

RELATIONSHIPS OF LENGTH OF PUNISHMENT WITH
TYPE OF PUNISHMENT AND DEVELOPMENT
OF GUILT RESPONSIVITY.

APPROVED:

Merl E. Bonney
Major Professor

Gary L. Landreth
Minor Professor

Swane Kingery
Dean of the School of Education

Robert B. Toulousy
Dean of the Graduate School

RELATIONSHIPS OF LENGTH OF PUNISHMENT WITH
TYPE OF PUNISHMENT AND DEVELOPMENT
OF GUILT RESPONSIVITY

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
North Texas State University in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

By

Bobby Leon Means, B.A.

Denton, Texas

May, 1969

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Importance of Problem	
Theory	
Statement of Problem	
Hypotheses	
II. RELATED STUDIES	18
III. THE INSTRUMENTS	36
The Projective Story Completion Test	
Measures of Antecedent Variables	
IV. METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES	40
V. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	50
Statistical Method	
Interrelationships Among All Variables	
Zero-order Correlations Between the Predictor	
Variables and the Criterion Variables	
Multiple Regression Analysis	
VI. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS	60
APPENDIX I	64
APPENDIX II	80
BIBLIOGRAPHY	92

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. High Conscience: Relationship to the Mother's Warmth and Her Use of Withdrawal of Love . . .	20
II. Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations Among the Predictor Tests and the Criterion Test (N = 73)	52
III. Rank Order of Predictors With Regard to Contribution to the Multiple Correlation Showing \bar{F} Level, Standard Error, Coefficient of Multiple Determination, and Multiple Correlation	57

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The guilt construct plays a prominent role in personality theory and in the explanation of many cases of maladjustment. One need spend little time in the volumes of psychology to behold the far-reaching development and use of the guilt construct. Although the guilt construct has for a great period of time played an influential role in theory, until recently empirical support of its influence on human behavior has been seriously lacking.

The lack of empirical research on the role of guilt in earlier years was a result of the unavailability of suitable instruments for measuring the nebulous character of guilt. As techniques for measuring guilt became available, research indicating relationships between certain types of maladjustment and guilt appeared.

As a result of the empirical relationships found between certain maladjustments and guilt, the search for the factors which influence the development of guilt began. Here again the long standing theoretical positions on the development of guilt have only recently received empirical support.

Those investigators who wished to find the factors which influence the development of the guilt response,

following the guides of personality theory, looked to early parent-child relationships. The preponderance of the research has focused on the types of parental punishments employed with consideration given the general emotional nature of the relationship.

Although much research has been compiled on the relationship between different types of parental discipline techniques and the development of guilt in the last two decades, very few consistent relationships can be found in a review of the literature. The inconsistencies and frequent contradictions in different studies can be attributed to a number of factors. Hoffman points out that we are in "... the early stages of research when measuring instruments and experimental procedures are cumbersome and inefficient" (8, p. 295). He also points out that terms such as "psychological discipline" should be broken down into more homogeneous units before consistency in research can be expected. Bradbury in accounting for the inconsistencies states:

The particular methods used in the socialization process, such as child-rearing practices, for instance, provide the area of greatest controversy. These discrepancies can be attributed to many factors, for example, the following: the size of the sample, the criteria by which the sample was chosen, the age of the children at the time of the study, the time between actual events and reported events, different measuring instruments, and many other factors (2, p. 13).

One factor not mentioned above, yet conceivably one which might account for some of the inconsistency in research, is that not all aspects of the parent-child relationship which

significantly influence the development of guilt have been investigated or identified.

~~The~~ The present study attempts to measure the length of punishment and investigate its relationship with the development of the guilt response. This previously unexplored hypothesized dimension of punishment should not be viewed as how many times the parent strikes or verbally scolds the child upon transgression, but rather how long the child perceives the parent as maintaining an angry punitive attitude after the child's misdeed.

Previous studies in this area have implicitly assumed, and on occasion explicitly stated, that physical types of punishment are short term; whereas, psychological types of punishment are long term. The following example is presented:

It seems plausible that psychological discipline may become even more "painful" to S than corporal methods once he learns to respond to it, in that, if the parent slaps him, the punishment is over; but the mother's not talking to him for half an hour lasts longer (3, p. 706).

Although this assumption might be essentially correct in many cases, there is no empirical evidence supporting the assumption. It is possible that the parent who uses corporal punishment does not forgive upon termination of the physical punishment, and the end of physical punishment may, in fact, mark the beginning of a type of psychological punishment.

(Put more simply, parental punishment techniques, regardless of type, involve some amount of overt dissatisfaction

with the child and/or his behavior. It is assumed that there is some variation in the length of time the parent maintains a punitive attitude toward the child and that the child is sensitive to the length or duration of this temporary "break-down" in the parent-child relationship. Further, the duration of the break-down may not be related to the type of punishment the parent employs, and the duration of the break-down in the relationship may in itself influence the development of the child's guilt responsivity.

40 Importance of Problem

Every parent faces the problem of somehow enforcing his will on the child. The desirable outcome of parental discipline is that the child will develop a sense of "right and wrong" and that the child will be largely guided by his concept of morality. Another desirable outcome of discipline is that the child should respond to some transgressions with an appropriate amount of guilt feelings. Feelings of guilt are important not only as a deterrent to further transgression, but also as motivation to "make things right again."

The field of psychology has few guidelines based on empirical evidence to offer parents in their quest to socialize their children although the results of abnormal conscience development often provide the basis for severe adjustment problems. Sears, et al. describe the child with an over and under developed conscience:

The child with too strong a conscience is guilt-ridden. His own impulses constantly excite him

to confession and to a too instant admission of wrong-doing. He is prevented from experimentation with new impulses; he dares not risk the danger of self-punishment. New ideas and new experiences, even new people, are dangerous to him. He becomes rigid and inflexible in his judgements of others, a purveyor of sanctimony and propriety. His repressed hostilities are brought into the service of his moral judgements. In childhood he is a prig, a teacher's pet; in adulthood he can become cruel and vicious in his expression of moral indignation. Worst of all, perhaps, he can have no fun in life, for fun itself is subject to inner control (14, p. ?).

In reference to the child at the other extreme, one with a weak conscience, they state:

What he lacks in guilt he makes up in fear. His actions are bounded only by the possibility of his being caught and punished for his wrongdoing. His moral judgements are based on expediency. He cannot be trusted out of sight and supervision. His infantile impulses remain strong, and in the absence of a punitive disciplinarian he has no reluctance to express them. He may bully younger or weaker children, steal and lie if he thinks he can get away with it, and flee to hide when anything happens that may conceivably be viewed amiss by adults. In childhood he is aggressive and mean, a troublemaker at home and at school. In adulthood, he may be a conscienceless rogue in his social and business relationships, an undisciplinable bum, or a criminal (14, p. ?).

Of further importance is the possibility that guilt feelings may hamper intellectual development. Weisskopf (16) suggests that intellectual blocking may result from guilt feelings related to a specific topic such as sex. Similarly, guilt may be displaced on general intellectual functioning from any specific aspect of knowledge.

One of the fundamental issues in the study of conscience involves the role of guilt in the genesis of neurosis. Studies

concerned with the relationship of guilt to neurosis are sparse, but the majority of the studies available suggest limitations to the hypothesis that neurotics suffer from too much guilt. Kohlberg (9) comments that many of these studies could be criticized on the grounds that the guilt they measure is general guilt related to transgressions of our culture, not inappropriate, neurotic guilt.

Although he has received very little empirical support, Freud was very explicit in his view on the role of guilt in neurosis. He states: "It seems as though this factor, the unconscious need for punishment, plays a part in every neurotic disease" (5, p. 148). He goes on to say:

As to the origin of this unconscious need for punishment, there can be, I think, no doubt. It behaves like a part of conscience, like the prolongation of conscience into the unconscious; and it must have the same origin as conscience, that is to say it will correspond to a piece of aggressiveness which has been internalized and taken over by the super-ego. . If only the words were less incongruous, we should be justified, for all practical purposes, in calling it 'an unconscious sense of guilt' (5, pp. 149-150).

Lending some support to Freud's theory is a recent experiment by Lowe. The results of the study indicate; "Guilt and anxiety, as measured by self-report scales, are thus seen to be equivalent and the commonly held distinction between the two terms is held to lie more in the mind of the beholder than in the mind of the beheld" (11, p. 554).

Although there are some differences of theoretical opinion as to the predominance of guilt in neurosis, and conflicting evidence as to the frequency of overly severe consciences

in neurotic patients, there can be little doubt that the guilt construct plays some role in the dynamics of some neurotic disorders. Be the role major or minor, it is important to discover the factors which influence the development of normal and abnormal guilt. If the findings are not of value to the psychoanalyst in his guiding the patient through the memories of his past, perhaps they may be of some value to the behavior therapist as guides to relearning.

Of course the concept of guilt has importance in the fields of juvenile delinquency and criminology. Following the extensive study of adolescent aggression Bandura and Walters state:

... the aggressive boys were restrained from aggression in the home primarily through fear of retaliation by their parents, whereas the control boys were restrained primarily through anticipation of the guilt that they would feel if they aggressed (1, p. 247).

They also found that both lower- and middle-class delinquents were late in developing self-critical guilt responses. A comparable occurrence was found in adult prisoners. Mosher (12) found that prisoners who measured high on his guilt scale were older before being sent to prison.

If for no other reason, further investigation of the guilt construct and its development is warranted by the frequent use of the construct in both theory and practice although our "understanding" of the construct has but little empirical support, much of which is conflicting.

This brief section gives the reader some idea of the importance and wide application of the guilt construct. Better

understanding of the construct could lead to more effective therapy or rehabilitation in a variety of settings while lending to better understanding of the development of normal and abnormal conscience development.

Theory

To this point the term guilt has been used with little indication of its relative role in personality organization. The present research is concerned with conscience development. Guilt is measured as it is suspect of being a symptom of the growth of the internal controls of the child. Guilt development and conscience development should be highly correlated. What are the signs of conscience development and why has guilt been chosen as the measure of conscience? Sears, et al. (13) suggest there are three indications of conscience development: (1) resistance to temptation, (2) acting the parental role by teaching parental standards to peers, and (3) by the way the child acts after transgression. The first two indications of conscience mentioned are qualities of behavior which are difficult to measure and observe, and which offer some serious complications to adequate research designs. Although the behavior indicative of guilt feelings also provides some difficulties in measurement, as discussed earlier, this approach to the problem of measuring conscience development has historically been seen as the lesser of three evils and has received most attention and development.

There is a wide range of behaviors which are interpreted as being guilt motivated, but for present purposes they can be grouped in two major categories: expiatory behavior and punishment seeking behavior. Guilt may also be interpreted as being present when the child overtly expresses a negative moral judgement or admits negative affect concerning his behavior. The behaviors which comprise the guilt score in this study are discussed more fully in the scoring manual in Appendix II.

It is well at this point to loosely "specify" the nature of the guilt response. In the well developed conscience the process between misdeed and expiation may be complex, and theoretically accountable in varied ways, but it does seem safe to view the guilt response as an uncomfortable psychophysical state. To exemplify this assumption an example of punishment-seeking behavior given by Unger is presented. In reference to an eight year old girl who smoked a cigarette and then ran to her mother begging to be spanked, Unger comments:

She looked at the remains of the cigarette. "It was wrong to do that," reproduced an activated pattern of neural assemblies, "I am a bad girl"; whereupon, a distinctive, epirephrine-like pattern of visceral responses ensued. The feedback stimuli from the viscera compounded with active association paths (or some such speculative picture) and maintained and built a reverberating pattern of "related ideation" and mounting affect. "I did wrong, I feel bad:" -- note, the youngster has learned, discriminative verbal responses in her repertoire "labeling" the intrusive emotional component in the reaction. "I feel awful" - "I deserve to be punished." The triggering of such a superstructure of mediating responses may play an important role in ensuring the outcome

of the sequence, i.e., the strange request: "Mommy, you've got to spank me." Thereupon, the episode was effectively terminated (15, pp. 809).

Although the feeling of guilt has been marked as an uncomfortable psychophysical state, this does not readily explain the organism's seeking further aversive stimulation, the punishment. To understand punishment seeking acts, which at first appear contrary to the laws of learning theory, the punishment must be viewed as marking the termination of the anxiety sequence. Clarity on this point may be aided by a review of an experiment by Liddell:

One of my experimenters spent the whole year with four goats ... and he began with a telegraph sounder clicking once a second and on the sixth click the animal got the shock. ... then clicking continued for ten seconds, then ... to fifteen and twenty. Finally (up to a one-hundred second delay).

We employed a cardiometer to correlate the degree of stress with the heart-rate. The metronome clicked, the heart was accelerated. ... then was accelerated again by the next click and so on, so that it continued to accelerate along a saw-tooth type of curve. In the hundredth second, when the animal got the shock, the heart-rate went back within two seconds to the pre-signal level, so sudden was the relaxing effect of this shock.

On the other hand, the same goat, standing in the Pavlov frame ... received an unsignalled shock. ... The stress under (the first) situation was tremendous before the shock relieved it and (in the second) was minor because it was over as soon as it had appeared (10, p. 183).

Under the first condition the noxious stimulation was in fact desired. The punishment following guilt may be viewed in the

the same light. Both the shock and the punishment mark the end of the anxiety sequence.

It is now assumed that for present purposes an adequate conceptual basis for the existence of the guilt response has been provided. The following task is to provide a theoretical explanation of the guilt-producing training episode. Freud's views on the development of the guilt response provide a suitable basis for this research. Freud states:

The role, which the superego undertakes later in life, is at first played by an external power, by the parental authority. The influence of the parents dominates the child by granting proofs of affection and by threat of punishment, which, to the child, means loss of love, and which also be feared on their own account. This objective anxiety; so long as the former is dominant one need not speak of super-ego or of conscience. It is only later that the secondary situation arises, which we are far too ready to regard as the normal state of affairs; the external restrictions are introjected, so that the super-ego takes the place of the parental function and thenceforward observes, guides and threatens the ego in just the same way as the parents acted to the child before (5, p. 89).

Freud makes a distinction between "loss of love" and "punishment." Punishment must be feared on its own account because it presents noxious stimuli, but the most important threat to the child is the threatened loss of love.

Much like Freud's theoretical views on this aspect of development is the "status envy" hypothesis of Burton and Whiting (4). They hypothesize that the child learns the moral values of the person who controls the material and

nonmaterial "resources" which the child covets. The "status envy" hypothesis is similar to the earlier "denial of love" hypothesis of Whiting (17) in that they both predict the strength or severity of conscience from the strength of the child's fear of withdrawal of love of those on whom he is dependent. Grinder indentifies two processes which must be present for either the "status envy" or the "denial of love" hypotheses to be effective.

First, there should be positive affect out of which the child develops dependency and which offers him frequent occasion for the observation of the model's behavior; second, the ongoing relations should be frustrated or disrupted in order that resources the child covets can be made contingent on his modeling his behavior upon the directives of the model (7, p. 804).

These theoretical views also support the theoretical basis of the present research.

A conceptual basis for two types of punishment has now been established. First, there are those types of punishments which signify loss of parental love to the child. Secondly, there are those types of punishments which present noxious stimulation to the child. These two groupings have been referred to earlier as "psychological" and "physical" types of punishment, but hereafter they will be referred to as "exclusively dependency threatening" (EDT), and "potentially avoidance and/or aggression arousing" (AAA). These terms and abbreviations are borrowed from Unger (15).

On first thought it does seem that both of the types of punishment listed above would signify "loss of love" to

the child and evoke a parasympathetic response. There is evidence to suggest this is not the case. Funkenstein (6) found that physical types of punishment produce "anger-out" rather than "anger-in." Wolpe (18) offers evidence that the two types of reactions on a physiological basis are incompatible.

Those types of punishment which are "exclusively dependency threatening" create in the child a "dependency anxiety." Further explanation of the process is warranted. To be considered first is the fact that the child, as a result of his limited development and experience, is dependent on his parents on many counts. The parents' love for the child and their general emotional and material support of the child can be grouped under the general term "nurturance." When the parent employs an EDT type of punishment, nurturance is to some degree temporarily lost. To the child, punishment by the EDT technique threatens his dependent position and he falls subject to "dependency anxiety."

It is clear from a review of the literature that a minimum amount of warmth or nurturance in the parent-child relationship is necessary for adequate moral development. In fact, the amount of warmth in the relationship has proven most often to be the most reliable predictor of the amount of guilt the child can be expected to demonstrate. Why is warmth in the parent-child relationship necessary for moral development? If Freud is correct in his emphasis on the

"fear of loss of love" aspect of punishment, it follows that the threat and the punishment would be greater for those children who had more to lose.

In summary, concerning parental punishment techniques, the parent who has nurturant significance to the child can create two types of anxiety in the child. First, the parent can create some physical discomfort in the child or threaten to do so. Secondly, the parent can through infinite ways relate to the child his dissatisfaction and threaten the child's dependency. The parent who has no nurturant significance to the child can provide or threaten noxious stimulation, but he is incapable of creating in the child an anxiety associated with loss of parental support.

Upon misdeed which earns parental disapproval, the child experiences anxiety associated with loss of parental love and support when some type of EDT punishment technique is employed and there is nurturance to be lost. This uncomfortable situation for the child may be alleviated by regaining the parent's favor. The child's apology, undoing, or atonement are generally for the purpose of reestablishing the positive parental response pattern and relieving feelings of guilt.

Statement of Problem

Based on psychoanalytic theory discussed earlier in this chapter, the purpose of this study is to examine the relationships between length of punishment and the two common groupings of types of punishment. Further, the influence of length of punishment on guilt responsivity will be examined.

Hypotheses

Based on a review of the literature, which suggests that psychological types of punishments are long term and physical types of punishments are short term, the following hypotheses are presented for investigation.

1. That the correlation between the length of punishment scale and the psychological punishment scale will not be significantly higher than the correlation between the length of punishment scale and the physical punishment scale.

2. That there will be a slight positive relationship between the length of punishment scale and the measure of guilt responsivity.

3. That in a multiple regression equation the measure of length of punishment will aid significantly in the prediction of guilt.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bandura, A., and R. H. Walters, Adolescent Aggression, New York, Ronald Press, 1959.
2. Bradbury, Beverly R., A Study of Guilt and Anxiety as Related to Certain Psychological and Sociological Variables, unpublished doctoral dissertation, Denton, Texas, North Texas State University, 1967.
3. Burton, Roger V., Eleanor E. Maccoby, and Wesley Allinsmith, "Antecedents of Resistance to Temptation in Four-year-old Children," Child Development, XXXII (1961), 689-710.
4. Burton, Roger V., and J. W. M. Whiting, "The Absent Father and Cross-sex Identity," Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, VII (1961), 7, 85-95.
5. Freud, Sigmund, New Introductory Lectures in Psychoanalysis, New York, Norton, 1933.
6. Funkenstein, D. H., S. H. King, and M. E. Drolette, Mastery of Stress, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1957.
7. Grinder, Robert E., "Parental Childrearing Practices, Conscience, and Resistance to Temptation of Sixth-grade Children," Child Development, XXXIII (1962), 33, 803-820.
8. Hoffman, Martin L., "Childrearing Practices and Moral Development: Generalizations from Research," Child Development, XXXIV (1963), 34, 295-318.
9. Kohlberg, Lawrence, "Development of Moral Character and Ideology," Review of Child Development Research, I, edited by M. L. Hoffman and L. W. Hoffman, New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1964.
10. Liddell, H., untitled symposium presentation, Discussions on Child Development, II, edited by J. M. Tanner and B. Inhelder, New York, International Universities Press, 1954.
11. Lowe, C. Marshall, "The Equivalence of Guilt and Anxiety as Psychological Constructs," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XXVIII (1964), 553-554.

12. Mosher, D. L., and J. B. Mosher, "Guilt in Prisoners," Journal of Clinical Psychology, XXIII (2) (1967), 171-173.
13. Sears, Robert R., Eleanor E. Maccoby, and Harry Levin, Patterns of Child Rearing, Evanston, Illinois, Row, Peterson and Co., 1957.
14. Sears, Robert R., A. Rau, and R. Alpert, Identification and Child Rearing, Stanford, California, Stanford University Press, 1965.
15. Unger, Sanford M., On the Development of Guilt-response Systems, unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ithaca, New York, Cornell University, 1960.
16. Weisskopf, E. A., "Intellectual Malfunctioning and Personality," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XXXXVI (1951), 410-423.
17. Whiting, J. W. M., and J. L. Child, Child Training and Personality, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1953.
18. Wolpe, J., Psychotherapy by Reciprocal Inhibition, Stanford, California, Stanford University Press, 1958.

CHAPTER II

RELATED STUDIES

In reviewing the literature related to the development of guilt it is found that the various authors utilize different terms for the two common groupings of parental punishment practices. Although the different terms representing the two different parental behavior patterns may at times include or exclude a specific type of discipline, they can be viewed as representing two comparable groupings although the general terms themselves may differ. "Exclusively dependency-threatening techniques," as they are referred to in this study, are comparable to "love-oriented techniques," "non-physical techniques," and "psychological punishment techniques." "Potentially avoidance and/or aggression arousing techniques," as they are referred to in this study, are largely comparable to "power-assertive techniques," "direct attack techniques," and "physical punishment techniques."

Although different authors may use different terms to point out "non-physical" types of discipline, they do agree that these types of discipline are based on the love relationship, nonaggressive, and often attempt to instill in the child feelings of guilt and responsibility. The parent in some way shows his disappointment and attempts to withdraw

love. "Physical" types of punishment, of course, include corporal punishment but may also include shouting, threats of physical punishment, and denial of material goods. This grouping is aggressive in nature and often provokes a fear and/or aggressive response in the child.

To provide the reader with a general understanding of the findings in this area of research, a brief summary of the more consistent findings is presented prior to a detailed examination of some of the studies.

Punishment does not directly produce guilt since very young children who suffer punishment do not demonstrate the ability for the guilt response. There appears to be no direct relationship between the "amount" of punishment and the amount of guilt. Physical punishment does not appear to relate positively with guilt (2).

* Turning now to those factors which do relate to the development of the guilt response, the "facts" become much less clear-cut. Psychological types of punishment or amount of parental nurturance in the relationship, when considered independently, most often have not shown significant positive relationships with measures of guilt. But, when both are present in the parent-child relationship and are considered simultaneously, a clear influence on the child's guilt reactivity is identifiable. Table I from Patterns of Child Rearing clarifies the interaction.

(r) Becker reviewed the literature and made the following

TABLE I
 HIGH CONSCIENCE: RELATIONSHIP TO THE
 MOTHER'S WARMTH AND HER
 USE OF WITHDRAWAL
 OF LOVE
 (Reproduced from Sears, et al., 11, p. 388)

	Percentage of Children Rated High on Conscience
Mother relatively cold, and:	
Uses withdrawal of love fairly often	18%
Uses little or no withdrawal of love	25%
Mother relatively warm, and:	
Uses withdrawal of love fairly often	42%
Uses little or no withdrawal of love	24%

conclusions concerning the results of love-oriented and power-assertive parental discipline techniques. He states:

In an overly simplified way, the research in this area may be summarized as suggesting that approaches to discipline which focus on using the love relationship with the child to shape his behavior are more likely to be correlated with internalized reactions to transgression (feelings of guilt, self-responsibility, confession) and with nonaggressive or cooperative social relations. On the other hand, power-assertive techniques in controlling the child are more likely to correlate with externalized reactions to transgression (fear of punishment, projected hostility), and with non-cooperative, aggressive behaviors. The effect of type of discipline on resistance to temptation has produced highly conflicting findings (2, p. 177).

It should be noted that Becker presents his conclusions on a "More likely to" basis. A review of the literature in this area provides few bases for significant summary statements.

* It is stated in the preceding chapter that although the present study is concerned with the criterion guilt, the guilt is viewed only as a "representative" of conscience; therefore, it could be logically expected that the child who demonstrates a potential for the guilt response would have a developed conscience and would avoid transgression when possible. As judged from the bulk of the literature this is not the case. In research concerning children, the most representative summary statement that can be made is that there is no consistent relationship between guilt and resistance to temptation. Nor are there any consistent generalizations that can be made concerning the relationship between types of punishment and resistance to temptation.

Although the term aggression may seem "out of place" in research concerned with the development of the guilt response, in the literature aggression has often been viewed as the opposing response to guilt in experimental situations. Though making the dicotomous view of behavior is questionable; at least the research concerned with the developmental antecedents of aggression is relatively consistent. The research rather consistently points to physical types of parental punishment practices as producing aggressive children.

Start
* In the remainder of this chapter a number of studies are outlined in some detail. The reader is forewarned that many of the results of the various studies will not agree with the above summary paragraph. This is in large a result of the fact that there is much inconsistency in the findings

* of the different studies. When more recent studies are available which appear to have utilized better controls, they are reported.

[Freud's view that superego develops as a result of parental punishment techniques which threaten loss of parental love, but yet keep the child oriented toward earning parental love and support, was tested by Whiting and Child (15). Their analysis included two groupings of parental punishment practices. The "love-oriented techniques" included punishment by denial of love, threat of denial of reward, and threat of ostracism. These types of punishment were seen by the authors as fulfilling the requirements for superego development as outlined by Freud. The second grouping included punishment by ridicule, physical punishment, and threats of physical punishment. This group was termed "non-love-oriented" parental punishment techniques. Whiting and Child evaluated these types of punishment as interfering with keeping the child oriented toward striving for the love of the parent. The types of punishment in the second grouping should in fact tend to prod the child to avoid the parent.

Adult members of thirty-five primitive societies which could be rated by judges on the above mentioned dimension of love-oriented vs. non-love-oriented punishment techniques were used as subjects. The measure of superego development was the amount of "patient responsibility" used in the explanation of illness, (e.g. responsibility for illness as a result of some

Unger

past moral transgression). The results upheld Freud's views.

The authors state:

We believe it is proper to conclude that we have some dependable evidence of the predicted relationship, that guilt feelings as measured by patient responsibility for illness are related to the relative importance of love-oriented techniques in the punishment of children by their parents. But certainly there is no evidence to suggest a very close relationship here (15, p. 246).

Unger (12) investigated the relationship between parental punishment practices and the "dependability of developed guilt potentials contingent on clear transgression stimuli," and also the relationship between parental punishment practices and the pervasiveness of the child's "worry about doing wrong." His subjects were 328 sixth-graders. His measure of frequency of use of psychological discipline practices, measure of frequency of physical discipline practices, and measure of parental nurturant significance are the same instruments used in the present study. A radical adaptation of the Children's Manifest Anxiety Scale was employed to measure the neurotic-like guilt. A questionnaire measure of "arbitrary, enduring, or unpredictable" parental punishment practices was also used.

Only the mother's reported behavior was used in the analysis, but the reported behavior of the fathers paralleled those for the mothers, though of a lesser strength. Mothers' nurturance and transgression-contingent guilt potentials were correlated $+ .23$ (zero-order product-moment r , $p < .001$). Using a subsample of ($n=174$), those in the upper half of the

transgression-contingent guilt measure, guilty apprehensiveness correlated $+ .24$ (3rd order partial r , $p < .01$) with the mothers' use of unclear and enduring negative responses. The measure of unclear and enduring negative responses correlated $+ .18$ (3rd order partial r , $p < .01$) with the measure of absolute frequency of psychological punishment.

In the above study Unger found warmth or nurturant significance of the mothers to have the most significant influence on the guilt scores. Type of punishment showed relationships in the expected direction. In data manipulation Unger found the highest relationship with transgression-contingent guilt potential by combining high relative use of psychological discipline and high nurturant significance.

One method of ascertaining the relationship of type of punishment and warmth in the relationship is to look to a society in which "love" and "punishment" are separated. Whiting, in a cross-cultural study, reports the following of the Zuni;

... the disciplining is done by a so-called disciplinarian--a typical case happens in the south-west--called kachina. Here the mother takes care of the child regularly, but somebody dressed up as a ghost, god, or spirit comes and visits them. He knocks on the door and says, "Have you got any bad little boys there?" and the parent says, "Well, Jimmy hasn't been very good but please don't take him away." The spirit will then say, "We have got to take him in our basket" and the mother will say, "I am sure he will be good"; he will then say, "Well, are you sure we shouldn't take him?" and finally the mother pushes the kachina out of the house, but the kid is plenty scared and has got plenty of discipline to last him for several weeks (14, p. 202).

Although this method of discipline appears to offer a very severe threat to the child, this method of discipline produces a very low conscience strength as contrasted with the other societies of the sample. The measure of conscience strength in this study was again the amount of "patient-responsibility" used in the explanation of illness.

Turning now to the laboratory it is found that nurturant significance has a place with animal behavior in a tem-
tuous situation. Whiting (14), starting with eight, six-week-old puppies, split them into two groups. One group lived in isolation in the laboratory and were machine fed. The other group received the same treatment except that they were human fed by the same person for about ten minutes each day. After four months of this treatment each dog was placed with an experimenter, the person who had fed him for the human-fed dogs, and provided with a bowl of horse meat and a bowl of dog chow. When the dog ate from the horse meat he was whacked by the experimenter with a newspaper; when he ate from the dog chow and not the meat, the experimenter gave no response. All dogs ate the chow and not the meat in a short time. The dogs were then put in the temptation situation. Both meat and chow were present, but not the experimenter. The range of resisting temptation (not eating the horse meat) for the machine fed dogs was thirty seconds to six minutes, for the human fed dogs, six minutes to six hours.

★ [AllinSmith and Greenling (1) designed a study to measure the "severity" of superego as predicted from parental discipline.

The "severity" measure was the amount of guilt displayed by 236 young adults on a story completion test in which the hero became "secretly angry at a friendly male authority figure." The guilt in the study was specified as being guilt over aggression. The independent variables, "direct attack" and "psychological" approaches to discipline, as they were grouped in the study, were measured by a questionnaire in which the subjects were asked to report on their parents' disciplining practices when they were "about age ten to twelve." The prediction that psychological disciplining by mothers would result in high guilt over aggression was borne out at the .01 level of significance.

In Glueck and Glueck's study (4) of male delinquents, they found the delinquent group to have been subjected to physical punishment, as measured by interview data, much more frequently than the nondelinquents; and the nature of the delinquents' relationships with their parents was relatively lacking in "warmth" and "feelings of attachment" for their parents.

In looking to the "types" of punishment as predictors of guilt, a recent dissertation by Levine (8) yields a very thought provoking finding. First-graders served as subjects and all measures were taken from interview data from the parents of the children. Levine found no relationship between withdrawal of love types of punishment and her measure of conscience. However, when only the warm mothers were considered,

a positive relationship was found. This was an expected finding in keeping with other research. An unexpected finding was that use of "reasoning" in discipline by the parents was the best predictor of her measure of conscience, and that splitting the parents who used reasoning as a method of discipline into warm and cold groups did not alter the relationship.

Turning now to research concerned with resistance to temptation, a comprehensive study by Burton, et al. (3) is reported. Their subjects were four-year-old nursery school children. Before stating their hypotheses and findings, it is well to point out that the authors themselves called attention to the crudeness and unreliability of some of their measures, most of which were based only on interview data. In explaining some of their unexpected findings the authors also pointed out the younger ages of their subjects. The following general questions were the objects of their research.

1. Do early childrearing practices--specifically, weaning, toilet training, and sex training--relate to conformity to rules in four-year-olds?
2. Are techniques of punishment (love-oriented as contrasted with physical punishment or object-oriented discipline) related to resistance to temptation?
3. Does the closeness of parental control relate to resistance to temptation? Two facets of this question deserve study: (a) parental consistency and (b) the general level of demands and restrictions.

4. Is resistance to temptation related to the timing of punishment (that is, whether punishment is usually administered just before, instead of after, the deviant act)?

5. Is resistance to temptation related to the identity of the disciplinary agent or to the degree of affectional warmth that characterizes this agent?

The authors' findings are of interest and the interested reader is referred to the discussion section of the article for an account of their findings. Briefly, the authors found a positive relationship between childrens' activity level and resistance to temptation, and unexpected finding. For boys only, severe weaning and long-continued bowel training were both found to be associated with high resistance to temptation; start of training at early age was not. Again for boys, those with high emotional reactivity (an anxiety measure based both on interview data and behavior during test situation: showed a consistent trend toward cheating. The timing of punishment, whether it was before or after the act, did not appear to be related to resistance to temptation. Neither did the "extent and severity of rules, restrictions, and demands, and the mothers" consistency and clarity in establishing them" show a relationship with the childrens' responses to temptation.

The mothers of the children were questioned about how well their children understood rules and about cheating. In comparing this information to actual test performance, it was found that the girls who reportedly understood rules and what it meant to cheat, surprisingly, tended to cheat. The boys who were said to understand tended to cheat.

Of primary relevance to the present study is the finding that physical punishment, as compared to psychological punishment, had a tendency to be associated with resistance to temptation. The authors explain this contradiction to most other similar studies by the younger age of their subjects and their limited cognitive development.

Parental warmth tended to produce resistance to temptation in boys, but not at a statistically significant level. More conformity to rules for girls was found in "cold" homes. The results of high withdrawal of love by the mothers resulted in conformity for boys, but not for girls. Again, of particular interest for the present study is the finding that the rating of conscience was negatively related to the measure of resistance to temptation.

* Grinder (³6) tested the hypothesis that signs of guilt at early age is related to resistance to temptation in later years. The author used 140 eleven to twelve-year-olds who had been used in an original study by Sears, et al. (⁴11). In the original study, trained interviewers judged conscience development by the mothers' responses to questions dealing with how the child acted after he had done wrong. From this data the original authors arrived at a measure of guilt. Grinder, using the measures of guilt for the subjects taken while they were five to six-years-old, hypothesized that the measures would be positively related to their measures of resistance to temptation at ages eleven or twelve.

To assess resistance to temptation, the author used a "ray-gun" shooting gallery. The device is described in detail in Grinder (5). It is basically a rather typical carnival type shooting gallery, but the machine is programmed to give a certain score regardless of the shooter accuracy. It was easy for the children to cheat with little possibility of detection. Each child kept his own score; he could easily skip low scores, take extra shots, or could simply record higher scores than he got. No one observed the children while they shot.

Temptation was instilled by offering handsome engraved badges on which "ray-gun" was printed plus the inscription: "marksman," "sharpshooter," or "expert." The incentive appeared to have been strong and to win a badge, you had to cheat. Only thirty percent were able to resist the temptation and did not win a badge. The results confirmed the hypothesis that resistance to temptation at age eleven or twelve is strongly related to guilt signs of conscience at age five or six.

Unger (13) conducted a study in which potential guilt responsivity at different levels of success motivation was correlated to cheating vs. non-cheating behavior. The Hartshorne and May (1928) test was used as the measure of honesty. An impossible to achieve level of performance was suggested as representing success on the task. Success and honesty were rendered mutually exclusive. The 313 sixth-graders who served as subjects could easily cheat without any realistic fear of detection. The success motivation

was measured by a general questionnaire plus each student's "estimate" of "how well" he would do on the task. Guilt responsibility was measured by the projective story completion test. The hypothesis that transgression-avoidance would be associated with potential guilt responsibility was supported. Relating only guilt responsibility to cheating was in itself significant ($X^2=5.38$, $df=1$, $p<.03$). When success motivation and guilt responsibility were related together the occurrence of cheating was more significant ($X^2=15.29$, $df=3$, $p<.005$). Unger's study is one of the few to find a strong relationship between a measure of conscience and transgression-avoidance in children. His measure of "success motivation" appears to have been a relevant variable often excluded or ignored in this area of research.

MacKinnon (10) investigated one aspect of the histories of violators and non-violators in an experimental situation. The ninety-three college graduates who served as subjects were asked to work twenty mathematical problems. Each subject was left alone in a room with an answer booklet. Each subject was instructed that he could look at the solutions to some of the problems, but not at others. Forty-six percent of the ninety-three subjects looked at one or more of the prohibited solutions.

The subjects were asked to list forms of punishment commonly used by their parents. The author stated the forms of punishment fell "naturally" into two groups: one in which

the child was "actively and physically punished or frustrated;" and the other being those which suggest to the child that he is "less loved by them (the parents) because of what he has done."

It was found that the fathers of the violators used physical punishment most often. The fathers of the non-violators used physical punishment least often. Little difference was found for the mothers when the two groups were compared. Four weeks after the testing the subjects were questioned as to whether or not they had cheated in the problem solving situation. Of the twenty-two violators who admitted to cheating, only six admitted to having felt any amount of guilt over their violation. Ten of the violators who did not confess to having cheated were asked how they would have felt had they cheated. Only two of the ten stated that they would have felt badly had they cheated. The same question was asked to thirty-seven subjects who were non-violators. Eighty-four percent of this group stated they would have felt badly had they cheated.

Sears, et al. (11) found childrens' aggressiveness to be positively related to mothers' use of physical punishment and her permissiveness toward aggressive behavior. Lynn (9) hypothesized that Sears' findings could have been a result of inherited aggressive tendencies. To test this hypothesis he used as subjects English children with an age range from seven to eleven years. The childrens' aggressiveness rating

was arrived at by the responses of two of their teachers on a questionnaire. Sears' scale was administered to the mothers of the children to arrive at a rating of mothers' use of physical punishment. The results clearly indicate the degree of mothers' use of physical punishment is positively related with the childrens' aggressiveness. There was a less clear tendency for mothers' permissiveness toward aggressive behavior to produce aggressive children. The author concluded that: "Sears' physical punishment factor is a genuine environmental influence determining the level of aggression of the child . . ." (11, p. 163).

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Allinsmith, Wesley, and Thomas C. Greenling, "Guilt over Anger as Predicted from Parental Discipline: A Study of Superego Development," American Psychologist, X (1955), 320. (Abstract.)
2. Becker, Wesley C., "Consequences of Different Kinds of Parental Discipline," Review of Child Development Research, I, edited by M. L. Hoffman and L. W. Hoffman, New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1964.
3. Burton, Roger U., Eleanor E. Maccoby, and Wesley Allinsmith, "Antecedents of Resistance to Temptation in Four-year-old Children," Child Development, XXXII (1961), 689-710.
4. Glueck, S., and E. Glueck, Unravelling Juvenile Delinquency, New York, Commonwealth Fund, 1950.
5. Grinder, R. E., "New Techniques for Research in Childrens' Temptation Behavior," Child Development, XXXII (1961), 679-688.
6. Grinder, R. E., "Parental Childrearing Practices, Conscience, and Resistance to Temptation of Sixth-grade Children," Child Development, XXXIII (1962), 33, 803-820.
7. Hartshorne, H., and M. A. May, Studies in the Nature of Character. Vol. I. Studies in Deceit, New York, MacMillan, 1928.
8. LeVine, B. B., Punishment Techniques and the Development of Conscience, unpublished doctoral dissertation, Evanston, Illinois, Northwestern University, 1961.
9. Lynn, R., "Personality Characteristics of the Mothers of Aggressive and Unaggressive Children," Journal of Genetic Psychology, IC (September-December, 1961), 159-164.
10. MacKinnon, D. W., "Violations of Prohibitions," Explorations in Personality, edited by H. W. Murray, New York, Oxford University Press, 1938.
11. Sears, Robert R., Eleanor E. Maccoby, and Harry Levin, Patterns of Child Rearing, Evanston, Illinois, Row, Peterson and Co., 1957.

12. Unger, Sanford M., "Antecedents of Personality Differences in Guilt Responsivity," Psychological Reports, X (February-June, 1962), 357-358.
13. Unger, Sanford M., "On the Functioning of Guilt Potential in a Conflict Dilemma," Psychological Reports, XI (August-December, 1962), 681-682.
14. Whiting, J. W. M., untitled symposium presentation, Discussions on Child Development, II, edited by J. M. Tanner and B. Inhelder, New York, International Universities Press, 1954.
15. Whiting, J. W. M., and I. Child, Child Training and Personality: A Cross-cultural Study, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1953.

CHAPTER III

THE INSTRUMENTS

The Projective Story Completion Test

Allinsmith (1) originally developed the projective story completion method for measuring moral development, but its use is probably best known from the well known study of Miller, et al. (3). In their endeavor to measure the aspects of personality which are involved in inner conflict and defense, they went to considerable trouble in choosing their measuring instruments. As their measure of guilt, they finally chose the projective story completion method. Concerning the approach, they comment:

Unlike an omnibus test, such as the Rorschach, the story completion test can be designed so that all endings are relevant to the study. Yet it retains many advantages of the omnibus type of projective test. It permits a range of responses rather than a dichotomous answer. It usually stimulates the subject to talk freely about himself because he thinks he is describing someone else. It also permits him to organize his response in any manner he chooses.

The story completion test has further assets. It can be administered to groups of subjects if the members are old enough to write. We consulted graded word lists when we constructed our stories, so that normal sixth-graders could--and did--take the test. It can be presented in a relatively short time; we were able to obtain endings to three stories in about twenty minutes (3, p. 371).

The story completion method is presently only a research instrument. Following the guides for construction of Miller, et al. (3), a great many different story beginnings are to

be found which were designed to measure various psychological constructs, but which are usually concerned with some aspect of conscience. Formal validity and reliability studies are not available for the method but Miller, et. al. did assess the validity of the method in the following manner:

A subject was included in this part of the study only if there were four classmates who felt they knew him well. They answered two questions; in each it was necessary to choose one of two alternatives. The first question was: "When he gets scolded by the teacher or some other adult, does he (a) feel bad, or (b) get mad at the teacher?" The second one: "He would talk back to the teacher if he thought he were right: (a) yes, or (b) no." The answers of four judges were pooled for each subject, and he was classified as being direct, intermediate, or indirect.

Data from the projective test agreed significantly with the descriptions of actual behavior. Children who reveal indirect aggression in story endings are inclined to be overtly aggressive in their responses to teachers, and children who reveal direct aggression in story endings are inclined to be overtly aggressive in their responses to teachers (3, p. 381).

It is acknowledged that the validity and reliability of the story completion method can be questioned, but if one wishes to measure conscience or guilt, the method is relatively efficient and effective. Kohlberg (2) reports that the story completion method is the most frequently used approach to measure conscience or moral development.

Measures of Antecedent Variables

All measures used in this study, with the exception of the length of punishment scale, are those used by Unger (4)

in his doctoral dissertation. In developing his test battery he conducted a pretest in which items or words which caused the children difficulty were modified. This pretest also served to develop standardized instructions and administration procedures which were also used in this study.

The measurement of the antecedent variables is rather straightforward. The children responded to questionnaire items concerning their parents' behavior. No validity or reliability studies are available to support this approach to measuring parental behavior. Some methodological procedures were employed to aid validity; they are discussed in the following chapter.

The measure of length of punishment is admittedly a very rough estimate. The items were designed with the idea in mind of eliciting a reflection of how long the child perceived each parent as "staying angry" after the child had transgressed and after the parent had administered some type of punishment.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Allinsmith, Wesley, The Learning of Moral Standards, unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ann Arbor, Michigan, University of Michigan, 1954.
2. Kohlberg, Lawrence, "Development of Moral Character and Moral Ideology," Review of Child Development Research, I, edited by M. L. Hoffman and L. W. Hoffman, New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1964.
3. Miller, Daniel R., Guy E. Swanson, Wesley Allinsmith, Elton B. McNeil, Beverly B. Allinsmith, Justin Aronfreed, Bett J. Beardslee, and Leonard M. Lansky, Inner Conflict and Defense, New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1960.
4. Unger, Sanford M., On the Development of Guilt-response Systems, unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ithaca, New York, Cornell University, 1960.

Chapter III

CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURE

Eighty-four sixth-grade children residing in Ada, Oklahoma, served as subjects. The children represented two of the seven public schools. Two of the classes, the entire sixth-grade population, attended Washington Public School. The third class tested attended Hayes Public School.

The city of Ada, Oklahoma, might be described as a typical small city of 18,000. The city hosts a small state college along with an average amount of business and industry. The childrens' parents serve in a wide range of occupations: teachers, salesmen, businessmen, doctors, factory workers, and other comparable occupations. It is assumed that children of all "social classes" were represented in the sample.

An intelligence measure was not taken, but as the school system provides a special class for slow learners, it is assumed that no children with Intelligence Quotients below those falling in the normal range were included in the sample. The children were predominately eleven and twelve year olds.

Of the eighty-four original subjects, seventy-three were used in the final statistical analysis. Thirty-two of these were boys, and forty-one were girls. To be included in the final sample the children had to have completed a scoreable

test booklet and had to have been living with both parents at the time of examination. Only one boy failed to complete a scoreable test booklet. He made no apparent attempt at the story completion items but did complete the remainder of the booklet. Ten subjects were excluded from the final sample because they were not living with both parents at the time of administration. Of those seventy-three test booklets used in the final analysis, ten of the 4,380 objective items were not completed. All of the story completions were scoreable.

* Total time for administration for each class was approximately one hour and ten minutes. The slight time variation between classes was largely a result of some students requiring more time for the story completions. Each class had at least a five minute break in the middle of the testing session. One class took their lunch break at slightly more than half-way through the testing period.

The experimenter strove to maintain a very formal atmosphere throughout testing. Generally the children were very well-behaved and responsive throughout the testing period. In those few instances where a child moved from his seat or communicated with another child in a disruptive manner, formal instructions not to do so "for it interferes with the other students' work" served to gain adequate control.

All instructions, test items, objective responses, and story beginnings were read aloud by the examiner. The children were instructed to read silently along with the examiner.

Time enough was given for the children to respond, but it was periodically stated: "If you need more time to think, just raise your hand." The children were allowed five minutes to complete each of the stories and approximately ten seconds for each objective item.

The manner by which the prepotency of transgression-instigated guilt-response potential (TIGRP) was measured was by the childrens' scores on the four projective story endings. The four projective story beginnings are as follows.

STORY I -- Howard

*ex. of
C. Maudsley
Scale
APPENDIX*

One day, Howard's mother sent him to the store to buy four quarts of milk. Howard got the milk. He paid the old storekeeper with a dollar bill that his mother had given him.

Then the old storekeeper made a mistake. He thought that Howard had paid him with a five dollar bill. He gave Howard four dollars back. Howard didn't say anything. He left the store. Now he had the money that he wanted. He knew the old storekeeper would never remember.

The next day, Howard was out walking. He had the four dollars in his pocket. He was thinking.

(What was Howard thinking? How did he feel? What comes next in the story? Does anything else happen? How does the story end up?)

STORY II -- Anne

Every afternoon after school, Anne had to work. It was her job to take a small flock of sheep out to the mountain-side where there was lots of grass. She had to watch them and guard them carefully. Anne sometimes felt it was not fair that she had to work every afternoon.

One day, Anne was tending the sheep when she saw some of her friends far away. They were playing. Anne ran over to say hello to her friends. They were having a good time. They wanted her to stay. Anne thought that she didn't have many chances to play, so she did stay and play with them.

Anne played for a while. Then she left to go back to her sheep.

(On her way back, what did Anne think? How did she feel? What comes next in the story? Does anything else happen? How does the story end up?)

STORY III -- Jerry

Jerry's uncle had made him a promise. On a certain day, he was going to take Jerry to the county fair. Jerry had never been to a fair. He was really looking forward to going.

When the day came, Jerry's uncle called up to say that he couldn't take Jerry to the fair. Jerry was disappointed. He got mad because his uncle had broken his promise. He wished something would happen to his uncle. He wished his uncle would be hurt.

Later, Jerry was in his room reading a book. He heard the telephone ring.

(What did Jerry think and feel when he heard the telephone ring? What comes next in the story? Does anything else happen? How does the story end up?)

STORY IV -- Paula

Paula had a very strict teacher. One day, the teacher gave a hard test. Paula wanted very much to get a good mark. But there were many questions that Paula couldn't answer.

When the teacher wasn't looking, Paula opened her book. She saw the right answers. She wrote them down. No one at all knew that she had opened her book.

On her way home from school that day, Paula was thinking that she would probably get a good mark on the test. She was thinking about the test, and about her strict teacher.

(What was Paula thinking? How did she feel? What comes next in the story? Does anything else happen? How does the story end up?)

Unger's (1) scoring system was used. The manual of detailed instructions for scoring is contained in Appendix II. Below Unger gives a general explanation of the scoring system.

There were only three, theoretically discrete, items of content which received point values in each of the protocols: 1) a "moral judgement" or evaluative mediating responses (e.g., she was

thinking she had done wrong to go and play"); 2) a statement or discription of negative affect (e.g., "she felt very bad about what she had done"); and 3) an act or even of expiation (e.g., "she went and told her father and said that she was sorry"). Appearance of a moral judgement was scored 1 point; of an act of expiation, 1 point; and of statement of negative affect, 2 points.

The affective reaction is so weighted because it is taken as the focal point in the sequence -- compounding a reverberating moral judgement, keeping evaluative responses alive and prepotent until translated into expiatory action. The negative affective component in the sequence thus is taken to provide the "motivational energy," both for the progress on toward expiation and for transgression-avoidance in future similar situations. It is granted that this is a throughly arbitrary decision (1, p. 51-52).

On each story a child could make a score from zero to four points. For the four story-completion-tests, the range was from zero to sixteen.

Three of the four antecedent variables measured in this study were the same as those used by Unger. Administration and scoring procedures for all four antecedent variables are the same as those developed by Unger. In reference to his antecedent measures Unger states:

... In establishing a frame of reference for their responses in the "nurturance" dimension, the children were instructed to "think only about what has been most true over the past year." This decision was based upon experience in pre-testing which indicated: 1) that the children would be somewhat confused and/or would establish idiosyncratic frames of temporal reference in considering their answer to such a question about their mother as "She spent a long time with me talking about things that I was very interested in"; and 2) that it was very difficult to elicit a range of responses if a specific period was not directly prescribed, i.e., the tendency

to "shove" the distribution toward the VERY MANY TIMES pole of the continuum was marked. Setting a temporal limit of one year on "the past" also seemed, for whatever reason, to overcome reluctance on the part of the children not to ascribe "good" behaviors to their parents in extreme degrees. This frame of reference was not established in the dimension of negative parental response; here the children were instructed to take into account all such events "since you were young."

Since obviously what the parents had done "in the past year" was of considerably less concern than what had happened in preceding years, the procedure "makes" some assumptions. One is that the child's responses are in part "attitudinal" rather than factual reports (1, p. 54).

The nurturance scale is reproduced below in neuter form. In the actual test booklet the proper pronouns for the mothers's and father's form was used.

DEGREE OF PREVAILING NURTURANT SIGNIFICANCE
(NURTURANCE-AFFECTION-COMPANIONSHIP VS. INDIFFERENCE-REJECTION)
ASSOCIATED WITH EACH PARENT

1. ... took the time to help me get something that I really wanted very much. (4 - 0)
2. ... spent a long time with me talking about things that I was very interested in. (4 - 0)
3. ... took me someplace for an afternoon, or on a week-end, where I really enjoyed myself. (4 - 0)
4. ... let me know that what I wanted didn't count for very much with them. (-4, -3, -2, 0)
5. ... did things which made me so mad that I just wanted to stay away from them for awhile. (-3 -0)
6. ... really tried hard to help me, or to fix things up, when they knew I was worried or in trouble. (4, 2, 0, -3)
7. ... taught me a skill, or showed me how to do the kind of things that I really wanted to learn about. (4 - 0)
8. ... hugged me, or held me close, just because they wanted to or felt real good about me. (3 - 0)

9. ... didn't have time or wasn't around when I could have used their help or needed something from them. (4 - 0)
10. ... went for a long time without being home much or without caring very much about things that happened. (-4, -3, -2, 0)

The possible range for the nurturance scale is +23 to -17.

The two negative parental response scales are reproduced below. They are presented in neuter form. In the test booklet they had the respective pronouns for the mother's and father's form.

FREQUENCY OF USE OF

EXCLUSIVELY DEPENDENCY-THREATENING (EDT)

DISCIPLINARY TECHNIQUES ASSOCIATED WITH EACH PARENT

1. ... said they were very ashamed of me, or very disappointed in me. (4 - 0)
2. ... made me stay in my room, or said they didn't want to see me again, until I was sorry. (4-0)
3. ... wouldn't talk to me, or pay any attention to me, until I apologized for doing wrong. (4-- 0)
4. ... said that I had hurt them very much by being bad. (4 -0)
5. ... sat me down and gave me a long talking-to about what I had done. (4 - 0)
6. ... said that they couldn't like me very much when I was bad. (4 - 0)

FREQUENCY OF USE OF

POTENTIALLY AVOIDANCE AND/OR AGGRESSION

AROUSING (AAA) DISCIPLINARY TECHNIQUES ASSOCIATED

WITH EACH PARENT

1. ... said they were going to give me a spanking or a whipping unless I behaved better. (4 - 0)

2. ... slapped me. (4 - 0)
3. ... really whipped me, or gave me the kind of beating that hurt for a long time. (8, 6, 4, 2, 0)
4. ... punished me by not letting me do something that I wanted to do a lot. (4 - 0)
5. ... really yelled and shouted at me so you could hear them far away.

The possible range for both of these scales is zero to twenty-four. Unger chose to double weight item number three of the AAA scale as the frequency of reported "whippings or beatings" was quite low and this parental response, or its effects, is what the scale was designed to measure.

LENGTH OF PUNISHMENT SCALE

1. ... I must be real careful for a long time after they have punished me or I will make them mad again. (4 - 0)
2. ... They just can't stay mad or angry. (-4 - 0)
3. ... Even if I try to make up for what I did wrong they still don't forgive me. (4 - 0)
4. ... They treat me like a bad child for a long time after I have been punished. (4 - 0)
5. ... They went out of their way to hurt my feelings after I had been punished. (4 to 0)
6. ... After they have punished me once during the day, rules get very strict around the house. (4 - 0)
7. ... They acted like they really didn't want me around for a long time after I had been punished. (4 - 0)
8. ... After they punish me they try to make me feel better. (-4 - 0)
9. ... If they get mad at me they stay mad at me. (4 to 0)

The possible range for the length of punishment scale is minus eight to plus twenty-eight.

All instruments were scored by hand and were recorded on the computer data sheets in the same manner. Each test booklet was scored twice with scores being recorded on two different data sheets. The two sets of scores were then compared and conflicting scores were rechecked and corrected.

The raw scores were analyzed by an IBM 1620 Computer. The Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis was utilized for data evaluation. The .05 level of significance, for rejection or acceptance, was established for the length of punishment scale as being a predictor of guilt responsivity.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Unger, Sanford M., On the Development of Guilt-response Systems, unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ithaca, New York, Cornell University, 1960.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Statistical Method

As will be recalled the criterion or dependent variable was the total score for the four projective-story-completion tests. The eight variables measured as predictors or independent variables were mothers' nurturant significance, fathers' nurturant significance, mothers' use of EDT techniques, fathers' use of EDT techniques, mothers' length of punishment, and fathers' length of punishment.

An IBM 1620 Computer solved the Stepwise Multiple Linear Regression Analysis. The calculations yielded the following data: means and standard deviations for all variables, the intercorrelations among all nine variables, the regression coefficients, and a test of significance for the predictors in the multiple regression equation.

It should be noted that the multiple R varies between 0 and +1.00, not between -1.00 and +1.00. Predictors having negative zero-order correlations with the criterion variable may contribute in the multiple R formula, but the multiple correlation itself is always a positive value.

In the Stepwise Multiple Linear Regression Analysis the predictor variables are ranked in order of their contribution

in predicting the criterion variable. This order for the predictors is not necessarily the same as the order by strength of their zero-order correlations with the criterion variable. The multiple R takes into account the overlapping effects or common variance of the predictors. The multiple R is based on both the intercorrelations of the predictor variables as well as their individual correlations with the criterion variable. Although multiple correlation and simple correlation vary greatly in computational procedures, they are interpreted in the same manner.

Interrelationships Among All Variables

The first hypothesis presented for investigation was that the correlation between the length of punishment scale and the psychological punishment scale will not be significantly higher than the correlation between the length of punishment scale and the physical punishment scale. Means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations among all nine variables are presented in Table II. I

Four correlations in Table II are directly relevant to the first hypothesis. The simple correlation coefficients are: fathers' length of punishment correlated $+0.09$ with fathers' use of EDT techniques, fathers' length of punishment correlated $+0.52$ with fathers' use of AAA techniques, mothers' length of punishment correlated $+0.45$ with mother' use of EDT techniques, and mothers' length of punishment correlated $+0.50$ with

TABLE II

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND INTERCORRELATIONS AMONG THE PREDICTOR TESTS AND THE CRITERION TEST (N = 73)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Mothers nurturant significance		.62	-.16	.15	-.35	-.29	-.39	-.27	.06
2. Fathers nurturant significance			-.07	.28	-.23	-.16	-.16	-.35	.01
3. Mothers use EDT techniques				.49	.65	.57	.45	.32	-.15
4. Fathers use EDT techniques					.15	.32	.12	.09	.13
5. Mothers use AAA techniques						.81	.58	.45	-.23
6. Fathers use AAA techniques							.51	.52	-.12
7. Mothers length of punishment								.59	-.06
8. Fathers length of punishment									-.01
9. Projective story completion test (guilt)									1.00
Mean	13.93	13.47	5.82	3.58	7.26	6.81	-.32	.73	9.04
Standard Deviation	5.30	6.26	3.62	3.10	5.10	5.24	5.54	6.32	2.66

mothers' use of AAA techniques. It can readily be seen that hypothesis one is confirmed. In the case of the fathers, the high correlation between type of punishment and length of punishment is the correlation between fathers' use of AAA techniques and length of punishment. Testing the two correlations for significance of difference yields a $P < .005$. In the case of the mothers, there is no statistically significant difference (.05 level of confidence) between the correlations of the two types of punishment with length of punishment.

An assumption often made is that physical types of punishment (referred to in this study as AAA techniques) are short in duration and that psychological types of punishment (referred to in this study as EDT techniques) are long in duration. On this basis it has been stated that psychological types of punishment may be more severe once the child learns to respond to them.

The present study contradicts the assumption often made in the literature. In the case of the mothers, there was no significant difference between the correlations of length of punishment with the two types of punishment. In the case of the fathers, the correlation between the measures of type of punishment and length of punishment was in direct contrast to the assumption often made in the literature. The measure of AAA techniques was positively associated with length of punishment for the fathers. The correlation between the measure of EDT techniques and length of punishment for the fathers

was not a significant relationship (.05 level of confidence). In summary, the data for the mothers and fathers differ, but support the hypothesis and contradict the previously assumed relationship.

The discrepancy between the results for the mothers and the fathers suggests no obvious explanation. Longer length of punishment being positively associated with parental use of physical punishment is not difficult to discuss. It is not too assumptive to view the parent, when he uses physical punishment, as being an angry parent in many instances. Secondly, employment of this technique most often may not serve to eliminate the parent's anger. Thirdly, the child has become the victim and may not be motivated to work toward establishing a favorable parental response pattern. All or any of these factors could serve to break down the positive parent-child interaction for some length of time. The punishment would not be "over and done with."

The above explanation offers a hypothesis concerning the inconsistencies between the correlations for the mothers and fathers. If the mother is the usual dispenser of punishment in the home (there is some evidence to support this), the father may become involved in discipline more often when the transgression is more severe and more anger-producing. Considering the first "explanation" concerning longer length of punishment being associated with physical types of punishment, a very tentative resolution is achieved.

Turning now to the lesser correlations found between length of punishment and parental use of EDT techniques, an explanation is also offered. The parent who uses an EDT type of punishment, by the very fact that he uses this type of discipline, might be viewed as being less angry because use of psychological or EDT techniques demand some emotional control. Also, the nature of the EDT technique serves to motivate the child to reestablish the favorable parental response pattern. When an EDT technique is employed it seems reasonable that both parent and child are more emotionally susceptible to reestablishing the favorable parent-child relationship. From this point of view it seems the length of punishment or break down in the relationship should not be as lengthy when an EDT technique is exercised.

There are, of course, parents who smolder with anger and use an EDT type of discipline, and there are parents who use AAA techniques without anger, but these cases are probably the exceptions rather than the rule.

Zero-order Correlations Between the Predictor Variables and the Criterion Variables

The second hypothesis presented for investigation was that there will be a slight positive relationship between the length of punishment scale and the measure of guilt responsibility. In Table II the correlations between mothers' and fathers' length of punishment and transgression-instigated

guilt-response potential (TIGRP) are found. Hypothesis two is not confirmed. The correlations are $-.06$ and $-.01$ for mothers and fathers, respectively.

It appears that at low levels of parental nurturant significance the measure of length of punishment may reflect the opposite of nurturance, namely, rejection. This conclusion is indicated by the correlations between nurturant significance and length of punishment, $-.39$ for the mothers and $-.16$ for the fathers. Above a minimum level of parental nurturant significance necessary for guilt development, it still appears feasible that the length of punishment scale and TIGRP may be positively related.

Multiple Regression Analysis

The third hypothesis presented for investigation was that in a multiple regression equation, the measure of length of punishment will aid significantly in the prediction of guilt. Table III presents the eight predictor tests ranked in order of their value in the multiple R . Also found in the table are the F levels, standard errors, coefficients of multiple determination, and multiple correlation.

As can be seen in Table III, hypothesis three was not confirmed. The $.05$ level of significance was reached by only two of the eight predictor variables. These two variables were mothers' use of AAA techniques, a negative value in the equation, and fathers' use of EDT techniques. The third ranked

TABLE III

RANK ORDER OF PREDICTORS WITH REGARD TO CONTRIBUTION
TO THE MULTIPLE CORRELATION SHOWING F LEVEL,
STANDARD ERROR, COEFFICIENT OF MULTIPLE
DETERMINATION, AND MULTIPLE
CORRELATION

Test	F level	Standard Error	R ²	R
mothers use AAA techniques	3.912*	2.622	.0522	.2285
fathers use EDT techniques	2.092*	2.602	.0797	.2823
fathers nurtur- ant significance	.912	2.603	.0917	.3029
mothers use EDT techniques	.953	2.604	.1043	.3229
mothers length of punishment	.520	2.613	.1112	.3334
fathers use AAA techniques	.073	2.632	.1122	.3349
mothers nurtur- ant significance	.037	2.651	.1127	.3356
fathers length of punishment	.024	2.671	.1130	.3361

*Significant at .05 level of confidence
Constant = 10.45799
R squared is .1130
R is .33

predictor was fathers' nurturance, but its contribution was not a significant level. After fathers' nurturance, the standard error begin to increase which effects adversely the reliability of the equation. As can be seen in Table III the last five variables in order of their contribution, are: mothers' use EDT techniques, mothers' length of punishment, fathers' use AAA techniques, mothers' nurturant significance, and fathers' length of punishment. These five variables do increase the R^2 but only very insignificantly.

Due to the high correlation between the two length of punishment forms $+ .59$, only one of the parental measures of length of punishment could have been expected to have been a contributor in the multiple R . So much common variance (see Table II) among the different measures was not expected. This lends strong evidence that not all major contributing variables are being considered at the present stage of research. It seems reasonable that there are positive parental response patterns (the other side of the coin) related to guilt and conscience development which should be considered when predicting guilt.

In summary the results suggest a low positive multiple R ($.3361$) between transgression-instigated guilt-response potential and the eight predictor variables: Mothers' nurturant significance, fathers' nurturant significance, mothers' use of EDT techniques, fathers' use of EDT techniques, mothers' use of AAA techniques, fathers' use of AAA techniques, mothers' length of punishment, and fathers' length of punishment. The results

lend strong evidence that length of punishment should be considered as an independent variable which is distinct from type of punishment. The influence of length punishment on development of guilt responsivity remains unclear.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The present study was undertaken to examine the relationships between length of punishment and two types of punishment. Further, the relationship between length of punishment and guilt responsivity was examined. The following hypotheses were presented for investigation:

1. That the correlation between the length of punishment scale and the psychological punishment scale will not be significantly higher than the correlation between the length of punishment scale and the physical punishment scale.

2. That there will be a slight positive relationship between the length of punishment scale and the measure of guilt responsivity.

3. That in a multiple regression equation the measure of length of punishment will aid significantly in the prediction of guilt.

Each child's composite score on four projective-story-completion-tests was used as the index of transgression-instigated guilt-response potential. Multiple choice questionnaires were used to index parental nurturant significance, parent use of physical punishment (AAA techniques), parent use of psychological punishment (EDT techniques), and length of

punishment. The length of punishment scale was devised for this study. There was both a mothers' and fathers' form for each of the four antecedent variables.

The test booklets containing four story-completion-tests plus the eight antecedent measures were administered to three sixth-grade classes during regular classroom periods. Completion of the booklets required about one hour and ten minutes for each of the classes. The subjects were not advised as to the nature of the test--just that they were participating in an experiment in psychology. Of the eighty-four original test booklets administered, seventy-three were scoreable and were included in the final sample.

Testing the hypotheses was accomplished by submitting the raw scores to treatment by a Stepwise Multiple Linear Regression Analysis. The total score on the four projective-story-completion-tests served as the criterion variable (guilt reactivity). The mothers' and fathers' forms for each of the four antecedent variables served as the eight independent variables.

The relevant results are as follows:

1. Hypothesis one was confirmed. For the mothers there was no significant difference indicated in the correlations between mothers' length of punishment and mothers' use of physical punishment, and mothers' length of punishment and mothers' use of physical punishment. For the fathers there was a significant difference; this difference was in contradiction

to the assumption made in the literature. The fathers' length of punishment was significantly related to use of physical punishment but not to fathers' use of psychological punishment.

2. Hypothesis II was not confirmed. Rather than a slight positive relationship between length of punishment and guilt reactivity, there was a slight negative relationship for both mothers and fathers.

3. Hypothesis III was not confirmed. Neither fathers' nor mothers' length of punishment was significantly related to the criterion in the regression equation. Only mothers' use of physical punishment, a negative value in the equation, and fathers' use of psychological punishment were significantly related to the criterion in the multiple R .

The nature of this study was exploratory. This study lends strong evidence that length of punishment is an independent variable distinct from type of punishment and must be considered as such in further research. The influence of length of punishment on guilt responsivity did not stand up under the statistical technique employed. The nature of the relationship deserves further research.

The measure of length of punishment used in this study is, of course, subject to much refinement. It is felt that items could be devised which would be less likely to have common variance with parental rejection. Development of a more refined measure appears to have some merit.

In additional research on this topic it appears that larger groups of subjects should be utilized so that length of punishment at different levels of nurturant significance could be analyzed in interaction with type of punishment. As indicated above, at low levels of parental nurturant significance, it is suspected that length of punishment has much in common with parental rejection.

The overall results of this study indicate the poor predictability of guilt from the major variables now under investigation. This suggests that more exploratory studies should be undertaken to identify other factors which contribute to development of the guilt response. It appears reasonable to look toward positive parental response patterns for major influences on guilt development.

Appendix I
INSTRUMENT BOOKLET

The following is a reproduction of the instrument booklet which each child received. Page numbers in parentheses (), indicate pagination in the original booklet.

THIS IS NOT A TEST, but what you do in this booklet is important. You are taking part in an experiment in psychology. Psychology is a science that tries to understand the things that people do and think.

In this booklet, you will be asked to do some things and think about some questions that you don't usually do or think about at school. Sometimes you will have to think hard, but you will see that there are no right or wrong answers. There are just answers which are most true for you, or which show the ideas you have, or the way you do things. That is why this is not really a test. Each person thinks about different kinds of things, and thinks and does things in his own way, and that is what psychology is interested in. Psychology is interested in all the different ways that boys and girls think and do things.

Lots and lots of boys and girls are filling out this booklet. You are one of them, and as you can see, so is everyone else in this class, and lots of other classes, too. That is the way psychology works. By asking many, many boys and girls, psychology is able to discover all the different things that happen to boys and girls and all the different ways they think and do things.

NOW, write down the name of your school, and circle whether you are a boy or girl, and then we can all start right in and work through the booklet together.

SCHOOL _____

CIRCLE ONE:

BOY

GIRL

DIRECTIONS: Written below is the beginning of a story. It is about a boy named Howard. We will read it together carefully. You will see that only the beginning of the story has been written. You are to write down your ideas about the rest of it by answering the questions at the end. You can look down and see that there is space for you to write in your ideas. There are no right or wrong answers. Everyone has different ideas about things in a story. First now, we will read the beginning. Does everyone understand?

ONE DAY, Howard's mother sent him to the store to buy four quarts of milk. Howard got the milk. He paid the old storekeeper with a dollar bill that his mother had given him.

Then the old storekeeper made a mistake. He thought that Howard had paid him with a five dollar bill. He gave Howard four dollars back. Howard didn't say anything. He left the store. Now he had the money that he wanted. He knew the old storekeeper would never remember.

The next day, Howard was out walking. He had the four dollars in his pocket. He was thinking.

NOW YOU WRITE DOWN YOUR IDEAS ABOUT THE REST OF THE STORY. Do not worry about spelling or anything like that. Work as fast as you can.

What was Howard thinking? How did he feel? _____

WHAT Comes next in the story? _____

DOES anything else happen? How does the story end up? _____

DIRECTIONS: Here is another story beginning. It is about a girl named Anne who lives on a sheep farm out west. We will read it together carefully. Then you are again to put down your ideas about the rest of the story by answering the questions at the end.

EVERY AFTERNOON after school, Anne had to work. It was her job to take a small flock of sheep out to the mountain-side where there was lots of grass. She had to watch them and guard them carefully. Anne sometimes felt it was not fair that she had to work every afternoon.

One day, Anne was tending the sheep when she saw some of her friends far away. They were playing. Anne ran over to say hello to her friends. They were having a good time. They wanted her to stay. Anne thought that she didn't have many chances to play, so she did stay and play with them.

Anne played for a while. Then she left to go back to her sheep.

NOW YOU WRITE DOWN YOUR IDEAS ABOUT THE REST OF THE STORY. Do not worry about spelling or anything like that. Work as fast as you can.

ON her way back, what did Anne think? How did she feel? _____

WHAT comes next in the story? _____

DOES anything else happen? How does the story end up? _____

DIRECTIONS: On this page, and on some of the pages to come later, there are questions about your parents. Some of the questions are ones that a lot of people would be able to answer. Most of them are ones that only you would know about and only you can answer. There are no right or wrong answers. There are just answers which are most true about your parents. You will see. Here are some questions that many people would know about your parents:

What is your father's job? If he works for a big company, try to tell what he does there or what his job is called (for example, foreman, bookkeeper, drives a truck, works a machine, or whatever he does).

Draw a circle around the answer which tells how far or for how long a time your father went to school:

LESS THAN HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION GRADUATED FROM HIGH SCHOOL
SOME COLLEGE GRADUATED FROM COLLEGE MORE THAN COLLEGE

Now do the same thing for your mother. For how long did she go to school:

LESS THAN HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION GRADUATED FROM HIGH SCHOOL
SOME COLLEGE GRADUATED FROM COLLEGE MORE THAN COLLEGE

Does your mother work on a job away from home? Circle what she does:

FULL-TIME JOB REGULAR PART-TIME JUST NOW & THEN DOESN'T WORK

How many children are there in your family who are older than you? ____.

How many children are there in your family who are younger than you? ____.

IF YOU LIVE WITH ONLY ONE OF YOUR PARENTS, mark an X here ____, and listen for special instructions.

DIRECTIONS: Here is a story beginning about a boy named Jerry. We will read it together carefully. Then you are to put down your ideas about the rest of the story. There are no right or wrong ideas, remember; everyone has a different idea about things in a story.

JERRY's uncle had made him a promise. On a certain day, he was going to take Jerry to the county fair. Jerry had never been to a fair. He was really looking forward to going.

When the day came, Jerry's uncle called up to say that he couldn't take Jerry to the fair. Jerry was disappointed. He got mad because his uncle had broken his promise. He wished something would happen to his uncle. He wished his uncle would be hurt.

Later, Jerry was in his room reading a book. He heard the telephone ring.

NOW YOU WRITE DOWN YOUR IDEAS ABOUT THE REST OF THE STORY. Do not worry about spelling or anything like that. Work as fast as you can.

WHAT did Jerry think and feel when he heard the telephone ring? _____

WHAT comes next in the story? _____

DOES anything else happen? How does the story end up? _____

DIRECTIONS: Here is another story beginning. It is the last one. It is about a girl named Paula. We will read it together carefully. Then you write down your ideas about the rest of the story by answering the questions at the end.

PAULA had a very strict teacher. One day, the teacher gave a hard test. Paula wanted very much to get a good mark. But there were many questions that Paula couldn't answer.

When the teacher wasn't looking, Paula opened her book. She saw the right answers. She wrote them down. No one at all knew that she had opened her book.

On her way home from school that day, Paula was thinking that she would probably get a good mark on the test. She was thinking about the test, and about her strict teacher.

NOW YOU WRITE DOWN YOUR IDEAS ABOUT THE REST OF THE STORY. Do not worry about spelling or anything like that. Work as fast as you can.

WHAT was Paula thinking? How did she feel? _____

WHAT comes next in the story? _____

DCES anything else happen? How does the story end up? _____

DIRECTIONS: Here are some questions about your parents that other people wouldn't know about. Nearly all parents do some things that are pretty nice, and some things that are not. Sometimes they are tired, or have something else to do, or they are just feeling mean and nasty for some reason. Boys and girls know more about the things that parents do than anyone else. Remember, psychology is not interested in finding out about any one person's parents at all. The science of psychology wants to find out about all parents. But the only way to do that is to ask lots and lots of boys and girls.

For now, you are to think only about your mother and what she has said or done over the past year. We will read the questions together, taking one at a time. Under each question, draw a circle around the answer which tells what has been most true for your mother over the past year. Here is a sample:

0. She made me wash the dishes.

MOST OF THE TIME VERY OFTEN A FEW TIMES JUST ABOUT NEVER

If you are a girl, you probably would circle MOST OF THE TIME, or VERY OFTEN, but maybe not. If you are a boy, well nobody would know better than you which answer to circle.

Think only about your mother for now, your father will come in a minute. We must work fast, but decide as carefully as you can. Do not leave any questions out. If you need more time to think, raise your hand. Does everyone understand what to do?

1. She took the time to help me get something that I really wanted very much.

OVER TEN TIMES OVER SIX TIMES A FEW TIMES ONCE OR TWICE NEVER

2. She spent a long time with me talking about things that I was very interested in.

OVER TEN TIMES OVER SIX TIMES A FEW TIMES ONCE OR TWICE NEVER

3. She took me someplace for an afternoon, or on a week-end, where I really enjoyed myself.

OVER TEN TIMES OVER SIX TIMES A FEW TIMES ONCE OR TWICE NEVER

4. She let me know that what I wanted didn't count for very much with her.

MOST OF THE TIME VERY OFTEN A FEW TIMES JUST ABOUT NEVER

5. She did things which made me so mad that I just wanted to stay away from her for a while.

MOST OF THE TIME VERY OFTEN A FEW TIMES JUST ABOUT NEVER

6. She really tried hard to help me, or to fix things up, when she knew I was worried or in trouble.

ALWAYS EXCEPT FOR A FEW TIMES DIDN'T HELP ME MUCH DIDN'T CARE

7. She taught me a skill, or showed me how to do the kind of thing that I really wanted to learn about.

OVER TEN TIMES OVER SIX TIMES A FEW TIMES ONCE OR TWICE NEVER

8. She hugged me, or held me close, just because she wanted to or to show that she felt real good about me.

VERY OFTEN A FEW TIMES ONCE OR TWICE JUST ABOUT NEVER NEVER

9. She didn't have time or wasn't around when I could have used her help or needed something from her.

MOST OF THE TIME VERY OFTEN A FEW TIMES JUST ABOUT NEVER

10. She went for a long time without being home much or without caring very much about things that happened.

MOST OF THE TIME VERY OFTEN A FEW TIMES JUST ABOUT NEVER

DIRECTIONS: It is now time to think about your father, and how often over the past year he has said or done these very same things. Again, draw a circle around the answer which tells what has been most true for your father over the past year. Does everyone understand?

1. He took the time to help me get something that I really wanted very much.

OVER TEN TIMES OVER SIX TIMES A FEW TIMES ONCE OR TWICE NEVER

2. He spent a long time with me talking about things that I was very interested in.

OVER TEN TIMES OVER SIX TIMES A FEW TIMES ONCE OR TWICE NEVER

3. He took me someplace for an afternoon, or on a week-end, where I really enjoyed myself.

OVER TEN TIMES OVER SIX TIMES A FEW TIMES ONCE OR TWICE NEVER

4. He let me know that what I wanted didn't count for very much with him.

MOST OF THE TIME VERY OFTEN A FEW TIMES JUST ABOUT NEVER

5. He did things which made me so mad that I just wanted to stay away from him for a while.

MOST OF THE TIME VERY OFTEN A FEW TIMES JUST ABOUT NEVER

6. He really tried hard to help me, or to fix things up, when he knew I was worried or in trouble.

ALWAYS EXCEPT FOR A FEW TIMES DIDN'T HELP ME MUCH DIDN'T CARE

7. He taught me a skill, or showed me how to do the kind of thing that I really wanted to learn about.

OVER TEN TIMES OVER SIX TIMES A FEW TIMES ONCE OR TWICE NEVER

8. He hugged me, or held me close, just because he wanted to or to show that he felt real good about me.

VERY OFTEN A FEW TIMES ONCE OR TWICE JUST ABOUT NEVER DID THAT

9. He didn't have time or wasn't around when I could have used his help or needed something from him.

MOST OF THE TIME VERY OFTEN A FEW TIMES JUST ABOUT NEVER

10. He went for a long time without being home much or without caring very much about things that happened.

MOST OF THE TIME VERY OFTEN A FEW TIMES JUST ABOUT NEVER

DIRECTIONS: The next questions are about things that parents do after their children have disobeyed, or after they have found out about something that their boy or girl has done which they thought was a wrong or bad thing. You know better than anyone else what your mother and father have said and done to you, since you were young, for things like that. First, here is one question to think very hard about. Mark an **X** in the space by the answer which is most true for you:

Which one of your parents has usually punished you, or taken charge of seeing that you were punished, after you disobeyed or did something that they thought was wrong or bad?

___ My mother has punished me a lot more, my father practically never punishes me.

___ My mother has punished me a little more than my father.

___ My mother and father have both punished me about the same amount.

___ My father has punished me a little more than my mother.

___ My father has punished me a lot more than my mother.

For now, as we read the questions below, think only about your mother. We will take one question at a time. Draw a circle around the answer which tells what has been most true for your mother, for what she has said or done, when you disobeyed her or did something that she thought was wrong or bad. We must work fast, but decide as carefully as you can. Do not leave any questions out.

1. She said that she was very ashamed of me, or very disappointed in me.

VERY MANY TIMES MANY TIMES A FEW TIMES ONCE OR TWICE NEVER

2. She made me stay in my room, or said she didn't want to see me again until I was sorry.

VERY MANY TIMES MANY TIMES A FEW TIMES ONCE OR TWICE NEVER

3. She wouldn't talk to me, or pay any attention to me, until I apologized for doing wrong.

VERY MANY TIMES MANY TIMES A FEW TIMES ONCE OR TWICE NEVER

4. She said that I had hurt her very much by being bad.

VERY MANY TIMES MANY TIMES A FEW TIMES ONCE OR TWICE NEVER

5. She sat me down and gave me a long talking to about what I had done.

VERY MANY TIMES MANY TIMES A FEW TIMES ONCE OR TWICE NEVER

6. She said that she couldn't like me very much when I was bad.

ALWAYS MOST OF THE TIME A FEW TIMES ONCE OR TWICE NEVER

DIRECTIONS: It is now time to think about your father, and how often he he has said or done these very same things. Again, draw a circle around the answer which tells what has been most true for your father when you disobeyed him or did something which he thought was wrong or bad. Does everyone understand?

1. He said that he was very ashamed of me, or very disappointed in me.

VERY MANY TIMES MANY TIMES A FEW TIMES ONCE OR TWICE NEVER

2. He made me stay in my room, or said he didn't want to see me again until I was sorry.

VERY MANY TIMES MANY TIMES A FEW TIMES ONCE OR TWICE NEVER

3. He wouldn't talk to me, or pay any attention to me, until I apologized for doing wrong.

VERY MANY TIMES MANY TIMES A FEW TIMES ONCE OR TWICE NEVER

4. He said that I had hurt him very much by being bad.

VERY MANY TIMES MANY TIMES A FEW TIMES ONCE OR TWICE NEVER

5. He sat me down and gave me a long talking to about what I had done.

VERY MANY TIMES MANY TIMES A FEW TIMES ONCE OR TWICE NEVER

6. He said that he couldn't like me very much when I was bad.

ALWAYS MOST OF THE TIME A FEW TIMES ONCE OR TWICE NEVER

DIRECTIONS: It is now time to think about your mother again, and how often she has said or done the things listed below. Again, draw a circle around the answer which tells what has been most true for your mother when you disobeyed her or did something which she thought was wrong or bad. Does everyone understand?

1. She said she was going to give me a spanking or a whipping unless I behaved better.

VERY MANY TIMES MANY TIMES A FEW TIMES ONCE OR TWICE NEVER

2. She slapped me.

VERY MANY TIMES MANY TIMES A FEW TIMES ONCE OR TWICE NEVER

3. She really whipped me, or gave me the kind of beating that hurt for a long time.

VERY MANY TIMES MANY TIMES A FEW TIMES ONCE OR TWICE NEVER

4. She punished me by not letting me do something that I wanted to do a lot.

VERY MANY TIMES MANY TIMES A FEW TIMES ONCE OR TWICE NEVER

5. She really yelled and shouted at me so you could hear her far away.

VERY MANY TIMES MANY TIMES A FEW TIMES ONCE OR TWICE NEVER

DIRECTIONS: It is now time to think about your father, and how often he has said or done these very same things. Again, draw a (circle) around the answer which tells what has been most true for your father when you disobeyed him or did something which he thought was wrong or bad. Does everyone understand?

1. He said he was going to give me a spanking or a whipping unless I behaved better.

VERY MANY TIMES MANY TIMES A FEW TIMES ONCE OR TWICE NEVER

2. He slapped me.

VERY MANY TIMES MANY TIMES A FEW TIMES ONCE OR TWICE NEVER

3. He really whipped me, or gave me the kind of beating that hurt for a long time.

VERY MANY TIMES MANY TIMES A FEW TIMES ONCE OR TWICE NEVER

4. He punished me by not letting me do something that I wanted to do a lot.

VERY MANY TIMES MANY TIMES A FEW TIMES ONCE OR TWICE NEVER

5. He really yelled and shouted at me so you could hear him far away.

VERY MANY TIMES MANY TIMES A FEW TIMES ONCE OR TWICE NEVER

DIRECTIONS: The next questions are about how your parents act and feel after you have done something they thought was wrong and after they have punished you. You know better than anyone else how your mother and father have acted after they have punished you. Think only of what has been true for the last year.

For now, as we read the questions below, think only about your mother. We will take one question at a time. Draw a circle around the answer which tells what has been most true for your mother, for how she felt or acted after you had done something she thought was wrong and after she had punished you. We must work fast, but decide as carefully as you can. Do not leave any questions out.

1. I must be real careful for a long time after my mother has punished me or I will make her mad again.

MOST OF THE TIME VERY OFTEN A FEW TIMES JUST ABOUT NEVER.

2. My mother just can't stay mad or angry.

VERY TRUE MOSTLY TRUE SOME TRUE NOT TRUE

3. Even if I try to make up for what I did wrong my mother still doesn't forgive me.

MOST OF THE TIME VERY OFTEN A FEW TIMES JUST ABOUT NEVER

4. My mother treats me like a bad child for a long time after I have been punished.

MOST OF THE TIME VERY OFTEN A FEW TIMES JUST ABOUT NEVER

5. My mother went out of her way to hurt my feelings after I had been punished.

MOST OF THE TIME VERY OFTEN A FEW TIMES JUST ABOUT NEVER

6. After my mother has punished me once during the day, rules get very strict around the house.

MOST OF THE TIME VERY OFTEN A FEW TIMES JUST ABOUT NEVER

7. My mother acted like she really didn't want me around for a long time after I had been punished.

MOST OF THE TIME VERY OFTEN A FEW TIMES JUST ABOUT NEVER

8. After my mother punishes me she tries to make me feel better.

MOST OF THE TIME VERY OFTEN A FEW TIMES JUST ABOUT NEVER

9. If my mother gets mad at me she stays mad at me.

MOST OF THE TIME VERY OFTEN A FEW TIMES JUST ABOUT NEVER

DIRECTIONS: It is now time to think about your father, and how often he has said or done these very same things. Again, draw a circle around the answer which tells what has been most true for your father, for how he felt or acted after you had done something he thought was wrong and after he had punished you.

1. I must be real careful for a long time after my father has punished me or I will make him mad again.

MOST OF THE TIME VERY OFTEN A FEW TIMES JUST ABOUT NEVER

2. My father just can't stay mad or angry.

VERY TRUE MOSTLY TRUE SOME TRUE NOW TRUE

3. Even if I try to make up for what I did wrong my father still doesn't forgive me.

MOST OF THE TIME VERY OFTEN A FEW TIMES JUST ABOUT NEVER

4. My father treats me like a bad child for a long time after I have been punished.

MOST OF THE TIME VERY OFTEN A FEW TIMES JUST ABOUT NEVER

5. My father went out of his way to hurt my feelings after I had been punished.

MOST OF THE TIME VERY OFTEN A FEW TIMES JUST ABOUT NEVER

6. After my father has punished me once during the day, rules get very strict around the house.

MOST OF THE TIME VERY OFTEN A FEW TIMES JUST ABOUT NEVER

7. My father acted like he really didn't want me around for a long time after I had been punished.

MOST OF THE TIME VERY OFTEN A FEW TIMES JUST ABOUT NEVER

8. After my father punishes me he tries to make me feel better.

79

MOST OF THE TIME VERY OFTEN A FEW TIMES JUST ABOUT NEVER

9. If my father gets mad at me he stays mad at me.

MOST OF THE TIME VERY OFTEN A FEW TIMES JUST ABOUT NEVER

APPENDIX II

SCORING OF STORIES FOR

TRANSGRESSION-INSTIGATED GUILT-RESPONSE POTENTIAL (TIGPR)

The general procedure for the scoring of all stories derives from the theoretical conception of guilt-response sequences, i.e., that they are initiated by a symbolic mediating process (a "moral judgment" or "expiatory evaluation") which triggers negative affect (assumed to be the focal constituent in the total reaction) and are terminated by one or another act of expiation (e.g., undoing of or atonement for the precipitating "transgression").

Excepting an arbitrary allowance for atypical themes to be noted explicitly in the instructions, the above categories: judgment (J), affect (A), and expiation (E) -- or their equivalents -- are the only separate items of content scored in each of the stories; and the simple appearance -- or "dependability" -- of these expressions is the only relevant consideration for scoring. (The variable "intensity" of statements of affect, for example, is an irrelevant dimension for present purposes.) The range for all stories is from 0 to 4 points.

STORIES I and IV admit of very direct implementation of this scoring formula; STORIES II and III, as will be seen below, require a number of arbitrary decisions to encompass

the much greater variability in projected story endings within the above pattern.

STORY I (Howard)

Moral Judgment (J) -- 1 point

Score this category if any single unequivocal statement appears, wherever it appears, which indicates either a general (e.g., "it was wrong") or a specific (e.g., "he shouldn't have taken the money") judgmental response or expiatory evaluation of the situation (e.g., "he was thinking he should return the money").

Hence, score 1 point for the appearance of any (or all) statements such as: he knew it was wrong; it was dishonest; it was the same as stealing; he was thinking he had been bad; he shouldn't have taken the money; he had cheated the storekeeper; he decided to bring the money back; etc.

[NB: DO NOT SCORE if the issue is merely raised but not resolved (e.g., "he was thinking whether he should spend the money or bring it back"); however, DO SCORE if the issue is explicitly resolved (e.g., "he was thinking whether he should spend the money or bring it back; he decided it would be wrong to keep it").]

Affect (A) -- 2 points

Score this category if any clear indication appears, wherever it appears, that Howard experienced negative affect while reflecting on and/or contingent upon his own earlier behavior -- excepting a statement of negative affect based upon or related to fear of discovery or punishment.

Hence, score 2 points for the appearance of any (or all) statements such as: he felt guilty; his conscience was bothering him; he felt bad; he was ashamed; he was very upset about what he had done; he walked around and around and couldn't do anything at all; he felt sorry, etc.; OR (if statement of the affect occurs as "relief" following expiation) now he felt better; now his conscience wasn't bothering him; his mind was free and clear; now he could feel good again; etc.

[NB: DO NOT SCORE for statements such as: he was worried because the storekeeper might remember; he felt afraid of what would happen to him if anyone found out; he was scared of the trouble he would be in; etc.]

Expiation (E) -- 1 point

Score this category -- 1 point -- if Howard "voluntarily" returns the money to the storekeeper or confesses to a parent (and the money is subsequently returned); OR, in the rare cases where the money has been spent or not returned, if a statement is made to the effect that Howard confesses and takes his punishment, or gets a job to earn the money back, or some other form of perhaps devious expiation.

Poetic Punishment (PP) -- 2 points

Score this category in the extremely infrequent cases where the development of the story is essentially an "alternative" one, i.e., that it seems clear that the subject has not identified and projected as was intended. The critical consideration is that "fate" has conspired to exact retribu-

ution when the hero neither feels badly about his act nor himself expiates: e.g., Howard goes out and buys a toy with the money, brings it home, and it breaks to pieces -- leaving him very unhappy. PP may be scored in addition to J, but not in addition to A or E.

[NB: DO NOT SCORE this category if a simple discovery theme is recounted such as, in effect, the storekeeper goes over his books and remembers, or Howard's parents find out in a direct way, etc. If a discovery theme is all that is in the story -- no judgment, no affect, just discovery -- it is scored in total: 0.]

STORY II (Anne)

Moral Judgment (J) -- 1 point

Score this category if any single unequivocal statement appears, wherever it appears, which indicates either a general or a situation-specific moral judgment or an expiatory evaluation of the situation (as in STORY I).

Hence, score 1 point for statements such as: she had left her job; it was her responsibility, her duty; she knew that if anything happened it would be her fault; she had left the sheep unguarded, unprotected; she knew she shouldn't have left the sheep; she was thinking she should have stayed with the sheep; she had better get right back to the sheep, she had done wrong in leaving them alone, etc.

[NB: As in STORY I, DO NOT SCORE if the moral issue is merely raised but not explicitly resolved, e.g., she was wondering if it had been all right to play instead of taking care of the sheep.]

Affect (or Fear for Safety of Sheep) (A) -- 2 points

Score this category, as in STORY I, for any indication or expression of negative affect appearing as Anne reflects on her own behavior or contingent on the consequences of that behavior (i.e., the loss of the sheep). Alternatively, score this category if there is a clear statement of affective concern expressly about the safety or welfare of the sheep.

Hence, score 2 points for statements such as: she felt guilty; she was sorry she had left the sheep alone; she was ashamed of herself; she felt bad; she felt that something could have happened to the sheep and she was worried; she hoped very much that the sheep were all right; she was afraid a wolf might have eaten them; she hoped nothing had happened; etc.; OR, (if the sheep are gone upon her return) she cried; she felt awful; etc.

[NB: DO NOT SCORE if, as in STORY I, "fear" is based upon or related to discovery or punishment (e.g., she was afraid that if something happened to the sheep she would really get it, etc.).]

Negative Event Befalling Sheep (Sh) -- 1 point

This category represents a semi-alternative story development and is not scored if either J or A has already been scored. Be it noted: this is tricky -- for in most stories something does happen to the sheep subsequent to the judgmental and/or affective responses. In those cases, this category is irrelevant and is ignored. It is only to be scored, as exemplified below, when it can theoretically be

considered as equivalent to a moral judgment -- and hence is irrelevant in the presence of an explicit judgmental response.

Therefore, score 1 point for story beginnings such as: Anne was thinking about the good time she had playing with her friends. She got back and the sheep were gone; OR She couldn't find the sheep, etc. (Then continue scoring any other categories which appear -- i.e., score for A and E if they appear.)

[NB: Sh is scored if and only if it is the first scorable category to appear in the protocol.]

Expiation (E) -- 1 point

Score this category if, at the conclusion of the story, Anne either 1) confesses that she has been derelict in her duties (regardless of the state of the sheep, or 2) vows or declares that she will never leave the sheep alone again (or some equivalent statement, e.g., she learned her lesson about playing when she had a job to do, etc.).

[NB: DO NOT SCORE for E if, subsequent to the loss of the sheep, Anne merely looks for them and does or does not find them -- this is considered to be an activity demanded by the event and not to constitute a distinctive expiation. In addition, DO NOT SCORE for E if it seems clear that Anne's object in "telling" some person in authority that "the sheep are lost" is merely to obtain help in finding them -- and thus is not a "confession," i.e., not expressed as an expiatory act.]

Poetic Punishment (PP) -- 2 points

Score this category, as in STORY I, in the infrequent

cases where it seems clear that the subject has not identified and projected as was intended. In this instance, the critical element is that "the sheep are lost for good and all" -- and this is not part of a story but represents a final and fateful retribution visited upon Anne for her transgression (e.g., The little girl Anne had a good time playing with her friends. Then she went to look for her sheep. They were gone. She never found them again.). Also score this category if "the fates" contrive a more personal punishment for Anne.

[NB: Again, as in STORY I, PP may be scored in addition to J, but not in addition to A or E.]

STORY III (Jerry)

Moral Judgment (J) -- 1 point

The pressing stimulus situation in which Jerry was left largely precluded the appearance of direct moral judgments and encouraged "second order" expressions of concern about the uncle. However, when judgments do occur, as in STORIES I and II (e.g., he knew it was wrong to wish that), score this category. Likewise, score this category if in one way or another there appears a statement of expiatory intent (e.g., he wished he hadn't said that, etc.) or assignment of responsibility to Jerry for any untoward consequences of his wish (e.g., he was afraid it might be about his uncle and it would be his fault, etc.).

[NB: Instructions are given below for statements or categories to be considered as equivalent to J]

Fear For Uncle's Welfare (J) -- 1 point OR (A) -- 2 points

Score this category for J -- 1 point -- if it is immediately followed by an expression of negative or self-blaming affect, i.e., consider it as equivalent to moral judgment (e.g., He was worried about his uncle and he felt sorry for what he had said; OR, Suppose his uncle was hurt. He felt bad, etc.). Note that the affect would itself be scored separately, i.e., that the above examples, in total, would receive 3 points.

Score this category 2 points if the statement of fear or affective concern is not followed by any other direct expression of negative affect -- in this case the "fear" is considered not as indicative of judgment but manifestly as negative affect and is grouped with A below. Hence, score this category for A -- 2 points -- for sequences such as: He was afraid it was the hospital calling to say his uncle was hurt. He answered the phone. It was his uncle and he was all right, etc.

Negative Affect (A) -- 2 points

Score this category, as in STORIES I and II, for any expression of negative affect, wherever it appears, describing Jerry's reaction to his own earlier wish or contingent on the "consequences" of that wish (i.e., an unfortunate event befalling the uncle).

Hence, score 2 points for statements such as: he felt guilty, sorry, bad; he was ashamed; he felt awful, he cried; etc.

Uncle Hurt (H) -- 1 point

As in STORY II (Sh), this category represents a semi-alternative story development and is not scored if either J or A has already been scored. Again, in this particular sequence, it is theoretically considered to be equivalent to a judgmental response.

Hence, score H -- 1 point -- for story developments such as: He thought it was just a regular call; he answered the phone. It was his aunt telling him that his uncle had been in an accident, etc.

NB: H is scored if and only if it is the first scorable category to appear in the story. As in STORY II, continue scoring for any other categories which appear.

Expiation (E) -- 1 point

Score this category if Jerry confesses his wish or apologizes for it and thereby brings the incident to a close. Alternatively, score this category if it is clearly indicated that a particular action or thought sequence on Jerry's part closes the affair: a declaration that he will never wish anything like that again, doing something for the uncle in the nature of reparation, an expression directly intended to undo or mullify the earlier wish (e.g., now he was very glad that his uncle hadn't been hurt; now he thought that he uncle was the greatest guy in the world; etc.), or a repetition (now occurring at the conclusion of the story) of a statement of expiatory affect (e.g., Jerry felt very sorry for what he had wished, etc.) which in this context is equated with "undoing."

[NB: If a statement of "expiatory affect," as it has been called above, is the first statement of affect to appear in the story, i.e., it is not a repetition, then DO NOT SCORE for E but score for A -- 2 points.]

Poetic Punishment (PP) -- 2 points

Score this category if events "conspire" to punish Jerry, either directly or indirectly (e.g., Jerry gets to the fair and is having a great time when he falls out of the ferris wheel and is himself seriously injured; OR, Jerry is so angry that when the phone rings he doesn't answer it, later he finds out that it was his uncle calling to say that he could take him to the fair, etc.). PP may be scored in addition to J and/or E; note that this is different from STORIES I and II and reflects the frequent similarity in this case of J and E. However, PP is not scored in addition to A.

STORY IV (Paula)

Moral Judgment (J) -- 1 point

Score this category, as in the other stories, if any single unequivocal statement appears, wherever it appears, of either a general or a specific judgmental nature (e.g., she knew it was cheating, it was wrong, OR, she knew she shouldn't have looked in the book, etc.). Alternatively (since the "demanded" expiation for Paula's deed is considered to involve confession), score this category if a statement appears at the end of the story to the effect that Paula learned a lesson, or that Paula would never do anything

like that again, etc. In other words, such an expression is considered as equivalent to J and is scored 1 point, unless J has already been scored -- in which case this is just a repetition.

Negative Affect (A) -- 2 points

Score this category if any clear indication appears, wherever it appears, that Paula experienced negative affect while reflecting on or contingent upon her "transgression" -- excepting a statement of negative affect based upon or related to fear of discovery or punishment.

Hence, score 2 points for the appearance of any (or all) statements such as: she felt guilty; her conscience was bothering her; she couldn't get it off her mind; she felt bad, ashamed, sorry, etc.; OR, now she felt better; now she felt free in her mind -- if statement of the affected is indicated as "relief" following expiation. Also score if affect is directly integrated with expiation or some other event (e.g., she told the teacher about what she had done and she cried, etc.).

Expiation (E) -- 1 point

Score this category if Paula "voluntarily" confesses her misdeed to her teacher, or confesses to a parent and the transgression is subsequently "undone." Confession is considered the only acceptable expiation in this case.

Fateful Discovery or Punishment (PP) -- 1 point

This category appears with much greater frequency here

than in other stories (perhaps because the reference to "a very strict teacher" discouraged confession on Paula's part). Hence, in this story, it is considered not as an alternative story development but as equivalent to explanation. It is scored 1 point -- note -- and may be scored in addition to J and/or A, but not in addition to E.

Therefore, score for PP -- 1 point -- if Paula turns out to have copied the wrong answers and fails the test, etc.; OR, if Paula appears too smart and is thereby unmasked, etc. [NB: DO NOT SCORE this category if a simple discovery theme is recounted, such as, in effect, the teacher saw Paula looking in her book and gave her a zero or sent her to the principal, or the teacher directly accuses her, etc. As in STORY I, if the entire content of this story is a discovery theme -- no judgment, no affect, just discovery -- it is scored in total: 0.]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Bandura, A., and R. H. Walters, Adolescent Aggression, New York, Ronald Press, 1959.
- Becker, Wesley C., "Consequences of Different Kinds of Parental Discipline," Review of Child Development Research, I, edited by M. L. Hoffman and L. W. Hoffman, New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1964.
- Freud, Sigmund, New Introductory Lectures in Psychoanalysis, New York, Norton, 1933.
- Funkenstein, D. H., S. H. King, and M. E. Drolette, Mastery of Stress, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1957.
- Glueck, S., and E. Glueck, Unravelling Juvenile Delinquency, New York, Commonwealth Fund, 1950.
- Hartshorne, H., and M. A. May, Studies in the Nature of Character. Vol. I. Studies in Deceit, New York, MacMillan, 1928.
- Kohlberg, Lawrence, "Development of Moral Character and Ideology," Review of Child Development Research, I, edited by M. L. Hoffman and L. W. Hoffman, New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1964.
- Liddell, H., untitled symposium presentation, Discussions on Child Development, II, edited by J. M. Tanner and B. Inhelder, New York, International Universities Press, 1954.
- MacKinnon, D. W., "Violations of Prohibitions," Explorations in Personality, edited by H. A. Murray, New York, Oxford University Press, 1938.
- Miller, Daniel R., Guy E. Swanson, Wesley Allinsmith, Elton B. McNeil, Beverly B. Allinsmith, Justin Aronfreed, Bett J. Beardslee, and Leonard M. Lansky, Inner Conflict and Defense, New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1960.
- Sears, Robert R., Eleanor E. Maccoby, and Harry Levin, Patterns of Child Rearing, Evanston, Illinois, Row, Peterson and Co., 1957.

- Sears, Robert R., A. Rau, and R. Alpert, Identification and Child Rearing, Stanford, California, Stanford University Press, 1965.
- Whiting, J. W. M., untitled symposium presentation, Discussions on Child Development, II, edited by J. M. Tanner and B. Inhelder, New York, International Universities Press, 1954.
- Whiting, J. W. M., and I. Child, Child Training and Personality: A Cross-cultural Study, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1953.
- Wolpe, J., Psychotherapy by Reciprocal Inhibition, Stanford, California, Stanford University Press, 1958.

Articles

- Allinsmith, Wesley, and Thomas C. Greenling, "Guilt over Anger as Predicted from Parental Discipline: A Study of Superego Development," American Psychologist, X (1955), 320. (Abstract.)
- Burton, Roger V., Eleanor E. Maccoby, and Wesley Allinsmith, "Antecedents of Resistance to Temptation in Four-year-old Children," Child Development, XXXII (1961), 689-710.
- Burton, Roger V., and J. W. M. Whiting, "The Absent Father and Cross-sex Identity," Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, VII (1961), 85-95.
- Grinder, Robert E., "Parental Childrearing Practices, Conscience, and Resistance to Temptation of Sixth-grade Children," Child Development, XXXIII (1962), 803-820.
- Hoffman, Martin L., "Childrearing Practices and Moral Development: Generalizations from Research," Child Development, XXXIV (1963), 295-318.
- Lowe, C. Marshall, "The Equivalence of Guilt and Anxiety as Psychological Constructs," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XXVIII (1964), 553-554.
- Lynn, R., "Personality Characteristics of the Mother of Aggressive and Unaggressive Children," Journal of Genetic Psychology, IC (September-December, 1961), 159-164.
- Mosher, D. L., and J. B. Mosher, "Guilt in Prisoners," Journal of Clinical Psychology, XXIII (2) (1967), 171-173.

- Unger, Sanford M., "Antecedents of Personality Differences in Guilt Responsivity," Psychological Reports, X (February-June, 1962), 357-358.
- Unger, Sanford M., "On the Functioning of Guilt Potential in a Conflict Dilemma," Psychological Reports, XI (August-December, 1962), 681-682.
- Weisskopf, E. A., "Intellectual Malfunctioning and Personality," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XXXXVI (1951), 410-413.

Unpublished Materials

- Allinsmith, Wesley, The Learning of Moral Standards, unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ann Arbor, Michigan, University of Michigan, 1954.
- Bradbury, Beverly R., A Study of Guilt and Anxiety as Related to Certain Psychological and Sociological Variables, unpublished doctoral dissertation, Denton, Texas, North Texas State University, 1967.
- LeVine, B. B., Punishment Techniques and the Development of Conscience, unpublished doctoral dissertation, Evanston, Illinois, Northwestern University, 1961.
- Unger, Sanford M., On the Development of Guilt-response Systems, unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ithaca, New York, Cornell University, 1960.