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Eighty junior and senior Psychology students responded to the Roe and Siegleman Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire (PCR), and the Strong Vocational Interest Blank (SVIB) in an attempt to explore the relationship between recalled parent-child interactions and occupational orientation.

From the standard scores obtained on the SVIB each subject was classified as either person-oriented (PO) or nonperson-oriented (NPO). Next, the scores obtained from the ten subscales of the Mother's and Father's PCR were analyzed by the classification of the subject according to the parent-child relationships of son-father, son-mother, daughter-mother, and daughter-father. Tests of differences between means of the PO and NPO groups were calculated for each of the four parent-child relationships.

The following hypothesized differences were supported in the present study. Subjects categorized as having person-oriented interests did perceive their mothers as being more direct-object rewarding than mothers of nonperson-oriented
males (P<.05). Females classified as PO did perceive their mother as more direct-object rewarding and direct-object-punishing than mothers of NPO females (P<.05). No other significant differences were obtained between PO and NPO subjects with regard to the perceptions of their parents.

It was suggested that more heterogeneous samples be used in future research, that Roe's theory of occupational interests be revised, and that the possible interaction of parental occupational interests and parent-child relationships in determining the occupational interests of children be investigated.
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Most researchers in the area of parent-child relations agree that the early interactions between a child and his or her parents play an important role in the development of the child's interest pattern. Included within the child's interest pattern are certain elements that predispose the child in the direction of a particular type of occupation. A close examination of the child's interactions with his parents may reveal these elements.

Many previous studies have dealt with some basic hypotheses about the influences of early parent-child relationships on the occupational orientation of the child. For the most part these studies have concentrated upon certain major characteristics or dimensions of parent-child interactions. These dimensions, as they are reflected in parental behaviors, are important early determinants of the child's later occupational choice (Roe, 1957).

Roe (1964) states that the process of interest development is the major determinant of the type of occupation the
individual will be involved in. The development of these interests is primarily determined by individual experience, through which the individual's attention is directed. The interests of the child are greatly influenced by the behaviors of the child's parents, and the degree of influence depends upon the child's perception of these behaviors.

In her study Roe (1957) hypothesized that the direction in which these interests are channeled is the result of the patterning of early satisfactions and frustrations. She states that the need patterns that develop in the early stages of life are unconscious and probably remain at least partially unconscious even in later life. Roe (1957) hypothesized that needs, the satisfaction of which is delayed but eventually accomplished, will become unconscious motivators, depending largely upon the degree of satisfaction felt. This will depend, among other things, upon the strength of the basic need in the given individual, the length of time elapsing between arousal and satisfaction of this need in the immediate environment (Roe, 1957, Pg. 214).

Roe makes use of three major categories in an attempt to explain the different patterns of experience a child has with his parents. The first major category of parental behavior, the emotional concentration on the child, ranges between the extremes of overprotecting and overdemanding.
According to Roe, parents who are typically overprotecting tend to baby the child and contribute to the child's dependence. Often this type of parent maintains strong emotional bonds with the child. The over-demanding parent, however, tends to expect perfection in the child and frequently is quite severe during the child's training. Often this type of parent pressures the child to achieve high levels of performance in both school and work.

The second category, the avoidance of the child, covers the extremes of rejection and neglect. The actual rejection of the child by his parents is more emotional than physical. Typically this form of rejection manifests itself as intentional neglect on the part of the parent to gratify the basic needs of the child. Parents at the other extreme, neglect, generally tend to be less of a threat to the child's emotional and psychological well being. The failure on their part to satisfy the needs of their child generally is not intentional.

The final category, acceptance of the child, is broken down in terms of the warmth or coldness of the family environment. Parents of this category typically encourage autonomy on the part of their children, and are neither coercive nor restrictive. Although there are no distinct extremes present in this category, Roe does differentiate between casual and
loving acceptance of the child. Casual acceptance is non-interference by default, and loving acceptance is seen as the encouragement of both the child's independence and his use of resources. Roe suggests that on the basis of these parental behavior patterns, the child will orient himself toward persons or toward non-persons. Roe states,

This basic orientation with respect to persons later ramifies into patterns of special interests and abilities. The degree of social interests is clearly related, and it is likely that verbal abilities are associated with this, since personal interactions are so largely mediated through words. Scientific and mechanical interests reach their fullest development in those who are concerned with nonpersons (Roe, 1957, Pg. 216).

Roe's (1957) hypothesis is that children with parents who are loving, overprotecting, and overdemanding should seek a person orientation, while children of rejecting, neglecting, casual parents should seek a nonperson orientation. Roe also states that persons brought up in homes with rejecting parents may develop a strong defensive awareness of others and will probably seek an occupation which is a socially acceptable expression of their attitudes. Those coming from accepting homes, however, will not be defensive with regard to their particular occupational orientation.

Becker (1964) cites some general implications from previous research in the area of parental discipline that
lends support to the research conducted by Roe and Siegelman (1963). The results, in general, indicate that those parents classified as being restrictive or dominating in nature, perpetuate socially inhibited behaviors in their children. A dominating parent is an individual who has strict control over his child, who severely punishes or overprotects his child. On the other hand, those parents classified as permissive in their daily interactions with their children facilitate uninhibited behaviors. A permissive parent is an individual who gives the child a great deal of freedom, who neglects the child, and who disciplines the child inconsistently.

Symonds (cited in Becker, 1964) compared children with dominating parents to those whose parents were permissive and reports that

1. Children of dominating parents were better socialized and more courteous, obedient, neat, generous, and polite. They were also more sensitive, self-conscious, shy and retiring.

2. Children of permissive parents were more disobedient, irresponsible, disorderly in the classroom, lacking in sustained attention, lacking in regular work habits, and more forward and expressive (Symonds, in Becker, 1964, pg. 191).

In light of Roe's (1957) hypothesis, children of dominating parents should seek a person-orientation (PO), while children of permissive parents should seek a nonperson-orientation (NPO).
Watson (cited in Becker, 1964) has done extensive research concerning the effects of the strictness or the permissiveness of parental discipline in families in which the child receives an adequate level of loving attention. He concludes that those children reared in a "warm-permissive" home were more able to accept responsibility for their own behavior, more able to interact with adults on a cooperative basis, relatively more persistent when involved in a difficult task, and were more creative. He further states that those children brought up in a "warm-restrictive" family environment were generally more dependent, uncooperative, either more or less persistent, less creative, and hostile. Therefore according to Roe's (1957) hypothesis children reared in "warm permissive" homes would seek a person-oriented occupation whereas, children brought up in a "warm-restrictive" home would seek nonperson-oriented occupations. Becker (1964) concludes that

... restrictiveness, while fostering well-controlled, socialized behavior, tends also to lead to fearful, dependent, and submissive behaviors, a dulling of intellectual striving and inhibited hostility. Permissiveness on the other hand, while fostering outgoing, sociable, assertive behaviors and intellectual striving, tends also to lead to less persistence and increased aggressiveness (Becker, 1964, pg. 194).

In their study Byers, Forrest, and Zaccaria (1968) investigated and tested Roe's (1957, 1964) theory of
occupational choice. Their study yielded a number of significant results regarding recalled early parent-child relations, the needs of the adult, and the occupational choice of the adult within the framework of Roe's theory. They hypothesized that if the child perceives his relationship with his parents as warm and loving, his occupational interest will be person-oriented. Conversely, if the child perceives his parents as cold and rejecting his occupational orientation will be nonperson-oriented in nature. The findings of their study reveal that Ss recalling their fathers as accepting significantly tended to be more person-oriented, while Ss recalling their fathers as avoiding tended to be more nonperson-oriented. In addition to their findings Byers, et al., suggest that a long term study might reveal that recalled parent-child relations may differ from the actually experienced parent-child relations which could possibly account for the low number of significant findings they obtained.

DeShanzo's (1966) study on the vocational interest development of individuals as a function of parental attitudes revealed that there were significant differences between Strong Vocational Interest Blank (SVIB) scale scores of subjects who described their parents' attitudes as rejecting, neglecting, passive, and submissive (P<.05). Those who
described their parents as accepting, protecting, concentrating, and exploitive had person-oriented occupational interests, while those describing their parents as rejecting, neglecting, passive, and submissive had nonperson-oriented interests.

Medvene (1968) also investigated relationships between early parent-child experiences and later occupational orientation. Taking nine vocational areas of psychology, he broke them down into either person-oriented areas of work or nonperson-oriented areas. His findings revealed that students who perceived their fathers as both the dominant parental figure and as accepting entered a person-oriented occupation in psychology. Students who, on the other hand, perceived either parent as avoiding tended to enter a non-person-oriented occupation in psychology. Thirdly, psychology students who perceived their mothers as avoiding entered a nonperson-oriented occupation.

Green and Parker (1965) also state that "if a child experiences warm, loving parents he will orient towards occupations predominantly involving people; conversely, cold, rejecting parents will predispose the child to non-person occupations" (Green & Parker, 1965, pg. 379). In their study of 355 seventh grade children they collected data
using the Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire (PCR) of Roe and Siegleman (1963). They found that males who perceived either parent as warm, protecting, or direct-object rewarding sought person-oriented occupations, while females who perceived either parent as basically cold, negative, and punishing tended to orient themselves toward non-person occupations.

The present investigation utilized two major instruments. One was used to measure recalled parent-child relations and the other occupational interest. An instrument particularly useful in assessing a person's perception of his early parent-child experiences is the Roe and Siegleman Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire (Roe & Siegleman, 1963). The Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire (PCR) was devised to obtain a measure of the parents' behavior toward their children as perceived by the child (see Appendix).

The other instrument used in this study is the Strong Vocational Interest Blank (Strong, 1966). The Strong Vocational Interest Blank (SVIB) provides an occupational interest profile for each individual and allows the empirical classification of each subject into either person-oriented or non-person-oriented occupational categories.
The purpose of the present study was to examine the relationship between early perceptions of parent-child relations, as measured by the Roe and Siegelman Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire (PCR), and the occupational orientation of the child, as measured by the Strong Vocational Interest Blank (SVIB). Based on Roe's theory of occupational choice and other previous empirical research the following hypotheses were formulated for this study:

1. Persons who have person-oriented PO occupational interests will perceive their mothers as more loving than persons who have nonperson-oriented NPO occupational interests.

2. Persons who have NPO occupational interests will perceive their mothers as more rejecting than persons who have PO occupational interests.

3. Persons who have PO occupational interests will perceive their fathers as more loving than persons who have NPO occupational interests.

4. Persons who have NPO occupational interests will perceive their fathers as more rejecting than persons who have PO occupational interests.

5. Males who have NPO occupational interests will perceive their mothers as being more casual than males who have PO occupational interests.
6. Males who have PO occupational interests will perceive their mothers as more demanding than males who have NPO occupational interests.

7. Males who have NPO occupational interests will perceive their mothers as using more direct-object reward than males who have PO occupational interests.

8. Males who have PO occupational interests will perceive their mothers as using more symbolic-love reward than males who have NPO occupational interests.

9. Males who have PO occupational interests will perceive their mothers as using more direct-object punishment than males who have NPO occupational interests.

10. Males who have NPO occupational interests will perceive their mothers as using more symbolic-love punishment than males who have PO occupational interests.

11. Males who have PO occupational interests will perceive their fathers as more casual than males who have NPO occupational interests.

12. Males who have NPO occupational interests will perceive their fathers as more demanding than males who have PO occupational interests.

15. Males who have NPO occupational interests will perceive their fathers as having used more direct-object reward than males who have PO occupational interests.
14. Males who have PO occupational interests will perceive their fathers as having used more symbolic-love reward than males who have NPO occupational interests.

15. Males who have PO occupational interests will perceive their fathers as having used more direct-object punishment than males who have NPO occupational interests.

16. Males who have NPO occupational interests will perceive their fathers as having used more symbolic-love punishment than males who have PO occupational interests.

17. Females who have PO occupational interests will perceive their mothers as being more casual than females who have NPO occupational interests.

18. Females who have PO occupational interests will perceive their mothers as more demanding than females who have NPO occupational interests.

19. Females who have PO occupational interests will perceive their mothers as having used more direct-object reward than females who have NPO occupational interests.

20. Females who have PO occupational interests will perceive their mothers as having used more symbolic-love reward than females who have NPO occupational interests.

21. Females who have PO occupational interests will perceive their mothers as having used more direct-object punishment than females who have NPO occupational interests.
22. Females who have NPO occupational interests will perceive their mothers as having used more symbolic-love punishment than females who have PO occupational interests.

23. Females who have PO occupational interests will perceive their fathers as being more casual than females who have NPO occupational interests.

24. Females who have NPO occupational interests will perceive their fathers as being more demanding than females who have PO occupational interests.

25. Females who have NPO occupational interests will perceive their fathers as having used more direct-object reward than females who have PO occupational interests.

26. Females who have PO occupational interests will perceive their fathers as having used more symbolic-love reward than females who have NPO occupational interests.

27. Females who have PO occupational interests will perceive their fathers as having used more direct-object punishment than females who have NPO occupational interests.

28. Females who have NPO occupational interests will perceive their fathers as having used more symbolic-love punishment than females who have PO occupational interests.
Subjects

Eighty North Texas State University students who were enrolled in undergraduate psychology classes served as subjects. Many were given course credit for their participation. The total sample was comprised of 47 males and 33 females between the ages of eighteen and forty-three. The average age for males was 25, and the average age for females was 22.

Instruments

Two instruments were utilized in the present study; Roe and Siegelman's (1963) Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire, and Strong's (1966) Strong Vocational Interest Blank. The Roe and Siegleman (1963) Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire (PCR) was designed to measure retrospective perceptions of parent-child interactions. The PCR has two forms, each of which has 130 items. Each form has ten subtests, six subtests of 15 items each, which measure the person's perception of his or her parents as loving, demanding, protecting, rejecting, neglecting, and casual. The remaining four subtests have ten items each and measure the subject's perception of his or her parents as utilizing...
symbolic-love reward, symbolic-love punishment, direct-object reward, and direct-object punishment. (See appendix for descriptions of PCR scales). Subjects were required to make ratings as to the relevance of each form's 130 statements regarding perceived father or mother behaviors. These ratings were made by marking on a five-point scale covering a continuum from "very true" to "very untrue." ("Very true" was scored as five points and "very untrue" was scored as one point, Roe & Siegleman, 1963). As reported in the Roe and Siegleman (1963) study the reliabilities for the separate scales range from .708 to .872 on the mother form and .687 to .896 on the father form.

The Strong Vocational Interest Blank (Strong, 1966) was also used in the present study. Ss responded to either the men's form 399TM (Strong, 1966) or the women's form TW398 (Strong, 1969) depending upon the S's sex. The men's form had 399 items and the women's form 398. Each of the items on both forms was to be marked in terms of whether the S liked it, felt indifferent about it, or disliked it.

The Strong Vocational Interest Blank (SVIB) manual reports that test-retest reliability after thirty days is .90 which drops to approximately .75 over a 20 year period (Campbell, 1966). Strong (1935) reported a median correlation of .72
between SVIB profile scores and occupation engaged in 19 years later.

Procedure

Subjects first completed both forms of the PCR. The forms were administered to a total of 80 Ss. Forty-three completed the questionnaires in the first group administration and 37 Ss in the second group administration. To control for order effects, half the Ss were given the fathers' form first, while the other half completed the mothers' form first. Four of the Ss had previously completed both PCR forms for another study and their PCR scores were obtained from that source.

The PCRs were hand scored according to the scoring key for the ten scales and there were 20 subtest scores from the PCR for each S.

Next, the SVIB was administered to 40 Ss in the first group session and to 36 Ss in the second group session. Due to limited time four of the Ss had to complete the SVIB at a later date. Prior to the administration of the SVIB each S was instructed to read a set of instructions (see Appendix for actual instructions). This procedure was included in an attempt to control for socially desirable
responses to the SVIB by the Ss. Healy's (1971) study demonstrates that this type of instruction does effectively reduce social desirability response biases. Although these instructions were given, no attempt was made in the present study to measure their effectiveness.

The SVIB answer sheets were machined scored and occupational interest profiles provided. Based on the SVIB profile sheets each S was classified as either PO or NPO with respect to their occupational orientation. This was accomplished by grouping together those occupational areas on the SVIB with regard to Roe's (1957) six categories of occupational classification. Those SVIB occupational scales assigned to Service, Business Contract, Organizations, General Cultural, and Arts-Entertainment categories were classified as PO, and those SVIB scales assigned to the categories of Technology, Outdoors, and Science were classified as NPO. Means were then computed from the SVIB standard scores obtained for both the PO and NPO groups. On the basis of the highest mean obtained, each S was classified as either PO or NPO.

Means, standard deviations, and tests of differences between means were calculated for each occupational group on each of the ten PCR subscales.
Results

For the purposes of the present study a single-tail $t$ test was used and all $t$ tests obtained were evaluated as significant at the $P < .05$ level. It should be noted that only intact families were included in the study.

Table 1 contains $t$ tests which were calculated between all PO and NPO subjects, both male and female, on each of the Mother's PCR subscales. For all $S$s combined there were 56 classified as PO, and 24 as NPO. As Table 1 reveals, neither hypothesis 1, that persons who have PO interests will perceive their mothers as more loving than persons who are classified as NPO, nor hypothesis 2, that persons classified as NPO will perceive their mothers as more rejecting than PO $S$s, was confirmed. Although not hypothesized, a significant difference was obtained with regard to the perception of mothers as direct-object rewarding. PO $S$s perceived their mothers as more direct-object rewarding than NPO $S$s ($P < .05$). No other significant differences were found between PO and NPO $S$s on the remaining scales of the Mother's PCR.
TABLE 1

Means, Standard Deviations, and Tests of Differences Between Means on Mother's PCR Subscales According to S's Occupational Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PCR Subscale</th>
<th>PO</th>
<th>NPO</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting</td>
<td>45.11</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>43.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic-love punishment</td>
<td>28.32</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>26.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejecting</td>
<td>30.67</td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td>30.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual</td>
<td>44.82</td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td>42.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic-love reward</td>
<td>35.39</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>33.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demanding</td>
<td>44.46</td>
<td>9.01</td>
<td>43.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct-object punishment</td>
<td>27.62</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>25.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loving</td>
<td>55.44</td>
<td>9.83</td>
<td>54.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglecting</td>
<td>27.78</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>28.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct-object reward</td>
<td>30.85</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>26.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.-Abbreviated: SD = standard deviation

**p<.01.

The data contained in Table 2 reveal that no significant differences, either hypothesized or not hypothesized, were obtained between the 56 Ss classified as PO and the 24 Ss classified as NPO with regard to the perceptions of their fathers.
as loving or rejecting. There were also no significant differences obtained between PO and NPO Ss on the remaining subscales of the fathers' PCR.

TABLE 2

Means, Standard Deviations, and Tests of Differences Between Means on Father's PCR Subscales According to Ss' Occupational Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PCR Subscale</th>
<th>PO</th>
<th>NPO</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protecting</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>43.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic-love punishment</td>
<td>26.71</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>24.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejecting</td>
<td>31.55</td>
<td>9.13</td>
<td>31.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual</td>
<td>45.41</td>
<td>7.88</td>
<td>43.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic-love reward</td>
<td>33.82</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>33.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demanding</td>
<td>45.51</td>
<td>8.71</td>
<td>44.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct-object punishment</td>
<td>26.23</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>23.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loving</td>
<td>52.67</td>
<td>11.71</td>
<td>52.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglecting</td>
<td>32.33</td>
<td>10.38</td>
<td>28.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct-object reward</td>
<td>28.75</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>27.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.-Abbreviated: SD = standard deviation

Table 3 contains data based on son-mother relationships according to the PO and NPO occupational interest
### TABLE 3

Means, Standard Deviations, and Tests of Differences Between Means on Mother's PCR Subscales According to Son's Occupational Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PCR Subscale</th>
<th>PO</th>
<th></th>
<th>NPO</th>
<th></th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting</td>
<td>43.13</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>44.09</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic-love punishment</td>
<td>27.19</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>26.45</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejecting</td>
<td>29.86</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>30.27</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual</td>
<td>46.47</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>43.54</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>1.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic-love reward</td>
<td>35.94</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>37.18</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demanding</td>
<td>42.94</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>43.81</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>.372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct-object punishment</td>
<td>26.55</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>26.90</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loving</td>
<td>56.08</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td>54.63</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglecting</td>
<td>28.19</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>28.09</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct-object reward</td>
<td>30.63</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>28.72</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.-Abbreviated: SD = standard deviation

categories. There were 36 Ss in the PO group and 11 Ss in the NPO group. As the data reveal there were no significant differences, either hypothesized or not hypothesized, between the PO males and NPO males in the perceptions of their mothers as casual, demanding, direct-object rewarding, symbolic-love rewarding, direct-object punishing, and symbolic-love punishing.
As evidenced in Table 4, the 36 males with PO occupational interests did perceive, as hypothesized, their fathers as being more casual than fathers of the 11 males in the NPO group (P < .05). Males with NPO occupational interests did not, however, as hypothesized, perceive their fathers as

**TABLE 4**

Means, Standard Deviations, and Tests of Differences Between Means on Father's PCR Subscales According to Son's Occupational Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PCR Subscale</th>
<th>PO</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>NPO</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting</td>
<td>40.55</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>41.63</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic-love punishment</td>
<td>25.94</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>26.72</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejecting</td>
<td>31.22</td>
<td>8.98</td>
<td>31.81</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual</td>
<td>46.05</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>41.09</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>2.245*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic-love reward</td>
<td>34.44</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>34.36</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demanding</td>
<td>43.69</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>45.81</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct-object punishment</td>
<td>26.25</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>26.36</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loving</td>
<td>53.00</td>
<td>11.18</td>
<td>52.45</td>
<td>9.88</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglecting</td>
<td>32.52</td>
<td>10.05</td>
<td>28.81</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>1.149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct-object reward</td>
<td>28.94</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>28.45</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.-Abbreviated: SD = standard deviation

*P < .05.
being more demanding, direct-object rewarding, or symbolic-love punishing than fathers of PO males. Also, males classified as PO did not perceive their fathers as being more symbolic-love rewarding or direct-object punishing than the fathers of NPO males. No other significant differences were obtained on the remaining PCR subscales between PO and NPO males with regard to perceptions of their fathers.

Data pertaining to mother-daughter relations are contained in Table 5. Of the 33 females, 20 were included in the PO group and 13 in the NPO group. As hypothesized, females in the PO occupational interest group perceived their mothers as both more direct-object rewarding and direct-object punishing than the females with NPO occupational interests (P<.05). A significant difference, not hypothesized, was found between PO and NPO females with regard to the protectiveness of their mothers. Those females classified as PO perceived their mothers as more protecting than mothers of NPO females (P<.05). No other significant differences were obtained on the mother PCR subscales.
TABLE 5

Means, Standard Deviations, and Tests of Differences Between Means on Mother's PCR Subscales According to Daughter's Occupational Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PCR Subscale</th>
<th>PO</th>
<th></th>
<th>NPO</th>
<th></th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting</td>
<td>48.65</td>
<td>9.63</td>
<td>42.30</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>2.190*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic-love punishment</td>
<td>30.35</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>27.15</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td>1.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejecting</td>
<td>32.15</td>
<td>12.55</td>
<td>30.76</td>
<td>10.41</td>
<td>.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual</td>
<td>41.85</td>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>42.15</td>
<td>9.55</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic-love reward</td>
<td>34.40</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>30.84</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>1.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demanding</td>
<td>47.20</td>
<td>11.19</td>
<td>43.76</td>
<td>11.48</td>
<td>.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct-object punishment</td>
<td>29.55</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>24.53</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>2.105*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loving</td>
<td>54.30</td>
<td>11.51</td>
<td>54.23</td>
<td>11.18</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglecting</td>
<td>27.05</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>28.84</td>
<td>8.72</td>
<td>.695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct-object reward</td>
<td>31.25</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>24.76</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>3.134**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.-Abbreviated: SD = standard deviation

*P<.05.

**P<.01.

Table 6 contains data on the relationships between daughter and father. The PO occupational group was comprised of 20 females and the NPO group of 13. The data did support
the hypothesis that females in the PO occupational interest group would perceive their fathers as more symbolic-love punishing than females in the NPO interest group (P<.05). For the remaining nine father PCR scales no significant differences were obtained between PO and NPO Ss.

**TABLE 6**

Means, Standard Deviations, and Tests of Differences Between Means on Father's PCR Subscales According to Daughter's Occupational Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PCR Subscale</th>
<th>PO</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting</td>
<td>46.85</td>
<td>9.32</td>
<td>44.38</td>
<td>8.95</td>
<td>.753</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic-love punishment</td>
<td>28.10</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>23.30</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>2.145*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejecting</td>
<td>32.15</td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td>30.46</td>
<td>9.92</td>
<td>.487</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual</td>
<td>44.25</td>
<td>9.99</td>
<td>45.92</td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>.465</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic-love reward</td>
<td>32.70</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demanding</td>
<td>48.80</td>
<td>10.60</td>
<td>42.76</td>
<td>9.01</td>
<td>1.689</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct-object punishment</td>
<td>26.20</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>21.53</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>1.950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loving</td>
<td>52.10</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>52.46</td>
<td>9.32</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglecting</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>11.19</td>
<td>28.53</td>
<td>9.91</td>
<td>.906</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct-object reward</td>
<td>28.40</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>27.30</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.-Abbreviated: SD = standard deviation

*P<.05.
Discussion

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between parent-child relations and the occupational orientation of the child. It is evident that many of the relationships examined in the present study provide little support for Roe's (1957) theory of occupational choice. Several previous studies have also provided only partial support of this theory (Green and Parker, 1965, DeShazo, 1965). The present study does provide evidence, however, that subjects categorized as having person-oriented occupational interests did, as hypothesized, perceive their mothers as being more direct-object rewarding than mothers of non-person-oriented subjects. Also, males with person-oriented occupational interests did, as hypothesized, perceive their fathers as being more casual than fathers of males in the nonperson-oriented group. Finally, females classified as person-oriented did, as hypothesized, perceive their mothers as being more direct-object rewarding and direct-object punishing than mothers of females in the nonperson-oriented interest group.

There are several variables which could account for the low number of significant differences obtained. First of all, there is the possibility that the range of occupational
interests represented in the present study is restricted due to the fact that only psychology majors were used. Most psychology majors, by the nature of their interests, are person-oriented. For future research it is recommended that more heterogeneous samples be taken, with a wider variety of potential occupations represented. A second possible explanation is that Roe's theory of occupational classification fails to take into account that the major occupational groups may contain both person-oriented and nonperson-oriented areas (Green and Parker, 1965, Medvene, 1968). Future studies should attempt to regroup the occupational scales on the SVIB so that the PO and NPO groups are more precisely defined.

Another possibility is that the parents' occupational interests interact with their relationships with the children to produce the occupational interests of the children. There is, at present, a dearth of theories and empirical studies concerning the relationships between parental occupational interests and parent-child relations as joint determinants of the occupational interests of children. Obviously, more differentiated theories and studies are needed in this area if an accurate accounting of the formation of occupational interests is to be made.
APPENDIX

Abridged Descriptions of Roe-Siegleman PCR Questionnaire Scales

Protective: This category includes parents who give the child's interests first priority. They are affectionate, indulgent, intrusive, and they reward dependency.

Demanding: Parents in this group set up high standards of accomplishment in particular areas. They are strict, demand obedience, highly punitive, and they do not try to find out what the child is thinking or feeling, they tell him what to think and feel.

Rejecting: Parents of this category reject the child as an individual. They are cold, hostile, and derogate the child. They have no regard for the child's point of view.

Neglecting: These parents pay little attention to the child. They give no affection. They are cold, but not derogatory. They leave the child alone, but do not try to avoid him.

Casual: These parents are mildly affectionate and pay more attention to their children. They have few rules, and make little effort to enforce those they have.

Loving: Parents of this category give the child warm and loving attention. They are helpful, not intrusive. They use praise and punishment discriminately, and they give the child's problems much thought.

Symbolic-love reward: Parents using this kind of reward praise their children for approved behaviors, give them special attention, and are affectionate.

Direct-object reward: Parents using this kind of reward give tangible things such as money, toys, and special trips to places.

Direct-object punishment: Such punishments include physical punishment, reducing allowances, or denying planned trips.

Symbolic-love punishment: These include such punishments as shaming the child before his peers, isolation, and withdrawal of love.

Instructions Given to Ss Prior To Administration of Strong Vocational Interest Blank

"It is hard to be objective when you rate yourself. All of us have the tendency to think that we are better than we are. But if this rating is going to be helpful, you must be especially careful to describe yourself and any occupation you are interested in accurately."
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