

32. If someone annoys me, I am apt to tell him what I think of him.  
   Males: .35  Females: .19

45. If I come across a domineering person I am inclined to put him in his place.  
   Males: .38  Females: .27

75. I often let myself go when I am angry.  
   Males: .32  Females: .37

105. I get into a fighting mood when the occasion seems to demand it.  
   Males: .64  Females: .63

119. I get angry and show it when I am treated with disrespect.  
   Males: .62  Females: .75

Egocentricity:

16. I can become entirely absorbed in thinking about my personal affairs, my health, my cares and my relations with others.  
   Males: .71  Females: .61

34. I dislike sharing the credit of an achievement with others.  
   Males: .30  Females: .30

47. I talk a great deal about myself, my experiences, my feelings and my ideas.  
   Males: .52  Females: .51

90. I can easily become wrapped up in my own interests and forget the existence of others.  
   Males: .51  Females: .30

107. I feel that I have enough trouble on my hands without worrying about other people's troubles.  
   Males: .32  Females: .19
128. I try to get my own way regardless of opposition.  
130. My feelings are easily hurt by ridicule or by slighting remarks.

Dependence:

2. I am easily discouraged when things go wrong.
33. I think of myself sometimes as neglected and unloved.
46. I am apt to complain about my sufferings and hardships.
76. I feel lost and helpless when I am left by someone I love.
106. I feel insecure when I must act on my own responsibility.
120. I think that most people are rather self-centered and heartless.
129. I want sympathy, understanding and affection more than anything else.

Emotionality:

3. My feelings and emotions are easily aroused.
17. I give full vent to my feelings when I am stirred.
48. I am considered somewhat excitable by my friends.
63. I am rather sensitive, impressionable and easily stirred.
77. I have intense likes and dislikes.
91. I display temper when the occasion warrants it.
121. I find it difficult to control my emotions.  .16  .30

Emotional Constriction:
5. I am calm and placid most of the time.  .71  .49
20. I usually express myself with caution and restraint.  .67  .67
50. I am moderate in my tastes and sentiments.  .62  .72
65. It takes a great deal to make me angry.  .64  .61
94. I do things in a leisurely sort of way without worry or irritation.  .52  .31
110. My emotional life is marked with moderation and balance.  .57  .51
132. I take pride in my ability to control my emotions.  .56  .42

Fear of Sexuality:
19. I have had a difficult sexual adjustment.  .22  .15
36. I have often thought that sexually men are animals.  .20  .24
49. I find sex distasteful and frightening.  .00  .08
79. In considering marriage, I do not, or did not, enjoy thinking about the sexual aspects.  .08  .06
93. Although my mind is often preoccupied with sexual matters, I have an intense fear of sex.  .06  .06
109. Others have felt that I have been afraid of sex.  .16  .25
131. At times I have thought I was sexually frigid (or impotent).  .11 .21

Exhibitionism:

4. Sometimes when I am in a crowd I say humorous things which I expect strangers will overhear.  .65 .42

18. I often dramatize a story which I am telling and demonstrate exactly how everything happened.  .54 .48

35. I have enjoyed flirting.  .75 .67

64. I feel pleasantly exhilarated when all eyes are upon me.  .46 .34

78. I enjoy holding the floor and performing before a group.  .35 .27

92. I often exaggerate my part in an event to make myself appear in a more interesting light.  .49 .33

108. I am dissatisfied if I remain unnoticed.  .51 .52

Obstinacy:

6. When I have decided how to do a thing I dislike having others make suggestions.  .48 .56

21. My ways of doing things are usually, work out better than those of others.  .64 .57

37. I have strong opinions on many subjects.  .75 .76

51. I do not usually back down from my opinions even when others argue with me.  .76 .78

66. I tend to be stubborn about things I consider important.  .95 .99

123. I become angry when someone insists upon doing something with which I do not agree.  .46 .51
133. I usually stand up for my rights.  .89  .90

Oral Aggression:
7. I find myself frequently disagreeing with and contradicting other people.  .38  .24
22. I must admit I enjoy swearing.  .38  .24
41. I have frequently been told that I have a scornful manner when I argue, especially with people whose ideas I consider inferior to mine.  .37  .24
52. I tend to make biting and sarcastic remarks when I criticize other people.  .44  .37
80. When in a rage, I tend to physically express my feelings, like stamping my feet, and tearing things, etc.  .25  .24
95. I am fond of arguing.  .49  .33
134. I find that sarcasm can be a good weapon to defend my point of view.  .60  .43

Parsimony:
8. I pride myself on my thriftiness.  .40  .46
23. I do not like to waste money.  .76  .87
55. I like to collect things.  .51  .64
69. I believe in "saving for a rainy day".  .56  .67
83. I keep a careful record of money that I spend.  .29  .37
98. I cherish the possessions that I have.  .76  .72
124. I sometimes enjoy going through and looking at my possessions.  .59  .58
Orderliness:

38. I am systematic and methodical in my daily life. .56 .64
53. I usually get through my work efficiently without wasting time. .46 .45
67. I organize my daily activities so that there is little confusion. .60 .73
81. When I have to undertake something difficult I make out a plan of procedure. .83 .87
96. I like to arrange my life so that it runs smoothly and without conflict. .68 .75
135. Everything I do must be precise and accurate. .40 .33
136. I have a tendency to put things off until the last minute. .60 .63

Passivity:

9. Good luck is more help than hard work. .21 .13
39. Work has no place in paradise. .24 .16
54. It is better to do nothing than make a mistake. .05 .03
68. Comfort is necessary for a contented life. .67 .76
82. I don't like competition, it irritates rather than stimulates me. .32 .42
97. It is better to play it safe than to take a chance on success and risk failure. .29 .30
111. I would like a life of ease and luxury. .62 .58
### Perseverance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Score 1</th>
<th>Score 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I can work at a difficult task for a long time without getting tired of it.</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>I am able to keep working, day in, day out, without getting bored or tired.</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>I can stand very long periods of exertion.</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>I am a horse for work. I am seldom exhausted.</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>I can enjoy a long spell of continuous activity.</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>I stick to a job even though it seems I am not getting results.</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.</td>
<td>I find that I enjoy work more than relaxation.</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rejection of Others:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Score 1</th>
<th>Score 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I get annoyed when my time is taken up with people in whom I am not interested.</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>I find the company of dull people completely unbearable.</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>I usually keep myself aloof and somewhat hard to approach.</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>I avoid closeness and familiarity with other people.</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>I am intolerant of people who bore me.</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.</td>
<td>I often tend to express my resentment against a person by having nothing more to do with him.</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.</td>
<td>I have always preferred the company of older, talented, or generally superior people.</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pessimism:

11. It is misery to be born, pain to live and grief to die.  .03  .05

25. Life is a heavy load along a rough and weary road.  .10  .12

57. Hope only brings disappointment.  .10  .15

85. Hardly anyone cares much what happens to you.  .14  .13

100. Selfishness and envy are the most powerful motives of mankind.  .24  .31

112. There is sure to be a snag somewhere.  .54  .48

137. I feel that people who say that every cloud has a silver lining just aren't being realistic.  .43  .40

Rigidity:

27. I prefer to associate with my old friends even though by doing so I miss the opportunity of meeting more interesting people.  .56  .30

42. I am usually consistent in my behavior; go about my work in the same way frequent the same routes, etc.  .70  .80

59. I find that many of my tastes and sentiments have remained relatively constant.  .68  .79

87. I find that a well-ordered mode of life, with regular hours and an established routine is most suited to my temperament.  .41  .46

102. I respect custom and am therefore somewhat resistant to untested change.  .37  .40

114. I am a creature of habit; I can even endure monotony without fretting.  .16  .19

125. I am guided in my conduct by certain
principles which I have accepted.

Self-Doubt:
13. When suddenly confronted by a crisis I can become inhibited and do nothing.
29. I am slow to decide on a course of action.
73. I dislike making hurried decisions.
88. I do most things slowly and deliberately.
104. I am poor at quick retorts and snap judgments.
116. I think much and speak little.
138. I find it difficult to make decisions.

Suggestibility:
14. I am easily swayed by others.
31. People like me because I usually go along with what they want.
44. It is difficult for me to stick to my own opinions when someone else insists on theirs.
62. I am a good follower.
74. I can often be easily convinced.
118. I am usually willing to go along with the opinions of experts.
139. Sometimes I feel I have no mind of my own.
Sexual Provocativeness:

30. I have enjoyed flirting.                        .83 .76
43. I have been a "tease".                        .52 .54
61. I enjoy being "carried away" by romantic movies. .33 .63
89. I spend a good deal of time thinking about sexual matters. .68 .21
117. I have difficulty controlling my sexual impulses.    .25 .08
122. I have enjoyed leading men (or women) on and then running the other way. .13 .05
127. I have enjoyed playing the female-male cat and mouse game. .33 .33

Superego:

28. I avoid gay and irresponsible pleasure seekers.    .52 .52
60. I am conscientious about telling the truth.       .79 .79
72. I do not allow myself the enjoyment of certain unprofitable pleasures. .14 .19
103. I carry a strict conscience with me wherever I go. .57 .61
115. I have a strong sense of responsibility about my duties. .76 .91
125. I am guided in my conduct by certain principles which I have accepted. .92 .96
126. I think I have a more rigorous standard of right and wrong than most people. .43 .54
Appendix 2. Scales for the Parental Role Patterns questionnaire.

A. Males:

1. Maternal Warmth:

10. Some parents encourage their children to bring friends home. .41

14. Some parents make a tremendous effort to keep the family closely knit. .46

16. Some people always express their feelings openly, rather than keeping them to themselves. .38

20. Some parents spend a lot of time entertaining their children by playing games with them, going on picnics, taking them to the circus, etc. .48

21. Some parents are always sympathetic whenever their child cries or is upset about something. .34

29. Some parents are very demonstrative in expressing love and affection toward their children. .48

30. Some parents give their children a lot of help with school work. .47

32. Some parents try to reason with their children when they misbehave, rather than using some form of punishment. .53

34. Some parents regulate the behavior of their children by praising them when they do well. .60

38. Some parents are especially concerned with teaching their children a great deal in the way on general information and practical knowledge. .52

39. Some parents are helpful in teaching their children how to get along with other people. .71
40. Some parents are helpful in teaching their child how to live comfortably with himself.  

41. Some parents are very effective in maintaining discipline in the home.  

44. Some parents are very effective in helping their children solve problems related to friendships outside the family.  

45. Some parents are very effective in helping their children solve practical problems like learning new skills.  

46. Some parents are very effective in helping their children through the various emotional crises associated with growing up.  

49. How often did you feel free to confide in your parents and tell them your troubles? (indicates often)  

2. Maternal Control:  

13. Some parents, when they make a rule, stick to it, rather than permitting exceptions and violations under particular circumstances.  

18. Some parents object when their children loaf, daydream or get spring fever.  

19. Some parents place a lot of emphasis on "being a man" and not getting easily upset.  

22. Some parents insist upon prompt and unquestioning obedience.  

24. Some parents always allow their children to express their feelings when the children are angry or annoyed at them.  

25. Some parents are strict.
26. Some people derive great pleasure from helping and caring for other people. 

27. Some people are inclined to hold a grudge.

28. Some parents use physical punishment as their principle form of discipline.

33. Many parents place a lot of emphasis on the importance of keeping busy and not wasting time on idle pleasures.

35. Many parents get angry when their children are disobedient or defiant.

3. Sociable Mother:

1. Some people are very sociable and gregarious.

4. Some people are very interested in literature.

6. Some people get tremendous pleasure from playing host.

9. Some people place a lot of emphasis upon the importance of controlling one's feelings.

11. Some people are very assertive.

30. Many parents give their children a lot of help with school work.

33. Many parents place a lot of emphasis on the importance of keeping busy and not wasting time with idle pleasures.

47. Which parent administered the discipline in your family when both parents were present? (indicates mother)

48. Which of your parents had the final say as to what you could or could not do? (indicates mother)
4. Modern Mother:

4. Some people are very interested in literature. .62

8. Some people are very optimistic about the motives of others. .58

15. Some parents try to smooth over quarrels and arguments that arise in the family. .54

38. Some parents are especially concerned with teaching their children a great deal in the way of general information and practical knowledge. .47

41. Some parents are very effective in maintaining discipline in the home. -.32

47. Which parent administered the discipline in your family when both parents were present? (indicates father) .51

5. Paternal Warmth:

10. Some parents encourage their children to bring friends home. .37

12. Some parents give their children a phenomenal amount of care and attention. .51

14. Some parents make a tremendous effort to keep the family closely knit. .42

15. Some parents try to smooth over quarrels and arguments that arise in the family. .48

20. Some parents spend a lot of time entertaining their children by playing games with them, going on picnics, taking them to the circus, etc. .58

21. Some parents are always sympathetic whenever their child cries or is upset about something. .43

24. Some parents always allow their children to express their feelings when the children are angry or annoyed with them. .54
26. Some people derive great pleasure from helping and caring for other people.

29. Some parents are very demonstrative in expressing love and affection toward their children.

30. Many parents give their children a lot of help with school work.

32. Some parents try to reason with their children when they misbehave rather than using some form of punishment.

34. Some parents regulate the behavior of their children by praising them when they do well.

36. Many people seem to spend their whole lives working and striving with hardly any thought of pleasure.

38. Some parents are especially concerned with teaching their children a great deal in the way of general information and practical knowledge.

39. Some parents are helpful in teaching their children how to get along with other people.

40. Some parents are helpful in teaching their child to live comfortably with himself.

41. Some parents are very effective in maintaining discipline in the home.

42. Some parents praise their children when they get good grades.

43. Some parents praise a child most when he accomplishes something of which he himself is proud.

44. Some parents are effective in helping the child solve problems related to his friendships outside the family.
45. Some parents are most effective in helping their children solve practical problems like learning new skills.

46. Some parents are very effective in helping their children through the various crises associated with growing up.

49. How often did you feel free to confide in your parents and tell them your troubles? (indicates often)

50. Some parents praise their children when they achieve success in their social life.

6. Paternal Control:

5. Some people are easy-going.

10. Some parents encourage their children to bring friends home.

13. Some parents, when they make a rule, stick to it, rather than permitting exceptions and violations under particular circumstances.

17. Some parents are soft with regard to discipline.

18. Some parents object when their children loaf, daydream or get spring fever.

19. Some parents place a lot of emphasis on "being a man" and not getting easily upset.

22. Some parents insist upon prompt and unquestionning obedience.

24. Some parents always allow their children to express their feelings when the children are angry or annoyed with them.

25. Some parents are strict.

28. Some parents use physical punishment as their principle form of discipline.

31. Many people are conventional and conform to all the rules and demands of society.
33. Many parents place a lot of emphasis on the importance of keeping busy and not wasting time on idle pleasures.  

35. Many parents get very angry when their children are disobedient or defiant.  

37. Many parents take pains to guide their children in their choice of career.  

41. Some parents are very effective in maintaining discipline in the home.  

7. Sociable Father:  

5. Some people are easy-going.  

6. Some people get tremendous pleasure from playing host.  

8. Some people are very optimistic about the motives of others.  

12. Some parents give their children a phenomenal amount of care and attention.  

26. Some people derive great pleasure from helping and caring for other people.  

27. Some people are inclined to hold a grudge.  

36. Many people seem to spend their whole lives working and striving with hardly any thought of pleasure.  

41. Some parents are very effective in maintaining discipline in the home.  

49. How often did you feel free to confide in your parents and tell them your troubles? (indicates often)  

50. Some parents praise their children for successes in their social life.
8. Modern Father:

4. Some people are very interested in literature. .53

6. Some people get tremendous pleasure from playing host. .31

14. Some parents make a tremendous effort to keep the family closely knit. .33

16. Some people always express their feelings openly rather than keeping them to themselves. .58

23. Some parents are very interested in music and art. .69

27. Some people are inclined to hold a grudge. .42

29. Some parents are very demonstrative in expressing love and affection toward their children. .40

30. Many parents give their children a lot of help with school work. .53

38. Some parents are especially concerned with teaching children a great deal in the way of general information and practical knowledge. .40

49. How often did you feel free to confide in your parents and tell them your troubles?

(indicates often) .42
B. Females.

1. Maternal Warmth:

2. Some people are "outdoor" types. .31

3. Some people are inclined to emphasize the humorous side of a situation. .47

5. Some people are easy-going. .54

10. Some parents encourage their children to bring friends home. .35

15. Some parents try to smooth over quarrels and arguments that arise in the family. .56

20. Some parents spend a lot of time entertaining their children by playing games with them, going on picnics, taking them to the circus, etc. .32

21. Some parents are always sympathetic whenever their child cries or is upset about something. .31

24. Some parents always allow their children to express their feelings when the children are angry or annoyed at them. .35

26. Some people derive great pleasure from helping and caring for other people. .49

27. Some people are inclined to hold a grudge. -.53

32. Some parents try to reason with their children when they misbehave, rather than using some form of punishment. .38

34. Some parents regulate the behavior of their children by praising them when they do well. .43

38. Some parents are especially concerned with teaching their children a great deal in the way of general information and
practical knowledge.

39. Some parents are helpful in teaching their children how to get along with other people.

40. Some parents are helpful in teaching their child to live comfortably with himself.

41. Some parents are very effective in maintaining discipline in the home.

43. Some parents praise a child most when he accomplishes something of which he himself is proud.

44. Some parents are effective in helping the child solve problems related to his friendships outside the family.

45. Some parents are most effective in helping their child solve practical problems like learning new skills.

46. Some parents are very effective in helping their children through the various emotional crises associated with growing up.

48. Which of your parents had the final say as to what you could or could not do? (indicates father)

49. How often did you feel free to confide in your parents and tell them your troubles? (indicates often)

2. Maternal Control:

8. Some people are very optimistic about the motives of others.

9. Some people place a lot of emphasis upon the importance of controlling one's feelings.

13. Some parents, when they make a rule, stick to it, rather than permitting exceptions and violations under particular circumstances.
17. Some parents are soft with regard to discipline.  

18. Some parents object when their children loaf, daydream, or get spring fever.  

19. Some parents place a lot of emphasis on "being a man" and not getting easily upset.  

22. Some parents insist upon prompt and unquestioning obedience.  

25. Some parents are strict.  

31. Many people are conventional and conform to all the rules and demands of society.  

33. Many parents place a lot of emphasis on the importance of keeping busy and not wasting time on idle pleasures.  

35. Many parents get angry when their children are disobedient or defiant.  

3. Dominant Mother:  

1. Some people are very sociable and gregarious.  

6. Some people get tremendous pleasure from playing host.  

11. Some people are very assertive.  

16. Some people always express their feelings openly, rather than keeping them to themselves.  

21. Some parents are always sympathetic whenever their child cries or is upset about something.  

25. Some parents are strict.  

27. Some people are inclined to hold a grudge.  

41. Some parents are very effective in maintaining discipline in the home.
47. Which parent administered the discipline in your family when both parents were present? 

(indicates mother) 

4. Modern Mother: 

2. Some people are "outdoor types". 

4. Some people are very interested in literature. 

23. Some parents are very interested in music and art. 

26. Some people derive great pleasure from helping and caring for other people. 

29. Some parents are very demonstrative in expressing love and affection toward their children. 

30. Some parents give their children a lot of help with school work. 

31. Many people are conventional and conform to all the rules and demands of society. 

37. Some parents take pains to guide their children in their choice of a career. 

5. Good Mother: 

7. Some parents place a certain emphasis on getting good grades in school. 

10. Some parents encourage their children to bring friends home. 

12. Some parents give their children a phenomenal amount of care and attention. 

20. Some parents spend a lot of time entertaining their children by playing games
with them, going on picnics, taking them to the circus, etc.

23. Some parents are very interested in music and art.

28. Some parents use physical punishment as their principle form of discipline.

32. Some parents try to reason with their children when they misbehave, rather than using some form of punishment.

34. Some parents regulate the behavior of their children by praising them when they do well.

36. Many people seem to spend their whole lives working and striving with hardly any thought of pleasure.

37. Some parents take pains to guide their children in their choice of a career.

39. Some parents are helpful in teaching their children how to get along with other people.

40. Some parents are helpful in teaching their child to live comfortably with himself.

42. Some parents praise their children when they get good grades.

43. Some parents praise a child most when he accomplishes something of which he himself is proud.

44. Some parents are effective in helping the child solve problems related to his friendships outside the family.

45. Some parents are most effective in helping their children solve practical problems like learning new skills.

46. Some parents are very effective in helping their children through the various emotional crises associated with growing up.
49. How often did you feel free to confide in your parents and tell them your troubles? (indicates often)

50. Some parents praise their children when they achieve successes in their social life.

6. Paternal Warmth:

6. Some people get tremendous pleasure from playing host.

10. Some parents encourage their children to bring friends home.

12. Some parents give their children a phenomenal amount of care and attention.

14. Some parents make a tremendous effort to keep the family closely knit.

15. Some parents try to smooth over quarrels and arguments that arise in the family.

20. Some parents spend a lot of time entertaining their children by playing games with them, going on picnics, taking them to the circus, etc.

21. Some parents are always sympathetic whenever their child cries or is upset about something.

23. Some parents are interested in music and art.

24. Some parents always allow their children to express their feelings when the children are angry or annoyed at them.

26. Some people derive great pleasure from helping and caring for other people.

29. Some parents are very demonstrative in expressing love and affection toward their children.

30. Many parents give their children a
lot of help with school work.

32. Some parents try to reason with their children when they misbehave, rather than using some form of punishment.

34. Some parents regulate the behavior of their children by praising them when they do well.

38. Some parents are especially concerned with teaching their children a great deal in the way of general information and practical knowledge.

39. Some parents are helpful in teaching their children how to get along with other people.

40. Some parents are helpful in teaching their child to live comfortably with himself.

41. Some parents are very effective in maintaining discipline in the home.

43. Some parents praise a child most when he accomplishes something of which he himself is proud.

44. Some parents are effective in helping the child solve problems related to his friendships outside the family.

45. Some parents are most effective in helping their children solve practical problems like learning new skills.

46. Some parents are very effective in helping their children through the various emotional crises associated with growing up.

49. How often did you feel free to confide in your parents and tell them your troubles? (indicates often)

7. Paternal Control:
5. Some people are easy going. - .56

8. Some people are very optimistic about the motives of others. - .30

11. Some people are very assertive. .42

12. Some parents give their children a phenomenal amount of care and attention. - .36

13. Some parents, when they make a rule, stick to it, rather than permitting exceptions and violations under particular circumstances. .32

17. Some parents are soft with regard to discipline. - .52

18. Some parents object when their children loaf, daydream or get spring fever. .41

22. Some parents insist upon prompt and unquestioning obedience. .70

25. Some parents are strict. .56

28. Some parents use physical punishment as their principle form of discipline. .34

32. Some parents try to reason with their children when they misbehave, rather than using some form of punishment. - .39

33. Many parents place a lot of emphasis on the importance of keeping busy and not wasting time with idle pleasures. .65

35. Many parents get angry when their children are disobedient or defiant. .45

36. Many people seem to spend their whole lives working and striving with hardly any thought of pleasure. .32

39. Some parents are helpful in teaching their children how to get along with other people. - .31

45. Some parents are most effective in helping their children solve practical problems like learning new skills. - .40
47. Which parent administered the discipline in your family when both parents were present?  
(indicates father)  

50. Some parents praise their children when they achieve successes in their social life.  

8. Sociable Father:  
1. Some people are very sociable and gregarious.  

3. Some people are inclined to emphasize the humorous side of a situation.  

6. Some people get tremendous pleasure from playing host.  

8. Some people are very optimistic about the motives of others.  

9. Modern Father:  
2. Some people are "outdoor types".  

4. Some people are very interested in literature.  

9. Some people are very optimistic about the motives of others.  

15. Some parents try to smooth over quarrels and arguments that arise in the family.  

16. Some people always express their feelings openly, rather than keeping them to themselves.  

18. Some parents object when their children loaf, daydream, or get spring fever.  

19. Some parents place a lot of emphasis on "being a man" and not getting easily upset.  

23. Some parents are very interested in art and music. .40

31. Some people derive great pleasure from helping and caring for other people. -.49

10. Praise -- Father:

5. Some people are easy going. .30

7. Some parents place a certain emphasis on getting good grades on school. .54

10. Some parents encourage their children to bring friends home. .52

12. Some parents give their children a phenomenal amount of care and attention. .32

32. Some parents try to reason with their children when they misbehave, rather than using some form of punishment. .34

34. Some parents regulate the behavior of their children by praising them when they do well. .58

37. Some parents take pains to guide their children in their choice of a career. .45

38. Some parents are especially concerned with teaching their children a great deal in the way of general information and practical knowledge. .52

39. Some parents are helpful in teaching their children how to get along with other people. .48

40. Some parents are helpful in teaching their child to live comfortably with himself. .53

42. Some parents praise their children when they get good grades. .64
43. Some parents praise a child most when he accomplished something of which he himself is proud. .58

44. Some parents are effective in helping the child solve problems related to his friendships outside the family. .44

45. Some parents are very effective in helping their children solve practical problems like learning new skills. .47

46. Some parents are very effective in helping their children through the various emotional crises associated with growing up. .31

47. Which parent administered the discipline in your family when both parents were present? (indicates father) .46

48. Which of your parents had the final say as to what you could or could not do? (indicates father) .45

50. Some parents praise their children when they achieve successes in their social life. .47
Appendix 3: Scale Statistics.

A. Personality questionnaire.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>s.d.</th>
<th>Skew</th>
<th>se</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Aggression.</td>
<td>10.70</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Egocentricity.</td>
<td>10.62</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dependence.</td>
<td>11.62</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Emotionality.</td>
<td>10.29</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Emotional constriction</td>
<td>9.65</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Fear of sexuality.</td>
<td>13.06</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Exhibitionism.</td>
<td>10.22</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Obstinacy.</td>
<td>9.05</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Oral aggression.</td>
<td>10.97</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Parsimony.</td>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Orderliness.</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Passivity.</td>
<td>11.49</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Perseverance.</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Rejection of others.</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Pessimism.</td>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>-0.96</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Rigidity.</td>
<td>10.18</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Self-doubt.</td>
<td>10.92</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Suggestibility.</td>
<td>11.70</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>-0.51</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Sexual provocativeness</td>
<td>10.79</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Superego.</td>
<td>9.79</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Significant skew (p<.05)
Females:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Skew</th>
<th>se</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Aggression.</td>
<td>10.67</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Egocentricity.</td>
<td>10.94</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dependence.</td>
<td>11.24</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Emotionality.</td>
<td>9.73</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Emotional constriction</td>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Fear of sexuality.</td>
<td>12.81</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>-1.89</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Exhibitionism.</td>
<td>10.97</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Obstinacy.</td>
<td>9.02</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Oral aggression.</td>
<td>11.88</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Parsimony.</td>
<td>9.66</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Orderliness.</td>
<td>9.61</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Passivity.</td>
<td>11.55</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Perseverance.</td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Rejection of others.</td>
<td>11.09</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Pessimism.</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Rigidity.</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Self-doubt.</td>
<td>10.96</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Suggestibility.</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Sexual provocativeness</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Superego.</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Significant skew (p<.05)
B. Parental Role Patterns questionnaire.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>s.d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Maternal Warmth:</td>
<td>23.51</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Maternal Control:</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Sociable Mother:</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Modern Mother:</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Paternal Warmth:</td>
<td>36.31</td>
<td>8.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Paternal Control:</td>
<td>18.63</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Sociable Father:</td>
<td>13.80</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Modern Father:</td>
<td>14.19</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Maternal Warmth:</td>
<td>25.49</td>
<td>6.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Maternal Control:</td>
<td>15.37</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Sociable Mother:</td>
<td>9.96</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Modern Mother:</td>
<td>10.06</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Good Mother:</td>
<td>19.78</td>
<td>5.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Paternal Warmth:</td>
<td>28.78</td>
<td>7.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Paternal Control:</td>
<td>22.70</td>
<td>5.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Sociable Father:</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Modern Father:</td>
<td>11.65</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Praise:</td>
<td>20.65</td>
<td>5.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Significant skew (p<.05)
Appendix 4: Personality Factor Structure

A. Males:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentricity</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependence</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionality</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Constrict.</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Sexuality</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibitionism</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstinacy</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Aggression</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsimony</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orderliness</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passivity</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perseverance</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejection of Others</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pessimism</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigidity</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Doubt</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestibility</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Provocative.</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superego</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Females:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentricity</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependence</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionality</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Constrict.</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Sex</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibitionism</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstinacy</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Aggression</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsimony</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orderliness</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passivity</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perseverance</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejection of Others</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pessimism</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigidity</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Doubt</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestibility</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.60</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex. Provocative.</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superego</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>