379
N81d
No. 1625

PERCEIVED CHILD-PARENT RELATIONSHIPS AND CHILD
ADJUSTMENT IN FAMILIES WITH BOTH ADOPTED
AND NATURAL CHILDREN

DISSERTATION

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

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

by

Marilyn R. Ternay, B.A., M.A.

Denton, Texas

August, 1980

Ternay, Marilyn R., Perceived Child-Parent Relationships and Child Adjustment in Families with Both Adopted and Natural Children. Doctor of Philosophy (Counseling), August, 1980, 110 pp., 35 tables.

This study examined perceived child-parent relationships and child adjustment in families with both adopted and natural children. Of interest was the relationship between these perceptions and the social and emotional adjustment of the children. The subjects included 133 intact families: 44 families with natural children, 45 families with adopted children only, and 44 mixed families with both adopted and natural children. The children were enrolled in the fourth through eighth grade level in school and included the oldest child in natural and adoptive families and the oldest natural and oldest adopted child in mixed families.

Perceived parent-child relationships were measured by the Child Parent Relationship Scale developed by Swanson. The California Test of Personality was utilized to measure the children's adjustment. A total of 30 variables were subjected to a series of multigroup discriminant analyses to determine if the four groups of children could be significantly differentiated. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were calculated between the children's scores on the 15 scales of the California Test of Personality and

mother's perceptions of the child-parent relationship, father's perceptions of the child-parent relationship and the child's perceptions of the child-parent relationship.

Discriminant analyses of child-parent relationship scores and child-parent discrepancy scores failed to significantly differentiate natural, all adoptive, and mixed families. Discriminant analyses of children's scores on the California Test of Personality subscales and major scales resulted in significantly differentiating adopted children in all adoptive families from adopted children in mixed families on the Social Standards and Family Relations subscales. Of the four groups of children, adopted children from all adoptive families scored poorest of the four groups of children on the Social Standards scale while adopted children from mixed families achieved the best scores. Adopted children in adoptive families scored significantly higher than the mixed family adoptees on the Family Relations scale indicating that these adopted children report a greater sense of security, self-respect, and individual worth.

Analyses of the California Test of Personality scales and the Child-Parent Relationship Scale scores statistically differentiated the natural and adopted children from mixed families on the Self-Reliance, Anti-social Tendencies and Family Relations subscales. The natural children scored higher in their sense of self-reliance and in their views of

family relationships. In addition, they scored higher in their anti-social tendencies.

Statistically significant correlations were determined for children's scores on the California Test of Personality and children's perceptions of the child-parent relationship. The preponderance and magnitude of the correlations lend some support to the belief that the well-adjusted child perceives child-parent relationships relatively happy and satisfying while poorly-adjusted children view these relationships as deviating from a theoretical ideal. In addition, the findings of this study indicate the adjustment of the adopted child in a mixed family appears to have been negatively affected by the presence of the natural child.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
List of Tables	iv
Review of the Literature	5
Hypotheses	25
Method	26
Subjects	26
Instruments	30
Procedure	36
Results	38
Related Findings	64
Discussion	69
Appendices	79
References	97

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. CPRS Means and Standard Deviations	40
2. Discriminant Functions Combining CPRS Variables	41
3. Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients	41
4. Summary Table of Analysis of CPRS Scores	42
5. Summary Table for Incomplete Analysis of CPRS Child-Parent Discrepancy Scores	43
6. CTP Means and Standard Deviations for Children	44
7. Discriminant Function Combining CTP Social Adjustment Subscales for Adopted Children	46
8. Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients	46
9. Summary Table of Analysis of CTP Social Adjustment Subscales for Adopted Children	47
10. Discriminant Function Combining CTP Personal Adjustment Subscales for Adopted Children	47
11. Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients	48
12. Summary Table of Analysis of CTP Personal Adjustment Subscales for Adopted Children	48

	Page
13. Discriminant Function Combining CTP Personal Adjustment Subscales for Natural Children	49
14. Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients	49
15. Summary Table of Analysis of CTP Personal Adjustment Subscales for Natural Children	50
16. Summary Table for Incomplete Analysis of CTP Social Adjustment Subscales for Natural Children	50
17. Discriminant Function Combining CTP Personal, Social and Total Adjustment Scales for Natural Children	51
18. Discriminant Function Combining CTP Personal Adjustment Subscales for Natural Children in Natural Families and Adopted Children in Adoptive Families	52
19. Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients	52
20. Summary Table of Analysis of CTP Personal Adjustment Subscales for Natural Children in Natural Families and Adopted Children in Adoptive Families	53
21. Discriminant Function Combining CTP Social Adjustment Subscales for Natural Children in Natural Families and Adopted Children in Adoptive Families	53
22. Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients	54
23. Summary Table of Analysis of CTP Social Adjustment Subscales for Natural Children in Natural Families and Adopted Children in Adoptive Families . . .	54

	Page
24. Summary Table for Incomplete Analysis of CTP Personal, Social and Total Adjustment Scales of Natural Children in Natural Families and Adopted Children in Adoptive Families	55
25. Product-Moment Correlations Between Children's Scores on the CTP and Mother's Perceptions of the Child-Parent Relationship	56
26. Product-Moment Correlations Between Children's Scores on the CTP and Father's Perceptions of the Child-Parent Relationship	58
27. Product-Moment Correlations Between Children's CTP Scores and Children's Perceptions of the Child-Parent Relationship in Natural Families	59
28. Product-Moment Correlations Between Children's CTP Scores and Children's Perceptions of the Child-Parent Relationship in Adoptive Families	60
29. Product-Moment Correlations Between Children's CTP Scores and Children's Perceptions of the Child-Parent Relationship in Mixed Families	61
30. Means and Univariate Comparisons of Natural and Adoptive Children in Mixed Families	64
31. Discriminant Function Combining Demographic Variables for Mixed and Adoptive Families	66
32. Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients	66
33. Summary Table of Analysis of Demographic Variables for Adopted Children	66

	Page
34. Correlation Coefficients for the Relationship Between Parent-Child Perceptions of the Parent-Child Relationship	68
35. Means and Standard Deviations for CPRS and Parent-Child Discrepancy Scores	68

PERCEIVED CHILD-PARENT RELATIONSHIPS AND CHILD
ADJUSTMENT IN FAMILIES WITH BOTH ADOPTED
AND NATURAL CHILDREN

Research in the area of child-parent relationships has gone through several developmental phases. Early researchers assumed that mothers had the greatest influence upon the development of a child and therefore a great deal of research concentrated upon mother-child relationships and ignored the impact of other family members (Behrens, 1954; Finney, 1961; Medinnus & Curtis, 1963; Yarrow, 1963).

During the decade of the sixties, the research literature reflected a growing concern for paternal influences upon children. Many of these studies were prompted by an interest in the adjustment of children to paternal loss resulting from death or family break up (Biller, 1968; Hetherington, 1972; Leichty, 1960; Pederson, 1966).

Some of the more recent studies parallel a major trend in the counseling profession which views family relationships as dynamic and mutually interactive. Individuals are not viewed in isolation nor are cause and effect viewed as unidirectional. It is now an acknowledged fact that children and parents influence each other and that this sphere of influence extends beyond the parent-child dyad (Allan, 1977; Bell, 1977; Essman, 1977; Johnson & Medinnus, 1965;

Lewis & Rosenblum, 1974; Olson, 1971; Segal & Yahraes, 1979; Sutton-Smith & Rosenberg, 1970; Thomas & Chess, 1977).

Although there has been a growing trend to broaden the scope of research in child-parent relationships, there are relatively few research studies which investigate child-parent relationships outside the biological family structure. Research investigating adoptive family relationships is lacking despite the fact that some authors point out these family relationships are subject to strains not found in biological families (Brown, 1974; Kirk, 1964, 1966; Ladner, 1977; Lewis, Balls & Gore, 1975). Toussieng (1971) reports that the lack of a mutual biological tie between parents and an adopted child leads to feelings of insecurity. Adoptive parents may have difficulty believing the adopted child is really theirs. This attitude, when perceived by the child, may create anxiety and tension that could affect the entire family relationship. Adoptive parents are confronted with an uncomfortable double bind situation: treat adopted children as if they were your own but tell them they are not (Seglow, Pringle & Wedge, 1972).

There appears to be much folklore or general knowledge concerning adoption. Those empirical studies concerned with adoption have been few in number, narrow in scope, and designed primarily to answer the needs and interests of the medical or social work professions.

The characteristics of adoptive families, how these families may be similar or different from other families and the adjustments these families have to make have not been well documented. Early studies reported that most adoptive parents were childless, 15 percent of the adoptive parents had biological children prior to adoption and about 10 percent had biological children after adoption (Kirk, 1964; Pringle, 1967). Bonham (1977) found considerable changes in adoption trends in a study of agency adoptions between 1955 and 1970. Over these years he found the average age of adoptive parents decreased, average time since marriage decreased, average social and economic status of the adoptive couples increased, and adoptive couples were more likely to have natural born children prior to adoption.

Contrary to popular belief, over half of all women who have adopted a child have also given birth to a child. For women who have both natural and adopted children, it is more likely that adoption follows giving birth to a child than that a birth follows adoption of a child. This pattern prevails in 74 percent of the families with both adopted and natural born children reported by the National Center for Social Statistics (1976).

Despite the lack of empirical data, authors have discussed family relationships in families with both natural and adopted children. Raymond (1955) points out that in an attempt to protect the adopted child from feeling less wanted

than the natural child, parents may consciously work to provide the adopted child with extra love and attention. The result might be that the adopted child actually feels inferior and interprets the extra efforts as compensatory behaviors; the natural child may feel resentful because actual accomplishments may not earn sincere recognition. Pannor and Nerlove (1977) echo this concern.

Extreme sibling rivalry between natural and adopted children was a primary concern of a group of adoptive parents who participated in group counseling (Sorosky, Baran & Pannor, 1978). The parents pointed out that in homes with both natural and adoptive children, adoptees may feel inferior and resentful of what they might consider to be the favorite status of the natural child. On the other hand, real or perceived differential treatment by parents could greatly aggravate what might be considered within the realm of natural sibling rivalry. It follows that a child's interpretation of the perceived differential treatment could affect many areas of the child's social and emotional adjustment. Several studies (Borgotta & Fanshel, 1965; Glatzner, 1955; Goodman, Silberstein & Mandell, 1963; Kirk, Jonasson & Fish, 1966) have found that adopted children have poorer social and emotional adjustment than non-adopted children; however, it is not known whether adopted children perceive their relationships with their parents differently from the relationships natural children have with their parents.

The problem examined in this study was perceived child-parent relationships and child adjustment in families with both adopted and natural children. Of further interest was the relationship between these perceptions and the social and emotional adjustment of the children. A total of 31 variables were investigated in an attempt to better understand those characteristics which might differentiate adoptive and non-adoptive families. A better understanding of these characteristics will aid everyone interested in adoption and help to move the subject of adoption outside the realm of folklore and general knowledge.

Review of the Literature

The journal literature is replete with studies investigating variables associated with different types of child-parent relationships. The vast majority of these studies were fostered by the belief that pervasive parental attitudes and behaviors significantly influence a child's personality and therefore affect the child's social and emotional adjustment (Brown, 1942; Connell, 1976; Dielman, Barton & Cattell, 1977; Krige, 1976; Martin, 1942; Medinnus & Curtis, 1963; Newell, 1934; Symonds, 1939, Walsh, 1968).

Early studies investigating child-parent relationships utilized an inventory or interview approach. They focused upon family interaction and maternal characteristics reported by the mother who was often the sole source of data.

As Yarrow (1963) pointed out, mothers can hardly be considered objective, unbiased participant observers. Mothers' responses would appear to reflect self-descriptions and reports tempered by a large degree of ego involvement and, often, cultural expectations. Kohn (1963) indicates that in addition to personal needs and values, social class identification greatly influences child rearing attitudes and behaviors (Bronfenbrenner, 1958; Duvall, 1946). Middle class mothers are more apt to consider expert opinion as the acceptable standard; working class mothers show a tendency to think in terms of the behaviors and attitudes of their own parents (Kohn, 1963).

Gildea, Glidewell and Kantor (1961) reported a significant relationship between children's disturbing behaviors and maternal attitudes. The best adjusted children in school had mothers who saw children's behavior resulting from many causes; these mothers believed they could influence the outcome of their child's behavior. At the other extreme were those mothers who denied responsibility for their children's behavior. These women had children who evidenced the highest rate of disturbing behaviors; they felt incapable of influencing their children and cited uncontrolled external influences. Social class differences were evident in the maternal attitudes. The upper-middle class mothers were most confident of their methods for dealing with their children. They enforced limited parental control and believed they

were both responsible and influential in determining the behavior of their children. The middle class mothers evidenced a moderate degree of confidence in their child-rearing attitudes and behaviors. They believed they were generally responsible for the behavior of their children and also that they could influence the children's behavior. Lower class mothers were the least confident of their methods and evidenced the least amount of influence and responsibility for their children's behavior.

Several studies have found that parental attitudes affect a child's academic achievement. Krige's (1976) study indicated frequent, positive interactions between parents and their children was related to higher academic achievement. Unrealistically high parental demands for academic achievement led to the development of neurotic symptoms in the children involved in a study by Teichmann, Gollnitz and Gohler (1975).

One of the earliest studies to assess father-child relationships indicated paternal attitudes were at least as relevant as maternal attitudes with respect to the occurrence and form of behavior problems in children (Peterson, Becker, Hellmer, Shoemaker & Quay, 1959). This study demonstrated that numerous paternal attitudes and behaviors were significantly related to adjustment difficulties of their children. Children's adjustment problems were related to lack of paternal concern and autocratic attitudes. Also,

paternal permissiveness and ineffective disciplinary measures were significantly related to children's conduct problems.

Contrary to the belief that paternal influence is not significant until after a child is four years old (Mower, 1950; Mussen, 1967, 1973; Parsons, 1958; Parsons & Bales, 1955), recent studies indicate infants are attached to both parents at an early age (Lamb & Lamb, 1976). The relationships infants experience with their fathers and mothers differ in their potential for significant impact upon the psychological and social development of the children (Burlingham, 1973; Lamb, 1975).

Exploration of father-child relationships has become an important issue in light of the upward spiraling divorce rate and the increasing numbers of children being raised without a father in the home. Research studies indicate that father absence may handicap children in their adoption of cultural mores and sex-typed behavior; however, confounding variables make it difficult to determine what proportion of the effects are due to deprivation of interaction with a father figure as opposed to those that result from economic hardship (Biller, 1968, 1969, 1971, 1974; Hetherington & Deur, 1971). Despite difficulty in interpreting results of many studies, one consistent finding has been the inverse relationship between the seriousness of the effects of paternal absence and the child's age at the time of the father's departure. The younger the child, the greater the

potential for maladaptive psychosocial development of the child (Blanchard & Biller, 1971; Hetherington & Deur, 1971).

Research in the area of single father families is scant; however, statistics indicate that 10 percent of the children in single parent families are being raised by their fathers. Approximately 1.5 million single fathers are rearing 3.5 million children. Recent studies (Atkin & Rubin, 1976; Keshet & Rosenthal, 1978; Mendes, 1976) indicate single fathers are successful at childrearing part-time and full-time and are capable of providing a stable, nurturing home environment.

A number of studies have investigated the child's perception of family relationships (Droppleman & Schaefer, 1963; Pines, 1978; Yarrow, 1963). Yarrow found children's perceptions of parental behaviors often differed significantly from those of adult observers. A possible explanation for these results is expressed in the concept that an individual's personal perceptions define a situation as good or bad (Adler, 1969). This seemingly simplistic concept has been cited as a possible underlying factor in the successful adjustment of children who appear to thrive and overcome extreme hardship despite living in the midst of apparent adverse family conditions (Adler, 1963; Pines, 1978).

In a study investigating perceived maternal and paternal behaviors, boys and girls consistently reported differences between maternal and paternal behaviors. Boys and girls

perceived mothers as more nurturant and more controlling by indirect methods. They indicated that the same sex parent was the chief source of discipline. Mothers were seen as more loving, more affectionate, less ignoring, and less neglecting than fathers (Droppleman & Schaefer, 1963).

In a study designed to investigate parental control of children, Armetrout (1971) found mothers were perceived as more controlling while fathers were seen as more accepting of their children. Stringent parental control was found to be significantly related to destructiveness, aggressiveness and antisocial behavior in the child.

Schaefer (1965) reported significant differences in perceived parental behaviors in families with an institutionalized delinquent child and those families without a delinquent child. The delinquent group identified extremely different patterns of behavior for mothers and fathers. While both parents in the families with a delinquent child were described as high on encouraging autonomy and lax in discipline, mothers were described as significantly more positive and loving and fathers less positive and loving than the parents in the non-delinquent group. Mothers of the delinquents scored significantly higher than their spouses on variables measuring expression of affection, positive evaluation, emotional support, intellectual stimulation, protectiveness, and child centeredness. The non-delinquent children described their parents as significantly more similar

in behavior. The results of the study suggest parents of delinquents may be less unified in their parental behaviors and childrearing techniques and the discrepancy between perceived parental behaviors may be related to the child's adjustment.

The dimensions of perceived parental consistency, constraint, and support and their relationship to the child's development of an external or internal control orientation were investigated by Scheck, Emerick and El-Assal (1973). Using Rotter's Internal-External Control of Reinforcement Scale and a parent-child relations questionnaire with ninth grade students, they found an adolescent's perception of parental behavior is significantly related to the adolescent's locus of control. The findings, consistent with existing theory, indicated the more an individual perceives parental discipline as inconsistent, the more externally oriented the individual will be; the more an individual perceives parental disagreement concerning expectations, the more externally oriented the child will be; the more overcontrolling or permissive parents are perceived, the more externally oriented the individual will be. Perceived parental support was found to be significantly related to an internal locus of control.

Numerous studies have found a high incidence of erratic or inconsistent discipline contributes to antisocial or maladaptive behaviors in children (Andry, 1960; Becker,

1964; Glueck & Glueck, 1950; McCord, McCord & Zola, 1959). Consistent parental discipline has been found to be related to independence and assertiveness in boys (Baumrind & Black, 1967). Anderslands (1967) found differences between parents' academic expectations of their sons were related to the boy's poor academic achievement.

The relationship of perceived parental attitudes toward a child's personality traits and physical attributes and the child's sense of security was investigated by Jourard and Remy (1955). The child's self ratings, perceived parental ratings, and a measure of personal security were found to be intercorrelated at the .05 level of significance. Self evaluations were significantly related to the individual's perception of parental evaluation. Negative self evaluations and perceived negative parental evaluations were significantly related to psychological insecurity.

Based upon the belief that well adjusted children will perceive their familial relationships as approximating the ideal, Serot and Teevan (1961) suggested that a child's perception of the child-parent relationship would be related to the child's overall adjustment. Their data support this belief and in addition, demonstrate that parental perceptions of the relationship are not related to the child's perceptions. Parental perceptions of the child-parent relationship were found to be unrelated to the child's adjustment.

Rode (1971) investigated how the parental perceptions of alienated adolescents differ from those of other adolescents. The subjects included 263 middle class boys and girls in grades 10-12. A significant proportion of the students had been expelled from or dropped out of school. Scores on an alienation inventory and mother and father forms of the Parent Behavior Inventory indicated that the strongest positive correlates of alienation involved maternal possessiveness, rejection, control through guilt, hostile detachment, withdrawal of relations, and instilling persistent anxiety; the paternal correlates included rejection and hostile detachment. According to the results of this study, alienated adolescents perceive their parents' behavior pattern in a distinct manner from non-alienated youths. Paulson, Tien-teh and Hanssen (1972) found alienated, anti-establishment youth hold negative perceptions of their parent-child relationships. They perceive their parents to be hostile, non-accepting, and controlling through negative, non-physical means. Alienated youth report more disharmony within their families.

In an attempt to identify those factors which are associated with some individual's rejection of traditional life patterns and consequent acceptance of alternate life styles, Stinnett and Taylor (1976) administered a scale which measured perceptions of the parent-child relationship and perceptions of seven alternate life styles. Individuals who perceived relationships with their parents as positive

and close tended to have significantly less favorable perceptions of alternate life styles than those who had negative perceptions of their parent-child relationships. These results suggest that acceptance of, and participation in, alternate life styles may be due to dissatisfaction of many youth with their perceived family environment.

Despite the large body of literature concerned with family relationships, relatively few studies deal with families which deviate from the nuclear, biological family. The rising divorce rate and the increasing numbers of blended or reconstituted families resulting from remarriages, have stimulated research of step-family relationships (Bowerman & Irish, 1962; Duberman, 1973; Keith, 1977). Results from these studies generally indicate stepfathers are more apt to establish better relationships with their stepchildren than do stepmothers; good step relations were more likely to occur when a previous marriage was terminated by death rather than by divorce. Previously unmarried stepmothers had the least successful stepchild relationships.

Although adoption as a means of bringing children into families can be documented in ancient law, very little research can be found that deals with the adoptive family after the adoption is consummated. The vast majority of adoption research has been conducted in the area of social work and has been concerned with those factors which influence placement of a child for adoption. Numerous studies

have investigated characteristics of adoptive parents. In general, the median age of adoptive parents is older than that of natural parents; the average time lapse between marriage and adoption is ten years. A significant number of adoptive fathers are in business, managerial or professional occupations (Ladner, 1977; Leahy, 1933).

Maas (1960) determined that couples who prefer to adopt infants are characterized as Protestant, white, high school graduates in their mid-thirties and married almost ten years. Older children are more frequently adopted by families characterized as blue collar workers. Parents of lower occupational and educational status will more readily accept children with physical or emotional problems. White collar workers appear to be less willing to accept children with special needs.

Anderson (1978) investigated perceived parental behaviors and childrearing attitudes in families with only adopted children. She found that contrary to popular belief, adoptive parents obtained scores comparable to biological parents in all areas sampled on the behavioral questionnaire. Adoptive fathers were more likely than biological fathers to believe environmental influences were more significant than biological factors.

Several studies have investigated and attempted to isolate those conscious and unconscious factors which motivate individuals to adopt a child (Edwards, 1954; Finch,

1960; Kirk, 1964). In addition to altruistic factors, Phipps (1953) found adoption sometimes has been initiated as a result of an adult's unconscious need for power and a desire to dominate another individual in the way one had been dominated in childhood.

Lamanna (1977) studied the value of children to biological and adoptive parents. The overall findings indicated children were meeting parental needs which were not easily replaceable by other relationships and activities; however, important differences were found related to the parent's sex and the type of parenthood. In general, men tended to value children for their achievement and conformity and viewed their parental role as focusing upon socializing of the child. Women valued children for their love and companionship. Biological fathers tended to be emotionally detached and highly evaluative of their offspring. Biological mothers were more sensitive than biological fathers and not quite as emotionally detached. Adoptive mothers were found to be highly evaluative, high in tension yet deriving great meaning and intrinsic pleasure from their parenting role; adoptive fathers resembled adoptive mothers to a lesser degree.

In a study designed to measure attitudes associated with parenthood, Humphrey (1977) found significant differences between males and females. Data indicate the maternal role means more to a female than the paternal role means to

a male. Sexual identity and masculinity were significantly related to the male parental role whereas, a non-significant relationship was found between femininity and the female parental role.

Very few studies have addressed themselves to post-adoption adjustment of the adoptive family. A longitudinal study conducted by Zur Nieden (1951) investigated the development of adoptive children over a twenty-year period. Judgments concerning success of the placement consisted of adoptive parents' evaluation of the child's social and emotional adjustment. Successful outcome was estimated in 70 percent of the placements; only 9 percent of the placements were judged as unsuccessful, and the remaining 21 percent of the placements were regarded as neither good nor bad.

A follow-up investigation of agency arranged adoptions was undertaken by Lawder, her associates at the Graduate Department of Social Work at Bryn Mawr College, and the Children's Aid Society (1969). The study was designed to determine: (a) how adequately adoptive parents adjust to the responsibilities of adoptive parenthood; (b) what information about adoptive parents and children, than can be collected prior to completion of adoption, is predictive of how the adoptive family will function later; and (c) the developmental patterns of adopted children.

The study involved 200 families and a total of 250 adopted children. Approximately 20 percent of the families had natural children. Questionnaires, rating scales, interviews, and various assessment techniques were used to evaluate family functioning.

The findings indicated that in six different areas related to parental functioning, 70-80 percent of the parents were rated as functioning from "average" to "high average" in all areas except communication of the fact of adoption. The parental qualities of warmth and affection, satisfaction in parent role, and acceptance of adoptive role were found to be the most significant factors in relation to later positive family functioning.

The results of the study did not clearly indicate specific preadoptive information which was associated with postadoptive family functioning. What was evident was the lack of a significant relationship between child factors prior to adoption and later family functioning. A predominance of parent characteristics, attitudes and behaviors emerged as determinants of later family functioning. It was noted that such factors as age of the child at placement, sex and health of the child, and degree of deprivation and number of foster homes prior to adoption were not related to family functioning.

Only one child background factor was found to be significantly related to later functioning of the child. The

degree of deprivation prior to placement was related to need for later professional help. When considered individually, child background factors were not predictive of a child's adjustment.

A followup study of 484 independent adoptions (Witmer, 1963) considered four aspects of adoptive parent functioning: the husband-wife relationship, the parent-child relationship, the mental health of the parents, and socioeconomic factors. The study concluded that approximately 75 percent of the adoptions appeared to be working out "fairly well" and of the four aspects investigated, the quality of the marital relationship and of the mother-child relationship were most closely related to the child's adjustment.

Numerous studies have been concerned with the incidence of psychiatric problems in adopted children after placement. Adoptive children were found to be overrepresented in clinic populations (Goodman, Silberstein & Mandell, 1963; Hoffman, 1971; Schechter, 1960; Toussieng, 1962; Wilborn & Smith, 1974). Other investigators, however, have found that when random sampling procedures replaced a frequency count of adopted children seen in clinics, adopted children did not encounter more emotional problems than non-adopted children (Borgatta & Fanshel, 1965; Lawton & Gross, 1964; Raleigh, 1954).

Many followup studies investigating emotional problems of adopted children have found that severity of behavior and emotional problems of children can be directly correlated with the age of the child at the time of placement for adoption, and with the apparent degree of maternal deprivation (McWhinnie, 1967, 1970; Offord, 1969; Witmer, 1963). It follows that these same apparently troubled children, barring successful therapeutic intervention, could continue to have adjustment difficulties including identity problems in late adolescence (Sorosky, Baran & Pannor, 1975, 1978). Despite these findings, numerous researchers continue to qualify these results based upon those characteristics which typify adoption of an older child. Several followup studies of older adopted children indicated that typically these children become available for adoption as a result of a court action that terminates parental rights. These children have usually experienced various forms of neglect and deprivation; the parents function inadequately in their marital as well as parental roles; there may be a history of foster care placements prior to legal adoption; and sibling groups are often involved (Kadushin, 1970; Meier, 1965; Van Theis, 1924; Witmer, 1963; Welter, 1965).

Data from followup adoption studies appear to be consistent with developmental studies which indicate that because of varying strengths and capacities to deal with potentially traumatic conditions, children, to differing degrees, are

capable of surmounting the damaging influences of early childhood. Social and emotional childhood deprivations, generally regarded as traumatic by some, may be regarded by others as merely annoying, inconvenient, or a challenge to be met. The apparent reversibility of early childhood trauma was reported in studies by Kadushin (1970), Maas (1963), Van Theis (1924), Rathbun (1964), and Ripple (1968). The majority of older adopted children in these studies were found to be functioning well according to data collected from numerous sources.

In addition to innate factors, environmental factors influence a child's ability to cope. Older adopted children are generally moved from a home which meets few needs to an adoptive home environment which is supportive and, to some extent, meeting many of the child's needs. Generally the child is moved from a lower class, multiproblem home situation to a middle class family of accepted social status (Levin, 1965). Social acceptability and positive familial relationships are considered to be important contributing factors in a child's successful adjustment. In general, existing data appear to converge upon the belief that the quality of a child-parent relationship is a major factor contributing to a child's overall adjustment (Chess, 1953; Elonen & Schwartz, 1969; Glatzner, 1955; Serot & Teevan, 1961).

Children who are considered hard to place fall into several categories: children over three years of age, children with handicaps, and children of minority or mixed racial background. Kadushin (1970) conducted a followup study of the experiences of 112 families who adopted white, healthy, hard to place older children between 5 and 12 years of age. The children were available for adoption as a result of court action to terminate parental rights because of abuse or neglect. Successful outcome as measured by parental satisfaction of the adoptive experience was reported in 82 percent of the families. The capacity of the adoptive child to develop good interpersonal relationships was highly related to both the child's and the adoptive family's successful adjustment. In addition, the older the child was at the time of adoptive placement, the greater the likelihood of less favorable outcome.

The successful outcome of adoptive placements in studies conducted by Maas (1963), Rathbun (1964), and Welter (1965) support assumptions concerning the resiliency and plasticity of most children. A majority of the culturally displaced, older children in these studies were found to be functioning well in their adoptive homes as well as in school. In general, in studies investigating the outcome of adoptions involving hard to place children, the more benign the child's environment prior to adoptive placement, the better the prognosis for successful adjustment.

Although adoption of children of Asian background has existed since the 1950's, it was not until the civil rights era of the 1960's that adoption agencies actively pursued transracial adoptions. Confronted with a shortage of available white infants, agencies focused upon the supply of infants who were available for adoption: minority group children, children of mixed racial background, and handicapped children. Major changes in adoption policy ensued. No longer was the ideal match between parents and child sought. Emphasis was placed upon the needs of the child, primarily the right of every child to a permanent home. Despite this basic philosophy, transracial adoptions, in particular black children placed with white parents, have aroused a great deal of controversy within social agencies. Many black social workers feel that only black families can provide an environment that will allow opportunity for social and emotional adjustment of a black child in a culture that discriminates because of color (Chestang, 1972).

A number of studies have addressed themselves to the concerns associated with transracial adoption. Robertson (1974) investigated socialization patterns in white families with a black child. She found interracial adoptive parents are distinctive in several ways. They tend to be politically active and of liberal orientation. They are well educated, have high status jobs, and most have their own natural children. A strong belief in the power of the

individual's ability to control and direct life events was very prevalent. A majority of the adoptive parents placed little emphasis on the child's blackness and placed power in the hands of the individual.

Concern for racial identity and racial preferences prompted Simon's (1974) study. She found that contrary to reports that Oriental and black children consistently reported pro-white attitudes (Porter, 1971), children raised in multiracial families did not show pro-white racial preferences.

Relatively few studies have investigated the outcome of transracial adoptions. Those that do exist indicate the adopted children are functioning satisfactorily in a high percentage of the adoptive families (Grow & Shapiro, 1974; Tod, 1977). Concerned adoption workers caution that transracial adoptions should not be considered successful based upon the existing limited research. Future research is needed to assess adult emotional and social adjustment of children raised in interracial families.

To summarize, the bulk of adoption research has focused upon the individual members of the adoptive family, the adoptive mother, the adoptive father, the adopted child. Those few studies that have addressed themselves to adoptive family relationships have been primarily limited to families with only adopted children. The trend in adoption indicates these families are becoming a minority and families with both adopted and natural children are increasing.

Social consciousness of the recent decades has prevailed in bringing about a number of changes in adoption policy; however, research efforts concerned with the outcome of these changes have not kept pace. As adoption workers strive to realize the right of every child to a permanent home, adoption no longer brings to mind a picture of a white infant perfectly formed and ideally matched with a middle-aged, childless couple. Agencies are actively seeking adoptive homes for children who are considered difficult to place because of age, race, physical or emotional factors. Statistics indicate placement of these children has been predominantly with families who have natural children. How these families adjust has not been documented by research. It appears that information concerning families with both adopted and natural children is primarily limited to beliefs, conjecture, and often the personal bias of individuals. Hence, research investigating these family relationships is much needed.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were formulated in the null form due to the exploratory nature of this study.

1. Scores obtained by adoptive and natural children on the Child-Parent Relationship Scale will not significantly differentiate mixed, natural, and adoptive families.

2. Child-parent discrepancy scores on the Child-Parent Relationship Scale will not significantly differentiate mixed, natural, and adoptive families.

3. Scores obtained by children on the scales of the California Test of Personality will not significantly differentiate mixed, natural, and adoptive families.

4. There will be no significant relationship between a child's scores on the California Test of Personality and the mother's perceptions of the child-parent relationship.

5. There will be no significant relationship between a child's scores on the California Test of Personality and the father's perceptions of the child-parent relationship.

6. There will be no significant relationship between a child's scores on the California Test of Personality and the child's perceptions of the child-parent relationship.

7. There will be no significant relationship between the adopted child's scores on the California Test of Personality and the child's age at the time of placement for adoption.

Method

Subjects

A narrative describing this research was filed with the Human Subjects Review Board at North Texas State University. The board approved the study. A copy of that letter is enclosed in Appendix A. All subjects were volunteers. The only inducement offered to subjects was a

promise of a summary of the overall results at the completion of the study.

The subjects of this study consisted of 133 families whose oldest children were enrolled in the fourth through eighth grade level at school. Three types of families were included: 44 natural families (both parents with their biological children currently living together in the same household), 45 families with only adopted children, and 44 mixed families (families with both biological and adopted children currently living together in the same household). Only those families without stepparents were included in the study to control for blood kinship and homogeneity in familial relationships. All of the families resided in the greater Dallas-Fort Worth area. Although both parents were requested to participate, fathers did not participate in six all-adoptive families and two mixed families. The North-Hatt Social Status Scale (Reiss, 1962) was used to determine socioeconomic status. The scale assigns a number to occupations. Those occupations with numbers between 53 and 82 are defined as middle class; occupations with numbers above 82 are classified as upper class, and those below 53 are classified as lower class. Based upon mean scores, the three family types included in this study were classified as middle class (natural families, 75.96; mixed families, 77.20; all adoptive, 79.56).

The adoptive families were obtained from four cooperating adoption agencies and by requesting names of prospective volunteers from those individuals who had expressed a willingness to participate in the study (a "snowball" sampling technique). Family Information Questionnaires (see Appendix B) and a letter of explanation of the study composed by the agencies were sent to prospective subjects. Those families who were willing to participate in the study completed the questionnaire and returned it by mail.

Natural families were solicited by letters (see Appendix C) distributed in five elementary schools in a middle class area of a metropolitan city in North Texas. The letter with the Family Information Questionnaire printed on the back was sealed in an envelope and given to all fourth, fifth, and sixth grade children in the selected schools. The schools were selected because of relative homogeneity of socioeconomic status as determined by the school administration. Parents who were willing to participate in the study returned the completed questionnaire to the school or mailed it directly to the investigator. Completed forms returned to the schools were gathered by the investigator. A total of 333 families volunteered for the study; 218 natural families, 65 mixed families, and 50 all-adoptive families.

Children selected to participate in the study were the oldest natural and the oldest adopted child in mixed

families, the oldest natural child in natural families, and the oldest adopted child in families with only adopted children. For the purposes of this study, a natural child refers to the biological child of the husband and wife. An adopted child is a child who has become a permanent member of a family by legal process and is not related to either parent by a blood relationship.

There were 23 natural families with oldest males, 21 families in which the oldest child was a female, a total of 44. The mean ages were 11.7 and 11.3 years respectively. In 27 mixed families the oldest adopted child was a male; adopted females were oldest children in 17 families, a total of 44. The mean ages were 10.8 and 11.2 years respectively. There were 22 natural males and 22 natural females in the mixed families with mean ages of 11.9 and 11.5 years respectively. Males were the oldest children in 22 all-adoptive families, females the oldest in 23 families, a total of 45. The mean age of the males was 12.0, the mean age of the females was 11.4. A one-way fixed effects, analysis of variance indicated no statistically significant difference in the ages of the groups of children, $F(3, 173) = <1, p > .05$.

All of the parents in the study were Caucasian. The ethnic make-up of the adoptive children participating in the study was as follows: Caucasians 83 percent, Blacks 2 percent, Asians 9 percent, Latins 6 percent.

Instruments

The Child-Parent Relationship Scale (CPRS) developed by Swanson (1950) was used to measure perception of the child-parent relationship (see Appendix D). The scale was formulated to measure a child's feelings of happiness and satisfaction with experiences in the family or with parents. The CPRS consists of statements that are to be answered "yes," "no," or "uncertain." For each statement there is one response which is considered to be indicative of an ideal relationship. Each "ideal" answer is given no score, each "uncertain" answer is given one point, each far from ideal answer is given two points. Scores can range from 0 to 110. A high score on the CPRS indicates poor parent-child relationships as perceived by the subject.

Swanson selected appropriate items for the scale from a variety of standardized tests. Other items were added based on a list of emotional disturbances developed by Healy and Bronner (1936). This procedure resulted in a 92-item scale. To determine which items differentiated significantly between children whose family experiences were a source of unhappiness and dissatisfaction, and those who found their family relationships happy and satisfying, Swanson administered the scale to 200 delinquent boys in a juvenile detention home school.

An item analysis of those test papers falling in the extreme quartiles of the score distribution resulted in 81

items that significantly differentiated between the two groups. Critical ratios were calculated for all remaining items. Only those items having the highest critical ratios were selected for the final form of the scale. The 200 papers were rescored to obtain scores based on the odd and even items of the final form of the scale. Based upon the Spearman-Brown formula, the corrected split-half reliability for the CPRS is reported to be .964.

The scale was validated on a sample of 200 boys who were given extensive interviews; one-half of the boys were delinquents, one-half were non-delinquents matched with the delinquents for age, race, I.Q., religious affiliation, and home location. A panel of judges rated each boy according to the degree to which the condition of unhappiness originated in family relationships. All ratings were blind ratings. The ratings ranged from zero to four, with zero indicating absence of the condition and four indicating the condition originated in the family. The rating scores correlated .951 with the CPRS scores.

Additional validity data were provided by two studies involving a total of 1,442 students. When used with all the eighth grade children in public schools from two contrasting socioeconomic areas in a large metropolitan city, and with all tenth and eleventh grade students (841 cases) in the same metropolitan area, the CPRS score distributions were able to significantly differentiate children from broken

and unbroken homes. Every fifth paper was rescored to provide ratings for the even and odd items. A reliability coefficient of .928 resulted from applying the Spearman-Brown formula.

Swanson (1950) found the CPRS did not discriminate well at the ideal relationship end, but did discriminate well at the other extreme. In those instances where the language, concepts, and idioms were considered to be outdated, synonymous words and phrases were substituted. A dictionary (Morris, 1978) was used for reference. The language and concepts of the scale were checked against an elementary graded word list and were found to be within the comprehension of average fourth grade students (Serot & Teevan, 1961). Serot and Teevan (1960) constructed a parallel measure for the parent's perceptions of the child-parent relationship. They reworded each item on the child scale to refer to the parent's perception of the relationship (see Appendix E).

The California Test of Personality (CTP) was used to measure the children's adjustment (Tiegs, Clark & Thorpe, 1953). The test is available in five levels: Primary, Elementary, Intermediate, Secondary and Adult. The Elementary Level, Form AA, was utilized in this study. The test consists of two parts: one part measures personal adjustment, the second part measures social adjustment. The first part, the Personal Adjustment Scale, is composed of subtests designed to measure six areas which contribute

to an individual's sense of personal security. The six subtest areas contributing to the Personal Adjustment Scale are:

1A Self Reliance--The ability of an individual to be self-directed and behave in an independent and responsible manner.

1B Sense of Personal Worth--The feeling that an individual possesses the capability to succeed and to be well regarded and accepted by others.

1C Sense of Personal Freedom--The feeling that an individual possesses opportunity for choices and self-determination.

1D Feeling of Belonging--The feeling that an individual is accepted and respected by family and friends.

1E Withdrawing Tendencies--The tendency of an individual to be preoccupied with individual concerns to the exclusion of real life concerns.

1F Nervous Symptoms--The tendency of an individual to suffer from any of a variety of physical symptoms. The physical symptoms may be expressions of emotional conflicts.

The second part, the Social Adjustment Scale, measures six areas which affect social security. The six subtest areas contributing to this scale are:

2A Social Standards--The tendency of an individual to adhere to socially acceptable modes of behavior.

2B Social Skills--The tendency of an individual to display social interest and subordinate individual interests to concern for others.

2C Anti-social Tendencies--The tendency of an individual to gain advantage in ways that are often damaging and inconsiderate of others.

2D Family Relations--The tendency of an individual to feel secure, loved, and respected within a family; the ability to demonstrate acceptable family relationships.

2E School Relations--The tendency of a student to feel accepted and appreciated by peers and teachers.

2F Community Relations--The tendency of an individual to be accepting of others, and demonstrate an interest and concern for the general welfare.

The Personal Adjustment Scale and the Social Adjustment Scale of the Elementary Level of the test each contain 72 questions. The scales can be machine scored or hand scored according to an answer key. Scores for the scales are obtained by summing the number of correct answers obtained on the component subtests. The Total Adjustment Score is the sum of the Personal Adjustment score and the Social Adjustment score.

Items for the test were selected from publications of psychologists and original research by the authors. The test items are based upon more than 1,000 criteria of adjustment patterns or response modes. A panel of ten

psychologists eliminated, restated, or reclassified the items and constructed test questions to measure them. All test questions are to be answered either "yes" or "no."

The test items were refined and revised as a result of a series of administrations to groups of students. Norms for the five test levels are based upon 4,500 pupils at the Primary Level, 4,562 pupils at the Elementary Level, 2,812 pupils at the Intermediate Level, 3,331 pupils at the Secondary Level, and 3,133 adults at the Adult Level. Factor analysis and multiple correlation studies indicate that all test items contribute significantly to the test (Thorpe, Clark & Tiegs, 1953).

Reliabilities, determined by the Spearman-Brown split-half method, range from .88 to .98 on the Total Adjustment Scale of the test. Reliabilities for the Personal Adjustment Scale are reported to range from .83 to .93 and for the Social Adjustment Scale .80 to .94. Subtest reliabilities range from .60 to .97. In general, reliability for the various subtests increases with the test age level (Thorpe, Clark & Tiegs, 1953). Sims (1959) and Shaffer (1959) caution against using the subtests for individual diagnosis because of the varied reliabilities. Research reported in the test manual and cited in Buros (1972) indicates the CTP is a highly valid measure of personality adjustment (Sims, 1972).

In addition to the CPRS and the CTP, a short Family Information Questionnaire was used to gather demographic

data (see Appendix B). The questionnaire asks for name, address, occupation of parents, type of family, names, ages, and sex of children. Also indicated is whether the child is adopted or a natural child, and the age of adopted children at the time of placement for adoption.

Procedure

The Family Information Questionnaire from each of the 333 volunteer families was checked to assure that the type of family, and the age level of the children, satisfied the requirements of the study. Families with stepparents, divorced parents, or an only child were eliminated. This screening procedure resulted in 238 families who were eligible to participate in the study. These families were placed in groups according to their home geographic location. Data collection points were selected to accommodate the geographically determined groups. Five churches and a private home served as data collection points. Letters announcing pertinent information concerning data collection were mailed to 123 natural families, 65 mixed families, and 50 all-adoptive families, a total of 238 families (see Appendix E). A total of 133 families responded positively to the letters.

Demographic information obtained from the Family Information Questionnaire was transferred to colored index cards. Family types were distinguished by color and numerical code. All family cards were alphabetized according to family surname.

Completion of the test instruments was counterbalanced according to predetermined sequences (see Appendix F). This procedure was necessary to minimize possible carry over and order effects of the different test instruments. Answers to all test instruments were recorded on IBM score sheets. To encourage honest responses, names were deleted and numerical codes were used on all answer sheets.

The investigator and three trained assistants distributed and collected the test instruments and the answer sheets. The assistants included a Ph.D. degree counselor and two doctoral candidates in counseling. All assistants were apprised of the purpose of the study and were given copies of the test instruments. The assistants were trained in the coding procedure. They were cautioned to refrain from influencing subject responses on the test instruments.

The rooms in the churches used for data collection were large meeting rooms furnished with long tables and chairs. Families were greeted by the investigator and the family index card was located. Parents were asked to read a description of the study and to sign a release form (see Appendix G). At no time during the study was any reference made to adoption. Each family member involved in the study was assigned to a test sequence which was noted on the index card. The number of subjects were equal in seven sequences; three sequences had one additional subject. All answer sheets were coded by the investigator or an assistant. When

a subject completed a test instrument, it was returned to the investigator. The subject then received another coded answer sheet and the next test instrument in the assigned sequence. Subjects were given verbal directions in addition to the specific directions on each test instrument. A subject was free to leave upon completion of all test instruments. It was necessary to conduct individual family sessions for 14 families who were not able to attend scheduled group sessions. These sessions were held in the subjects' homes.

All answer sheets were computer scored. All scores were transferred to work sheets for computer analysis.

Results

Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3 were tested by a discriminant function analysis. The SPSS discriminant analysis stepwise program was utilized to determine whether differences between the three family types were statistically significant. The discriminating variables, CPRS scores, CPRS discrepancy scores, and CTP scores, are those variables which are expected to differentiate the family groups. A discrepancy score refers to the difference between the child's total score and the parent's total score on the CPRS. According to Klecka (1975):

The objective is to weight and linearly combine the discriminating variables such that groups are forced to be as statistically distinct as possible. The major

objective is to find a single dimension on which the groups cluster at opposite ends. (p. 435)

The Wilks' lambda test of significance was used to determine the discriminating power that remained in the variables being explored. The discriminating power of the test correlates inversely with the size of the reported lambda. The larger lambda is, the less discriminating information remaining. Group mean scores (centroids) were calculated for each variable and provided an average profile for each group on each set of variables. Standardized discriminant function coefficients were calculated to determine the contribution of a variable to the discriminant function.

Two criteria were used to establish that the groups had been significantly differentiated: the .05 level of significance was used to determine statistical significance for derived discriminant functions, and the classification technique was used to provide a check on the ability of the derived discriminant functions to correctly classify the original cases. Significant separation of the groups was arbitrarily based upon correct classification of at least 66 percent of the group members.

Hypothesis 1 stated that scores obtained by adoptive and natural children on the CPRS will not significantly differentiate mixed, natural, and adoptive families. Four groups of children were involved in the multigroup analysis: natural children, adoptive children, natural children from

mixed families, and adopted children from mixed families. Means and standard deviations for the CPRS scores are presented in Table 1.

Table 1
CPRS Means and Standard Deviations

Family Type	Variable					
	CMRELC	CFRELC	CMRELM	CFRELF	CFDREL	CMDREL
Natural						
M	22.68	20.95	23.16	22.68	14.05	11.93
<u>SD</u>	19.35	18.19	12.29	12.73	13.71	9.40
Adoptive						
M	24.77	28.64	25.51	24.67	16.72	15.21
<u>SD</u>	18.29	21.69	16.80	14.19	14.25	11.01
Mixed Natural						
M	26.40	22.95	23.69	25.33	17.14	15.05
<u>SD</u>	20.23	21.76	16.64	16.76	14.47	12.07
Mixed Adoptive						
M	23.07	22.64	28.29	24.05	17.60	15.81
<u>SD</u>	17.82	18.46	16.45	14.60	13.59	14.15

Scores on the CPRS range from 0 to 110 with 0 indicative of an ideal relationship. A high score on the CPRS indicates a poor child-parent relationship as perceived by the subject.

The stepwise discriminant analysis of the CPRS scores resulted in the selection of the mother's perception of the child-mother relationship (CMRELM), the child's perception

of the child-father relationship (CFRELC), and the child's perception of the child-mother relationship (CMRELC) as the major discriminators. Three discriminate functions were derived (see Table 2).

Table 2
Discriminant Functions Combining CPRS Variables

Discriminant Function	Wilks' lambda	Chi-Square	df	Level of Significance
1	.94	10.84	9	.29
2	.98	4.00	4	.41
3	.99	0.68	1	.41

The standardized discriminant function coefficients were calculated to determine the amount of the variance in the discriminant functions explained by the variables (see Table 3).

Table 3
Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients

Variable	Function		
	1	2	3
CMRELM	0.69	0.81	0.36
CFRELC	1.13	-0.80	-0.15
CMRELC	-1.20	-0.13	0.88

Group centroids were computed and used to determine the percentage of original group cases correctly classified by the discriminant function (see Table 4).

Table 4
Summary Table of Analysis of CPRS Scores

Actual Group	No. of Cases	Predicted Group Membership			
		1	2	3	4
Natural (1)	44	24 54.5%	2 4.5%	2 4.5%	16 36.5%
Adoptive (2)	45	25 55.6%	0 0.0%	2 4.4%	18 40.0%
Mixed Natural (3)	44	24 54.5%	1 2.4%	2 4.5%	17 38.6%
Mixed Adopted (4)	44	14 31.8%	0 0.0%	4 11.4%	25 56.8%

28.81% of "grouped" cases correctly classified.

On the basis of the low percentage of cases correctly classified by the derived functions, the null hypothesis was retained.

Hypothesis 2 stated that child-parent discrepancy scores on the CPRS will not significantly differentiate mixed, natural, and adoptive families.

The parent-child discrepancy scores for the CPRS were subjected to a discriminant analysis in an attempt to differentiate the four groups of children on these variables. Neither the mother-child discrepancy scores nor the father-

child discrepancy scores achieved an F level sufficient for statistical analysis (see Table 5), therefore, the null hypothesis was retained.

Table 5
Summary Table for Incomplete Analysis of CPRS
Child-Parent Discrepancy Scores

Variable	F to enter	Wilks' lambda
CMDSC	0.95	0.98
CFDSC	0.56	0.99

Hypothesis 3 stated that scores obtained by children on the scales of the CTP will not significantly differentiate mixed, natural, and adoptive families.

The 15 scales of the CTP were subjected to a discriminant analysis in an attempt to differentiate the four groups of children on these variables. The CTP is composed of two major scales, the Personal Adjustment Scale and the Social Adjustment Scale. The Total Adjustment Score is a composite score obtained by summing the two major scales. Both the Personal Adjustment Scale and the Social Adjustment Scale are composed of six subtests. The maximum score on each of the 12 subtests is 12. Scores on the two major scales can range from 0-72; the maximum score on the Total Adjustment Score is 144. Means and standard deviations for the groups of children on the CTP scales are presented in Table 6.

Table 6
CTP Means and Standard Deviations for Children

Variable	Natural		Adopted	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
CTP 1A	7.93	1.77	7.08	1.91
CTP 1B	8.70	2.63	9.32	1.75
CTP 1C	9.66	2.40	9.43	2.00
CTP 1D	9.18	2.44	9.73	2.21
CTP 1E	7.57	3.09	7.22	3.22
CTP 1F	9.50	2.44	8.11	2.34
Per. Adj.	52.55	11.56	50.89	9.89
CTP 2A	10.14	1.68	9.49	2.06
CTP 2B	8.23	1.61	8.38	1.85
CTP 2C	8.00	2.65	7.95	2.45
CTP 2D	8.98	2.98	9.19	2.61
CTP 2E	7.61	2.28	8.11	2.27
CTP 2F	9.55	1.42	9.54	1.86
Soc. Adj.	52.40	8.50	52.54	9.94
Tot. Adj.	105.05	19.03	102.57	19.73
Variable	Mixed Natural		Mixed Adopted	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
CTP 1A	7.38	2.21	6.26	2.24
CTP 1B	8.52	2.47	8.12	2.87

Table 6 Continued
CTP Means and Standard Deviations for Children

Variable	<u>Mixed Natural</u>		<u>Mixed Adopted</u>	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
CTP 1C	8.48	2.29	8.14	2.73
CTP 1D	9.60	1.78	9.02	2.44
CTP 1E	7.07	2.71	6.86	3.82
CTP 1F	9.07	1.84	8.14	2.85
Per. Adj.	50.12	9.03	46.57	13.07
CTP 2A	10.07	1.72	10.14	1.54
CTP 2B	8.52	1.85	7.83	2.24
CTP 2C	8.52	2.51	7.33	2.94
CTP 2D	9.00	2.46	8.10	3.12
CTP 2E	8.02	2.30	7.29	3.04
CTP 2F	9.21	1.99	11.07	9.15
Soc. Adj.	53.36	9.72	50.33	10.76
Tot. Adj.	103.48	16.73	97.14	23.21

The discriminant analyses attempted to differentiate natural children in natural and mixed families, adopted children in adoptive and mixed families and natural children in natural families from adoptive children in adoptive families.

A statistically significant discriminant function was determined for adopted children in mixed families and adopted

children in adoptive families on the component scales of the Social Adjustment Scale (see Table 7).

Table 7
Discriminant Function Combining CTP Social
Adjustment Subscales for Adopted Children

Discriminant Function	Wilks' lambda	Chi- Square	df	Level of Significance
1	.91	6.80	2	.03

Standardized discriminant function coefficients were calculated to determine the amount of the variance in the discriminant function explained by the groups (see Table 8).

Table 8
Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients

Variable	Function 1
CTP 2A	-0.81
CTP 2D	0.82

Group centroids were calculated and utilized to determine the percentage of original group cases correctly classified by the discriminant function (see Table 9).

Table 9
Summary Table of Analysis of CTP Social Adjustment
Subscales for Adopted Children

Actual Group	No. of Cases	Predicted Group Membership	
		1	2
Adopted (1)	45	31 68.9%	14 31.1%
Mixed (2)	44	15 34.1%	29 65.9%

67.42% correct classification of original group cases.

Based upon the significance of the discriminant function and the percentage of original cases correctly classified by the discriminant function, the null hypothesis was rejected.

A discriminant analysis of the component scales of the Personal Adjustment Scale resulted in a statistically significant discriminant function for adopted children in adoptive and mixed families (see Table 10).

Table 10
Discriminant Function Combining CTP Personal
Adjustment Subscales for Adopted Children

Discriminant Function	Wilks' lambda	Chi- Square	df	Level of Significance
1	.88	9.37	3	.02

Standardized discriminant function coefficients were calculated (see Table 11).

Table 11
Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients

Variable	Function 1
CTP 1B	-0.72
CTP 1C	-0.84
CTP 1E	0.84

Group centroids were used to determine the percentage of original group cases correctly classified by the discriminant function (see Table 12).

Table 12
Summary Table of Analysis of CTP Personal Adjustment
Subscales for Adopted Children

Actual Group	No. of Cases	Predicted Group Membership	
		1	2
Adopted (1)	45	29 64.4%	16 35.6%
Mixed (2)	44	15 34.1%	29 65.9%

65.17% correct classification of original group cases.

Although the discriminant function was significant ($p < .05$), the groups were not significantly differentiated because

the 66% correct classification criterion was not achieved.

A statistically significant discriminant function was determined for natural children in natural and mixed families for the component scales of the Personal Adjustment Scale (see Table 13).

Table 13

Discriminant Function Combining CTP Personal
Adjustment Subscales for Natural Children

Discriminant Function	Wilks' lambda	Chi- Square	df	Level of Significance
1	.88	10.43	2	.01

Standardized discriminant function coefficients were calculated (see Table 14).

Table 14

Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients

Variable	Function 1
CTP 1C	-1.12
CTP 1D	0.83

Group centroids were calculated and used to determine the percentage of correctly classified group cases (see Table 15).

Table 15

Summary Table of Analysis of CTP Personal Adjustment
Subscales for Natural Children

Actual Group	No. of Cases	Predicted Group Membership	
		1	2
Natural (1)	44	26 59.1%	18 40.9%
Mixed (2)	44	19 43.2%	25 56.8%

57.95% correct classification of original group cases.

The significant discriminant function did not correctly classify a minimum of 66% of the original cases. The groups were not considered to be significantly differentiated.

A discriminant analysis combining the components of the Social Adjustment Scale for natural children resulted in abandonment of the analysis due to an insufficient $\underline{F}$ value (see Table 16).

Table 16

Summary Table for Incomplete Analysis of CTP Social
Adjustment Subscales for Natural Children

Variable	$\underline{F}$ to enter	Wilks' lambda
CTP 2A	0.31	0.99
CTP 2B	0.63	0.99
CTP 2C	0.89	0.99

Table 16 Continued

Summary Table for Incomplete Analysis of CTP Social
Adjustment Subscales for Natural Children

Variable	<u>F</u> to enter	Wilks' lambda
CTP 2D	0.15	0.99
CTP 2E	0.69	0.99
CTP 2F	0.79	0.99

The composite scores of the Personal, Social and Total Adjustment Scales of the natural children resulted in a nonsignificant discriminant function (see Table 17).

Table 17

Discriminant Function Combining CTP Personal, Social
and Total Adjustment Scales for Natural Children

Discriminant Function	Wilks' lambda	Chi- Square	df	Level of Significance
1	.96	3.77	2	.15

A discriminant analysis combining the component scales of the Personal Adjustment Scale for natural children in natural families and adopted children in adoptive families resulted in a significant discriminant function (see Table 18).

Table 18

Discriminant Function Combining CTP Personal Adjustment
Subscales for Natural Children in Natural Families
and Adopted Children in Adoptive Families

Discriminant Function	Wilks' lambda	Chi Square	df	Level of Significance
1	.88	10.19	4	.04

Standardized discriminant function coefficients were
calculated (see Table 19).

Table 19

Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients

Variable	Function 1
CTP 1A	-0.88
CTP 1B	0.62
CTP 1C	-0.71
CTP 1D	0.71

Group centroids were calculated to determine the
percentage of correctly classified original cases (see
Table 20).

Table 20

Summary Table of Analysis of CTP Personal Adjustment
Subscales for Natural Children in Natural Families
and Adopted Children in Adoptive Families

Actual Group	No. of Cases	Predicted Group Membership	
		1	2
Natural (1)	44	25 56.8%	19 43.2%
Adopted (2)	41	25 61.0%	16 39.0%

56.63% correct classification of original group cases.

It was concluded that the groups were not significantly differentiated based upon the criterion of a minimum of 66% correct classification of original cases.

The component scales of the Social Adjustment Scales for the natural children in natural families and adopted children in adoptive families resulted in a significant discriminant function (see Table 21).

Table 21

Discriminant Function Combining CTP Social Adjustment
Subscales for Natural Children in Natural Families
and Adopted Children in Adoptive Families

Discriminant Function	Wilks' lambda	Chi- Square	df	Level of Significance
1	.87	11.36	4	.02

Standardized discriminant function coefficients were calculated (see Table 22).

Table 22
Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients

Variable	Function 1
CTP 2B	0.51
CTP 2C	0.91
CTP 2D	-0.48
CTP 2E	-0.63

The group centroids were used to determine the percentage of original cases correctly classified utilizing the derived function (see Table 23).

Table 23
Summary Table of Analysis of CTP Social Adjustment
Subscales for Natural Children in Natural Families
and Adopted Children in Adoptive Families

Actual Group	No. of Cases	<u>Predicted Group Membership</u>	
		1	2
Natural (1)	44	25 56.8%	19 43.2%
Adopted (2)	41	16 38.1%	25 61.9%

59.30% correct classification of original group cases.

Despite a significant discriminant function, a minimum of 66% of the original group cases were not correctly classified.

A discriminant analysis combining the composite scores of the Personal, Social and Total Adjustment Scales for the natural and adoptive children failed to produce an F value sufficient to continue the analysis (see Table 24).

Table 24

Summary Table for Incomplete Analysis of CTP Personal, Social and Total Adjustment Scales of Natural Children in Natural Families and Adopted Children in Adoptive Families

Variable	F to enter	Wilks' lambda
Personal Adjustment	0.31	0.99
Total Adjustment	0.18	0.99
Social Adjustment	0.73	0.99

Based upon the results of these analyses, the null hypothesis was retained for natural children in natural families and adopted children in adoptive families, and natural children in natural and mixed families. The null hypothesis was rejected for adopted children in adoptive and mixed families.

Hypothesis 4 stated that there will be no significant relationship between a child's score on the CTP and the mother's perceptions of the child-parent relationship. Pearson

product-moment correlation coefficients were calculated between the children's scores on each of the CTP scales and the mother's perceptions of the child-parent relationship as measured by the CPRS. The child-parent dyad was considered as a single unit. Significant relationships were determined for the three family types (see Table 25).

Table 25

Product-Moment Correlations Between Children's
Scores on the CTP and Mother's Perceptions
of the Child-Parent Relationship

Variable	Family Type			
	Natural	Adoptive	Mixed	
			Natural	Adoptive
CTP 1A				
CTP 1B	-0.34*			
CTP 1C	-0.42**	-0.46**	-0.26*	
CTP 1D	-0.42**			
CTP 1E	-0.35**			
CTP 1F	-0.58**			
Per. Adj.	-0.50**	-0.28*		
CTP 2A				
CTP 2B				
CTP 2C	-0.35**			
CTP 2D	-0.54**	-0.34**		
CTP 2E	-0.31*			

Table 25 Continued

Product-Moment Correlations Between Children's
Scores on the CTP and Mother's Perceptions
of the Child-Parent Relationship

Variable	Family Type			
	Natural	Adoptive	Mixed	
			Natural	Adoptive
CTP 2F				
Soc. Adj.	-0.44**			
Tot. Adj.	-0.51**	-0.27*		
* <u>p</u> < .05		** <u>p</u> < .01		

Based upon the results of this analysis, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 5 stated that there will be no significant relationship between a child's scores on the CTP and the father's perceptions of the child-parent relationship. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were calculated between the children's scores on each of the scales of the CTP and the father's perceptions of the child-parent relationship. Again, the child-parent dyad was considered as a single unit. Statistically significant correlations in all three family types resulted in rejection of the null hypothesis. Those scales of the CTP which were significantly correlated with the father's perceptions of the child-parent relationship are reported in Table 26. An r value of .26

was necessary to attain significance at the $p < .05$ level.
The null hypothesis was rejected.

Table 26
Product-Moment Correlations Between Children's
Scores on the CTP and Father's Perceptions
of the Child-Parent Relationship

Variable	Family Type			
			Mixed	
	Natural	Adoptive	Natural	Adoptive
CTP 1A				
CTP 1B	-0.33*		-0.27*	
CTP 1C		-0.44*	-0.46**	
CTP 1D				-0.33*
CTP 1E				-0.30*
CTP 1F		-0.35*		
Per. Adj.		-0.31*	-0.39**	-0.33*
CTP 2A	-0.36*			
CTP 2B	-0.39*			
CTP 2C			-0.27*	-0.42**
CTP 2D		-0.39**	-0.44**	
CTP 2E	-0.43**		-0.46**	
CTP 2F	-0.38**			
Soc. Adj.	-0.29*		-0.40**	
Tot. Adj.		-0.36*	-0.44**	

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

Hypothesis 6 stated that there will be no significant relationship between a child's scores on the CTP and the child's perceptions of the child-parent relationship. An r value of .26 ($df = 42$) was needed to attain significance at the $p < .05$ level. Statistically significant correlation coefficients for natural families are presented in Table 27.

Table 27

Product-Moment Correlations Between Children's
CTP Scores and Children's Perceptions of
the Child-Parent Relationship in
Natural Families

Variable	Natural Family	
	Mother-child	Father-child
CTP 1A	-0.33*	
CTP 1B	-0.53**	-0.46**
CTP 1C	-0.64**	-0.65**
CTP 1D	-0.65**	-0.62**
CTP 1E	-0.61**	-0.58**
CTP 1F	-0.57**	-0.47**
Per. Adj.	-0.72**	-0.66**
CTP 2A	-0.41**	-0.35*
CTP 2B		-0.26*
CTP 2C	-0.50**	-0.40**
CTP 2D	-0.79**	-0.64**
CTP 2E	-0.44**	-0.33**
CTP 2F		

Table 27 Continued

Product-Moment Correlations Between Children's
CTP Scores and Children's Perceptions of
the Child-Parent Relationship in
Natural Families

Variable	Natural Family	
	Mother-child	Father-child
Soc. Adj.	-0.69**	-0.60**
Tot. Adj.	-0.75**	-0.66**

*p < .05 **p < .01

Statistically significant correlation coefficients for
adoptive families are presented in Table 28.

Table 28

Product-Moment Correlations Between Children's
CTP Scores and Children's Perceptions of
the Child-Parent Relationship in
Adoptive Families

Variable	Adoptive Family	
	Mother-child	Father-child
CTP 1A		
CTP 1B	-0.42**	-0.36*
CTP 1C	-0.62**	-0.46**
CTP 1D	-0.43**	-0.44**
CTP 1E	-0.36**	-0.44**
CTP 1F	-0.37**	-0.31*
Per. Adj.	-0.53**	-0.47**

Table 28 Continued

Product-Moment Correlations Between Children's
CTP Scores and Children's Perceptions of
the Child-Parent Relationship in
Adoptive Families

Variable	Adoptive Family	
	Mother-child	Father-child
CTP 2A		-0.31*
CTP 2B	-0.30*	-0.34*
CTP 2C	-0.50**	-0.47**
CTP 2D	-0.71**	-0.64**
CTP 2E	-0.39**	-0.49**
CTP 2F	-0.27*	-0.41**
Soc. Adj.	-0.55**	-0.61**
Tot. Adj.	-0.56**	-0.56**

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

Statistically significant correlation coefficients for
mixed families are reported in Table 29.

Table 29

Product-Moment Correlations Between Children's
CTP Scores and Children's Perceptions of
the Child-Parent Relationship in
Mixed Families

Variable	Mixed Family	
	Mother-Natural Child	Father-Natural Child
CTP 1A		

Table 29 Continued

Product-Moment Correlations Between Children's
CTP Scores and Children's Perceptions of
the Child-Parent Relationship in
Mixed Families

Variable	Mixed Family	
	Mother- Natural Child	Father- Natural Child
CTP 1B		
CTP 1C	-0.54**	-0.31*
CTP 1D	-0.30*	
CTP 1E		
CTP 1F		
Per. Adj.	-0.36**	
CTP 2A	-0.40**	-0.33*
CTP 2B	-0.29*	
CTP 2C	-0.29*	
CTP 2D	-0.48**	-0.41**
CTP 2E	-0.31*	-0.38**
CTP 2F	-0.30*	
Soc. Adj.	-0.46**	-0.36**
Tot. Adj.	-0.46**	-0.34*

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

Variable	Mixed Family	
	Mother- Adopted Child	Father- Adopted Child
CTP 1A		

Table 29 Continued

Product-Moment Correlations Between Children's
CTP Scores and Children's Perceptions of
the Child-Parent Relationship in
Mixed Families

Variable	Mixed Family	
	Mother- Adopted Child	Father- Adopted Child
CTP 1B	-0.51**	-0.59**
CTP 1C	-0.48**	-0.54**
CTP 1D	-0.67**	-0.49**
CTP 1E	-0.66*	-0.39**
CTP 1F	-0.33*	-0.31*
Per. Adj.	-0.63**	-0.55**
CTP 2A		-0.28*
CTP 2B		-0.41**
CTP 2C	-0.50**	-0.30*
CTP 2D	-0.54**	-0.48**
CTP 2E	-0.56**	-0.29*
CTP 2F		
Soc. Adj.	-0.59**	-0.51**
Tot. Adj.	-0.67**	-0.55**

*p < .05

**p < .01

Based upon the preponderance of statistically significant relationships reported in Tables 27-29, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 7 stated that there will be no significant relationship between the adopted child's scores on the CTP and the child's age at the time of placement for adoption. Nonsignificant relationships were determined in adoptive families. In mixed families a significant relationship was found between the adoptive child's placement age and the child's sense of self-reliance, $r = -.26$ ($p < .05$). The null hypothesis was rejected.

Related Findings

A two-tailed t test ($df = 43$) for related samples was conducted to determine if natural and adopted children in mixed families differed significantly on the scales of the CTP and on child-parent relationship scores on the CPRS. The results of the analyses are presented in Table 30.

Table 30
Means and Univariate Comparisons of Natural and
Adoptive Children in Mixed Families

Variable	Child		t
	Natural	Adopted	
CTP 1A	7.4	6.3	2.73**
CTP 1B	8.6	7.9	1.20
CTP 1C	8.6	8.0	1.17
CTP 1D	9.7	8.9	1.60
CTP 1E	7.2	6.6	.75
CTP 1F	9.1	8.0	1.83

Table 30 Continued
Means and Univariate Comparisons of Natural and
Adoptive Children in Mixed Families

Variable	Child		<u>t</u>
	Natural	Adopted	
Per. Adj.	50.5	45.8	2.01
CTP 2A	10.0	10.2	- .52
CTP 2B	8.6	7.9	1.62
CTP 2C	8.7	7.2	2.45*
CTP 2D	9.1	7.9	2.03*
CTP 2E	8.1	7.2	1.61
CTP 2F	9.2	11.0	-1.34
Soc. Adj.	53.8	50.1	1.77
Tot. Adj.	104.3	96.1	2.00
CMRELM	23.5	27.8	1.55
CMDREL	14.7	15.6	.37
CFRELF	25.3	24.0	- .53
CFDREL	17.1	17.6	.17

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

A t value of 2.02 was needed to achieve statistical significance at the $p < .05$ level.

A discriminant analysis combining variables describing the number of adopted children in a family, the age of the adopted child, race of the adopted child, and the placement age of the adopted child resulted in a significant discriminant function (see Table 31).

Table 31

Discriminant Function Combining Demographic Variables
for Mixed and Adoptive Families

Discriminant Function	Wilks' lambda	Chi- Square	df	Level of Significance
1	.66	31.35	3	.001

Standardized discriminant function coefficients were
calculated (see Table 32).

Table 32

Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients

Variable	Function
No. adopted children	-0.93
Adopted child's age	-0.57
Placement age	0.60

Group centroids were used to determine the percentage
of correctly classified original cases (see Table 33).

Table 33

Summary Table of Analysis of Demographic
Variables for Adopted Children

Actual Group	No. of Cases	Predicted Group Membership	
		1	2
Adoptive (1)	45	38 84.4%	7 15.6%

Table 33 Continued
 Summary Table of Analysis of Demographic
 Variables for Adopted Children

Actual Group	No. of Cases	<u>Predicted Group Membership</u>	
		1	2
Mixed (2)	44	38 22.7%	34 77.3%

80.90% correct classification of original group cases.

Based upon correct classification of 80.90% of the original cases, it was concluded that adoptive families and mixed families were significantly differentiated. The standardized discriminant function coefficients indicate that the number of adopted children in the family is the major contributing variable.

A Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated between the parent's and the child's perceptions of the parent-child relationship. The results are presented in Table 34. An r value of .26 in adopted families (df = 44) and .27 in natural and mixed families (df = 43) was necessary to achieve statistical significance at the p < .05 level.

Table 34
Correlation Coefficients for the Relationship
Between Parent-Child Perceptions of the
Parent-Child Relationship

Variable	Family Type		
	Natural	Adopted	Mixed
Mother-child	.69**		
Father-child			.34*
Mother-adopted child			
Father-adopted child		.33*	

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

The means and standard deviations for the CPRS and parent-child discrepancy scores are presented in Table 35.

Table 35
Means and Standard Deviations for CPRS
and Parent-Child Discrepancy Scores

Variable	Family Type							
	Natural		Adopted		Mixed			
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Natural</u> <u>M</u> <u>SD</u>	<u>Adopted</u> <u>M</u> <u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
CMRELM	22.16	12.29	27.04	16.83	23.52	16.55	27.77	16.31
CMRELF	22.68	12.73	24.67	14.19	25.33	16.77	24.05	14.60
CMRELC	22.18	19.35	27.20	19.72	26.02	19.95	23.43	18.56
CFRELC	20.95	18.19	28.73	21.39	22.95	21.76	22.64	18.46
CFDS	14.05	13.71	16.71	14.25	17.14	14.47	17.59	13.59
CMDS	11.93	9.40	15.89	12.49	14.74	12.10	15.72	14.03

Discussion

This study explored perceived child-parent relationships and child adjustment in mixed, natural, and adoptive families. A multigroup discriminant analysis failed to significantly differentiate the three family types in their perceptions of child-parent relationships as measured by the CPRS. Inspection of data in Table 3 indicates the child's perceptions of the child-parent relationships are the major contributing variables in function 1. The mother's perceptions and the child's perceptions of the mother-child relationship contribute equal amounts to function 2. Function 3 is composed mainly of the child's perceptions of the child-mother relationship. None of the three derived functions reached significance. Based upon these findings, it appears perceptions of child-parent relationships as measured by the CPRS are not significantly different in natural, adoptive, and mixed families.

A discriminant analysis to differentiate the three family types based upon discrepancies between the parents' and the children's perceptions of the relationship failed to produce significant discriminating variables. Based on these findings, the three family types are not significantly different in the discrepancies between reported child-parent relationships as measured by the CPRS.

Pair-wise discriminant analyses were conducted to determine if family membership differentiated the four groups of

children with regard to their adjustment. A statistically significant discriminant function was determined for adopted children in the mixed and adoptive families. The Social Standards (CTP 2A) and Family Relations (CTP 2D) subscales of the Social Adjustment Scale are the variables which comprise the discriminating function (see Table 8). The classification technique successfully differentiated 67.42 percent of the original group cases. Close examination of the mean scores of the four groups of children on these components indicates adopted children in adoptive families score lowest in their appreciation of recognized standards for determining right and wrong while adopted children in mixed families score highest on this variable. The Social Standards Scale indicates social awareness and the ability of an individual to put accepted group standards above the needs and desires of the individual.

Adopted children in adoptive families scored significantly higher on the Family Relations Scale than did adopted children in mixed families (see Table 8). The results of the analysis indicate the adopted child in an adoptive family has a greater sense of security, self-respect and individual worth than does the adopted child in a mixed family. The latter child may view the adoptive position in the family as subordinate to that of the natural child position. This view may negatively influence the child's sense of security, self-respect and individuality. Being adopted in a mixed

family may not indicate a favored position. The adopted child may feel inferior and resentful of the real or imagined favored status of the natural child; however, being adopted in a family with only adopted children precludes the existence of a favored status position. The results of this analysis are consistent with the writings of Sorosky, Baran and Pannor (1978).

A statistically significant discriminant function (see Table 10) combining the Personal Adjustment subscales failed to significantly differentiate adopted children in mixed and adopted families. However, the analysis requires a closer look because of its near significance (see Table 12). On each of the subscales comprising the significant function, adopted children in mixed families achieved the lowest scores of all four groups of children, while adopted children in adoptive families achieved higher scores (see Table 6). The data indicate adopted children in adoptive families possess a greater sense of self-worth and belief in individual potential for future success than adopted children in mixed families. In addition, these adopted children exhibit a greater sense of personal freedom and choice in determining life goals than adopted children from mixed families. On the other hand, these same adopted children evidence signs of a preoccupation with fantasy in contrast to real life concerns. These individuals are prone to be sensitive, lonely and preoccupied with individual concerns. These findings are

consistent with other results from this study that indicated the adopted child in an adopted family tended to place individual concerns above the needs and desires of the group.

Pair-wise discriminant analyses of natural children in natural families with natural children in mixed families and adopted children in adoptive families with natural children in natural families did not significantly differentiate these groups.

A two-tailed t-test for related samples resulted in significant differences between the natural and the adopted children in mixed families (see Table 30). Natural children scored significantly higher in their sense of self reliance. These children indicated to a greater degree than the adopted children, a sense of responsibility and self-direction. In addition, natural children scored significantly higher than adopted children in their anti-social tendencies and their family relationships. Individuals prone to anti-social behaviors tend to bully, quarrel and use unfair tactics to gain advantage of other individuals. Sorosky, Baran and Pannor (1978) point out that natural children in a mixed family may demonstrate more problem behaviors than adopted children because of the tendency of the parents to overprotect the adopted children in their attempts to prove equal affection and acceptance of the natural and adopted children.

The fact that natural children in mixed families view their family relationships (as measured by the CPRS) more favorably than the adopted children may be related to the perceived favored status of the natural child. Lack of biological kinship in a mixed family may contribute to feelings of insecurity, inferiority and resentment on the part of the adopted child.

In addition to significant differences in the scores of the groups on the CTP subscales, it should be noted that the Personal Adjustment Scale and the Total Adjustment Scale achieved significance at the $p = .051$ and $p = .052$ levels, respectively.

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was calculated to determine if there is a significant relationship between the adopted child's scores on the CTP scales and the child's age at the time of the placement for adoption. Non significant relationships were determined for adoptive families; however, a significant relationship was found in mixed families between the child's placement age and a sense of self-reliance.

Based upon the results of these analyses, it appears family membership does make a difference in the adjustment of the adopted child. It appears that homogeneity in family membership, all natural or all adoptive children, lessens the opportunity for a favorite status position. In this study it appears that the adjustment of the adopted child in

a mixed family was negatively affected by the presence of the natural child.

Data in Tables 25-29 indicate that there are significant correlations between the child's perceptions of the child-parent relationship and many of the scales of the CTP. Despite these findings, caution must be exercised when interpreting the data. Use of the .05 level of statistical significance would lead one to expect three of the 60 correlation coefficients reported in each of Tables 25-29 to achieve statistical significance by chance alone. In addition, examination of the reported correlation coefficients indicates that despite the fact that they are statistically significant at the .05 level, many account for a negligible amount of the variance which exists in the relationship between the two variables.

In spite of those factors which limit the interpretation of the correlation coefficient, an examination of data in Tables 27-29 indicates that there is some support for the belief that the well-adjusted child perceives child-parent relationships as relatively happy and satisfying while the parent-child relationships of the poorly adjusted child are viewed as deviating from the theoretical ideal.

Data in Table 34 indicate that in those instances where there is a significant correlation between the child's and the parent's perceptions of the relationship, there tends to be a significant relationship between the parent's perceptions

of the child-parent relationship and the child's adjustment. It follows that in those instances where there is no significant correlation between child-parent perceptions, there tends to be little relationship, if any, between the parent's perceptions of the relationship and the child's adjustment.

Based upon the data presented in this study, which does not fully support that of Serot and Teevan (1961), it cannot be concluded that there is a direct one-to-one relationship between a child's perceptions of the child-parent relationship and the child's adjustment or that there is no relationship between the parent's perceptions of the child-parent relationship and the child's adjustment. It appears that child-parent relationships within a family involve factors which have individual meanings for all concerned. These meanings tend to influence each individual's perception of the relationship.

In this study it was noted that children's perceptions of the child-parent relationship were reported as less ideal than those of the parents. However, there were instances when the reverse was true. Just what effect the direction of the discrepancy has upon the child-parent relationship is unknown. It could be, as indicated by Raymond (1955) and Pannor and Nerlove (1977), that excessive love and attention given to a child could result in the child feeling inferior and helpless. The child might interpret these efforts as compensatory behaviors for real or imagined shortcomings.

The end result might be a child-parent relationship which is perceived as relatively happy but a child whose adjustment has been negatively affected.

Thus, just as there is not a one-to-one relationship between a parent's behavior and a child's perceptions of that behavior, there does not appear to be a one-to-one relationship between a child's perceptions of the child-parent relationship and the child's adjustment.

Since this study relied upon data which were obtained from self-report inventories, it is necessary to address those factors which might relate to an individual's distortion of the data. It can only be assumed that the volunteer participants in this study answered the test instruments honestly. Thorpe, Clark and Tiegs (1953) address the social desirability factor by asserting that there is no problem with truthfulness on the CTP, particularly at the lower levels. They maintain that children's problems are so close to their everyday living they are prone to answer questions without distorting their answers.

The CTP attempts to minimize variance that may result from "response sets" by using a forced choice format; the CPRS attempts to compensate for its three choice answer format by its scoring procedure. In addition, the CTP authors have disguised test items which might conflict with the individual's need for self protection. The examiner addressed the need for self protection by eliminating names on answer

sheets and assuring all participants that data would be computer scored and group analyzed. It is believed that because of the effort required to participate, and the many handwritten notes left by the parents, the data obtained in this study are both valid and reliable.

It is recommended that future research include children of high school age. As Sorosky, Baran and Pannor (1978) point out, adolescence is an especially difficult period for adoptees and their families. Adoptees are reported by clinicians to have a great amount of difficulty resolving identity crises and achieving independence; however, there is little empirical data to support this claim.

In addition to a need for more empirical research in the area of adoptive child-parent relationships, there is a need for research in the area of sibling relationships. This study utilized the CPRS because it appeared to measure those observable behaviors which might differentiate the three family types and in particular, the adopted and natural children in mixed families. Despite the fact that the CTP Family Relations subscale was able to differentiate the groups of children in some instances, the CPRS did not. It is recommended that future research use an instrument which might better make these distinctions.

In summary, this study investigated perceived child-parent relationships and the adjustment of children in families with both adopted and natural children. Discriminant

analyses of child-parent relationship scores and child-parent discrepancy scores failed to statistically differentiate natural, adoptive and mixed families. Discriminant analyses of the CTP subtests and the major scales resulted in statistically differentiating adopted children in adoptive families and adopted children in mixed families on the Social Standards and Family Relations subscales. Adopted children in mixed families scored lower on the Family Relations Scale; they scored higher on the Social Standards Scale. Univariate analyses of CTP scales and CPRS scores resulted in statistically differentiating natural and adopted children in mixed families on the Self Reliance, Anti-social Tendencies and Family Relations subscales. Statistically significant negative correlations were determined for parent perceptions of the child-parent relationship and the children's adjustment in natural, adoptive and mixed families. Statistically significant negative correlations between the child's CTP scores and the child's perception of the child-parent relationship lend support to the belief that the well-adjusted child perceives child-parent relationships as relatively happy and satisfying while poorly adjusted children view their parent-child relationships as deviating from the ideal. In addition, the findings in this study indicate the adjustment of the adopted child in a mixed family appears to have been negatively affected by the presence of the natural child.

FORM 3

USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS

79

COMMITTEE ACTION

1. Activity Title Perceived Child-Parent Relationships and Child Adjustment in Families
With Both Adopted & Natural Children
2. Activity Director Marilyn R. Ternay
3. Department Counseling (Education) 4. Telephone Extension _____
5. Date Submitted July 23, 1979

XX

The statement submitted for the activity conforms to the University Policy on the Protection of Human Subjects and the activity is approved.

The statement submitted for the activity does not conform to the University Policy on the Protection of Human Subjects and the activity is disapproved for reasons stated on the attached sheet (s).

Signature for the Committee
R.W. Gracy, Chairman Institutional Review Board

August 24, 1979

Date

APPENDIX B

FAMILY INFORMATION SHEET

1. This is an Adoptive family (adoptive children only)____.
 This is a Natural family (no adoptive children)____.
 This family has Adoptive and Natural children_____.
2. Are both biological and/or adoptive parents currently
 living together in the same household? Yes____No_____.
3. Last name of family_____.
4. First name of male parent_____; occupation_____.
5. First name of female parent_____; occupation_____.
5. Address_____.
6. Telephone number_____.
7. First names, ages, sex, and grade levels of the children.
 _____Age____Sex____Grade____Adopted____Natural____
 _____Age____Sex____Grade____Adopted____Natural____
 _____Age____Sex____Grade____Adopted____Natural____
 _____Age____Sex____Grade____Adopted____Natural____
 _____Age____Sex____Grade____Adopted____Natural____
 _____Age____Sex____Grade____Adopted____Natural____
8. For adopted children please put name and age at the time
 of placement (in months or in years and months)._____

Please return this form to the school office in the attached

envelope. If you prefer, you may mail the form to me:

Marilyn R. Ternay
1204 Park Lane
Arlington, Texas 76012

Sincerely,
Marilyn Ternay
Marilyn Ternay

APPENDIX C

Dear Parents:

A study is being conducted to investigate natural and adoptive parent-child relationships. Your voluntary participation in this study would be greatly appreciated. If you would be willing to participate, please fill out the form on the reverse side of this sheet and have your child return the form, in the attached envelope, to the school office this week.

As participants in this study, you will be asked to complete a questionnaire; your children will be asked to complete two questionnaires. The total time investment for participation will be approximately one hour. A selection of times and convenient locations for data collection will be mailed at a later date.

All answers to the questionnaires will be confidential and individual responses will not be identified. I am interested in group data, not in individual answers or individual families. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please call me in the evening at 460-3146.

Since group analysis necessitates large samples, I would sincerely appreciate your help with this study.

Sincerely yours,

Marilyn Ternay

Marilyn Ternay, M.A.

Doctoral Candidate

North Texas State University

APPENDIX D

CHILD-PARENT RELATIONSHIP SCALE (FATHER)

Name _____ Grade _____

The following sentences are arranged to find out how you feel about your life at home. The right answers will be your true feeling about each sentence.

Many of these sentences refer to your feeling about your father most of the time.

Please do not write or mark on these pages. Mark all your answers on the answer sheet. Please mark only one answer for every sentence. For a "true" answer make a dark mark in the first box under the "T". For a "false" answer mark the second box under the "F". An "uncertain" or "not sure" answer should be marked in the third box.

1. It is hard for me to feel pleasant at home.
2. I feel that my father is honest with me most of the time.
3. My father criticizes me too much.
4. My father has faith in me.
5. As far as ideas are concerned, my father and I do not agree.
6. My father gets angry easily.
7. I feel that my father treats me fairly at home.
8. My father makes me feel that I am an important member of this family.
9. When he makes me mind, my father is nice about it.
10. As I have known it, our family life is happy.
11. My father nags at me.
12. My father is mean to me.
13. I find more understanding at home than anywhere else.

14. My father treats all the children in this family the same.
15. My father argues with me a lot.
16. It is easy for me to be pleasant and happy when my father is around.
17. I feel happy and content at home.
18. My father tells other people things about me that I think he should not mention.
19. I have to keep quiet or leave the house to keep peace at home.
20. I feel that my father picks on me.
21. My father is interested in the things I like.
22. My father is what I think an ideal father should be.
23. I believe that my father thinks that I will not "amount to much".
24. I feel that my father trusts me.
25. My father shows a real love and affection for me.
26. My father tries to understand my problems and worries.
27. My father compares me unfavorably with other children in the family.
28. My father often makes me angry.
29. I have good times at home with my father.
30. I believe that my father feels that I can take care of myself.
31. I talk over important things with my father.
32. I often have good times at home with my family.
33. I wish that I had a different father than the one I have.
34. My friends have happier homes than I do.
35. I feel that my father doesn't always tell me the truth.

36. My father takes the attitude of, "Oh, you don't want to do that," to the things I would like to do.
37. I enjoy going out with my father.
38. My father criticizes me unfairly.
39. I feel nervous at home.
40. I feel that my father worries about me a lot.
41. Other people understand me better than my father does.
42. My father says that I am not as nice to him as I should be.
43. My father expects too much from me.
44. My father points out my faults to my friends.
45. I think that my father often tries to keep from telling me things.
46. I sometimes feel like leaving home for good.
47. I feel that my father is pleased with me.
48. My father usually treats me fairly and sensibly.
49. I feel that my father favors one of the other children in the family over me.
50. When I ask my father if I may do something, he usually says "No".
51. I feel that I can trust my father.
52. I change from loving my father to hating him and back again.
53. I worry about what my father thinks of me.
54. I feel close to my father.
55. I know that my father is my friend.

Please check to see that you have marked only one answer for every statement.

CHILD-PARENT RELATIONSHIP SCALE (MOTHER)

Name _____ Grade _____

The following sentences are arranged to find out how YOU feel about your life at home. The right answers will be your true feelings about each sentence.

Many of these statements refer to your feelings about your mother most of the time.

Please do not write or mark on these pages. Mark all your answers on the answer sheet. Please mark only one answer for every sentence. For a "true" answer make a dark mark in the first box under the "T". For a "false" answer mark the second box under the "F". An "uncertain" or "not sure" answer should be marked in the third box.

1. It is hard for me to feel pleasant at home.
2. I feel that my mother is honest with me most of the time.
3. My mother criticizes me too much.
4. My mother has faith in me.
5. As far as ideas are concerned, my mother and I do not agree.
6. My mother gets angry easily.
7. I feel that my mother treats me fairly at home.
8. My mother makes me feel that I am an important member of this family.
9. When she makes me mind, my mother is nice about it.
10. As I have known it, our family life is happy.
11. My mother nags at me.
12. My mother is mean to me.
13. I find more understanding at home than anywhere else.
14. My mother treats all the children in this family the same.
15. My mother argues with me a lot.

16. It is easy for me to be pleasant and happy when my mother is around.
17. I feel happy and content at home.
18. My mother tells other people things about me that I think she should not mention.
19. I have to keep quiet or leave the house to keep peace at home.
20. I feel that my mother picks on me.
21. My mother is interested in the things that I like.
22. My mother is what I think an ideal mother should be.
23. I believe that my mother thinks that I will not "amount to much".
24. I feel that my mother trusts me.
25. My mother shows a real love and affection for me.
26. My mother tries to understand my problems and worries.
27. My mother compares me unfavorably with other children in the family.
28. My mother often makes me angry.
29. I have good times at home with my mother.
30. I believe that my mother feels that I can take care of myself.
31. I talk over important things with my mother.
32. I often have good times at home with my family.
33. I wish that I had a different mother than the one I have.
34. My friends have happier homes than I do.
35. I feel that my mother doesn't always tell me the truth.
36. My mother takes the attitude of, "Oh, you don't want to do that", to the things I would like to do.
37. I enjoy going out with my mother.

38. My mother criticizes me unfairly.
39. I feel nervous at home.
40. I feel that my mother worries about me a lot.
41. Other people understand me better than my mother does.
42. My mother says that I am not as nice to her as I should be.
43. My mother expects too much from me.
44. My mother points out my faults to my friends.
45. I think that my mother often tries to keep from telling me things.
46. I sometimes feel like leaving home for good.
47. I feel that my mother is pleased with me.
48. My mother usually treats me fairly and sensibly.
49. I feel that my mother favors one of the other children in our family over me.
50. When I ask my mother if I may do something, she usually says "No".
51. I feel that I can trust my mother.
52. I change from loving my mother to hating her and back again.
53. I worry about what my mother thinks of me.
54. I feel close to my mother.
55. I know that my mother is my friend.

Please check to see that you have marked only one answer for every statement.

CHILD-PARENT RELATIONSHIP SCALE (PARENT)

Name _____ Grade _____

The following sentences are arranged to find out how you feel about your relationship with your child most of the time. The right answers will be your true feelings about each statement.

Please do not write or mark on these pages. Mark all your answers on the answer sheet. Please mark only one answer for every sentence. For a "true" answer make a dark mark in the first box under the "T". For a "false" answer mark the second box under the "F". An "uncertain" or "not sure" answer should be marked in the third box.

1. I make our home a pleasant place for our child.
2. I am honest with my child most of the time.
3. I criticize my child too much.
4. I have faith in my child.
5. As far as ideas are concerned, my child and I do not agree.
6. I get angry easily.
7. I feel that I treat my child fairly at home.
8. In general, I make my child feel that he is an important member of this family.
9. When I make my child mind, I am nice about it.
10. Our family life is happy.
11. I nag at my child.
12. I am often mean to my child.
13. I give my child more understanding at home than he gets elsewhere.
14. I think that I treat all the children in my family the same.
15. I argue with my child a lot.

16. I make it easy for my child to be pleasant and happy when he is around me.
17. I make my home a place where my child is happy and contented.
18. I tell other people things about my child that he might think I should not mention.
19. In our home, my child has to keep quiet or leave to keep things peaceful.
20. I pick on my child.
21. I take an interest in the things my child likes.
22. I am what I think an ideal parent should be.
23. I often think my child will not "amount to much".
24. I believe that my child is trustworthy.
25. I offer my child real love and affection at home.
26. I try to understand my child's problems and worries.
27. I sometimes compare my child unfavorably with other children in the family.
28. I often feel as though I make my child angry.
29. We have good times together at home.
30. In general, I believe that my child can take care of himself.
31. My child talks to me about plans that are important to him.
32. My child often has good times at home with his family.
33. I think my child sometimes wishes he had different parents than the ones he has.
34. My child's friends have happier homes than he does.
35. I sometimes find it necessary to try to deceive my child.

36. I often take the attitude of "Oh, you don't want to do that", to the things my child wants to do.
37. My child enjoys going out with me.
38. I sometimes feel that I criticize my child unjustly.
39. I believe there are things about our home which might make my child nervous there.
40. I sometimes feel that I worry about my child too much.
41. Sometimes I think other people understand my child better than I do.
42. I sometimes tell my child that he is not as nice to me as he should be.
43. I sometimes feel that I expect too much from my child.
44. I sometimes criticize my child in the presence of his friends.
45. I sometimes avoid telling my child things.
46. I think that my relationships with my child sometimes get so bad that he might want to leave home for good.
47. I am usually pleased with my child.
48. I usually treat my child fairly and sensibly.
49. I sometimes feel that my child thinks I favor another child in our family over him.
50. When my child asks for permission to do something, I often say "No".
51. My child can trust me completely.
52. Sometimes I do things that might make my child hate me, other times I do things that might make him love me.
53. My child worries about what I think of him.
54. My child feels "close" to me.
55. I am a friend to my child.

Please check to see that you have marked only one answer for every statement.

APPENDIX E

Arlington, Texas 76012

Dear _____:

After many months of preparation and unavoidable delay, I am ready to begin my research study of parent-child relationships. At present, I have enough volunteer families to statistically justify group data, however, I must admit that I am counting upon the participation of every family that volunteered. Needless to say, I sincerely appreciate your interest and willingness to participate.

In light of the gasoline crisis, I have attempted to accommodate as many people as possible when selecting data collection points. I realize that some people will not be available on the dates listed; however, since I need everyone's data, I will attempt to make alternate arrangements for those of you who cannot attend.

I will be at the following locations. Please mark your calendar:

BEDFORD-HURST

1. Monday, Sept. 15, 6:30PM - 9:30PM
St. Timothy Cumberland Presbyterian Church
Maxon Drive near Harwood Road

NORTH ARLINGTON

1. Tuesday, Sept. 16, 6:30PM - 9:30PM
Parkview Baptist Church
820 North Fielder Road (one block south of Wimbish Elementary)
2. Monday, Sept. 24, 6:30PM - 9:30PM
Trinity Baptist Church
2212 N. Davis (north of the Turnpike near Rocky Canyon Road)

SOUTH ARLINGTON

1. Tuesday, Sept. 25, 7:00PM - 9:30PM
The home of Gary and Barbara Prince
1810 Queensborough (three blocks north of Mayfield between Fox Hill and South Fielder)

FORT WORTH

1. Thursday, Sept. 20, 6:30PM - 9:00PM
Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints
6161 Meadowbrook (Loop 820 at McDonald's)
2. Wedgewood-McCart Area
I plan to collect data the week of Sept. 30. I will
contact families in this area for specific arrangements.

DALLAS-RICHARDSON

I plan to collect data the week of Sept. 30. I will contact families in this area for specific arrangements.

I am looking forward to the opportunity to meet and talk with you. If you have any questions, scheduling problems, or need directions, please contact me at (817) 460-3146.

I hope to see you soon!

Sincerely yours,

Marilyn R. Ternay

Marilyn R. Ternay, M.A.
Doctoral Candidate
North Texas State University

APPENDIX F

COUNTERBALANCING OF CPRS AND CTP

All Children

1. CPRS (mother)-CTP-CPRS (father)
2. CTP-CPRS (father)-CPRS (mother)
3. CPRS (father)-CPRS (mother)-CTP
4. CPRS (mother)-CPRS (father)-CTP
5. CPRS (father)-CTP-CPRS (mother)
6. CTP-CPRS (mother)-CPRS (father)

Parents in Mixed Families

1. Father: adopted child-natural child
2. Father: natural child-adopted child
3. Mother: adopted child-natural child
4. Mother: natural child-adopted child

APPENDIX G

To the Subjects:

PURPOSE OF THIS RESEARCH:

The era of viewing children as sole products of parental influence is past; it is now an acknowledged fact that children and parents influence each other in a mutually interactive fashion. The purpose of this research is to investigate child-parent relationships in families that have both natural and adoptive children.

The following assessment instruments will be administered:

1. the Child-Parent Relationship Scale to parents and children
2. a personality inventory form
3. a family history questionnaire will request demographic information.

I will answer any questions you have about the procedures for this study. You are free to withdraw your consent and to discontinue participation in the project at any time.

ANONYMITY:

It will not be necessary to put your name on answer sheets. All families will be assigned a number. No attempt will be made to identify or analyze individual data. All data will be grouped for statistical analysis.

INFORMED CONSENT:

Name of subject: _____

1. I hereby give consent to Marilyn Ternay to perform the above investigational procedure.
2. I have heard a clear explanation and understand the nature and purpose of the procedure. I have heard a clear explanation and understand the benefits to be expected. I understand that the procedure to be performed is investigational and that I may withdraw my consent for my participation at any time. With my understanding of this, having received this information and satisfactory answers to the questions I have asked, I voluntarily consent to the procedure described in the first paragraph.

Date

Signature of Subject

Signature for Minor
Children

Relationship

REPRINT REQUEST:

All too often people take part in research but never hear what the results were. When my dissertation is completed, I will write a several-page summary of the results. If you would like a summary of the findings, please put your name, address and telephone number below.

Thank you for your participation.

Name: _____
Address: _____
City: _____
Telephone No.: _____

Sincerely,
Marilyn Ternay

REFERENCES

- Adler, A. The problem child. New York: Capricorn Books, 1963.
- Adler, A. Understanding human nature. New York: Fawcett Premier Books, 1969.
- Allan, G. Sibling solidarity. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1977, 39, 177-183.
- Anderslands, P. Parental rejection and adolescent academic achievement. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of New Jersey, 1967.
- Anderson, J.A. Child rearing attitudes, perceived paternal behavior patterns, and learning disabilities in adoptive and natural families. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University, 1978.
- Andry, R. Delinquency and parental pathology. London: Methuen, 1960.
- Armetrout, J.A. Parental childrearing attitudes and pre-adolescents' problem behaviors. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1971, 27, 278-285.
- Atkin, E. and Rubin, E. Part-time father. New York: Vantage, 1976.
- Baumrind, D. Child practices anteceding three patterns of pre-school behavior. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1967, 125, 345-388.

- Becker, W. Consequences of different kinds of parental discipline. Review of child development research (Vol.I). New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964.
- Behrens, M. Child rearing and the character structure of the mother. Child Development, 1954, 25, 225-238.
- Bell, R. Child effects on adults. New York: Halstead Press, 1977.
- Biller, H. A note on father absence and masculine development in lower-class negro and white boys. Child Development, 1968, 39, 1003-1006.
- Biller, H. Father absence, maternal encouragement and sex role development in kindergarten-age boys. Child Development, 1969, 40, 539-546.
- Biller, H. Father, child and sex role. Lexington: Heath, 1971.
- Biller, H. Paternal deprivation: family, school, sexuality, and society. Lexington, Mass.: Heath, 1974.
- Biller, H. Father, child, and sex role. Lexington, Mass.: Heath, 1977.
- Blanchard, R.W., and Biller, H. Father availability and academic performance among third grade boys. Developmental Psychology, 1971, 4, 301-305.
- Bonham, G.S. Who adopts: the relationship of adoption and social-demographic characteristics of women. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1977, 39, 295-306.

- Borgatta, E.F., and Fanshel, D. Behavioral characteristics of children known to psychiatric out-patient clinics. New York: Child Welfare League of America, 1965.
- Bowerman, C.E., and Irish, D.P. Some relationships of step-children to their parents. Marriage and Family Living, 1962, 24(1), 113-121.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. Socialization and social class through time and space. In E. Maccoby, T.M. Newcomb, and E.L. Hartley (Eds.), Readings in social psychology. New York: Holt, 1958.
- Brown, F. An experimental study of parental attitudes and their effects upon child adjustment. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1942, 12, 224-230.
- Brown, J. Rootedness: involvement, 1974, 5, 1-7.
- Brown, R., and Harper, L. Child effects on adults. New York: Halstead Press, 1977.
- Burlingham, D. The pre-oedipal infant-father relationship. Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, 1973, 28, 23-47.
- Buros, O.K. (Ed.) The fifth mental measurements yearbook. Highland Park, New Jersey: Gryphon Press, 1959.
- Buros, O.K. (Ed.) The seventh mental measurements yearbook. Highland Park, New Jersey: Gryphon Press, 1972.
- Chess, S. Adopted child grows up. Child Studies, 1953, 30, 6-8.
- Chestang, L. The dilemma of biracial adoption. Social Work, 1972, 17(3), 100-105.

- Connell, A. A study of achievement motive, nurturance motive, and satisfaction in mothers of preschool children. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University, 1976.
- Dielman, T. Relationships among family practices. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1977, 130, 105-112.
- Droppleman, L.F., and Schaefer, E.S. Boys' and girls' reports of maternal and paternal behavior. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 67(6), 648-654.
- Duberman, L. Step-kin relationships. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1973, 35(1), 283-292.
- Duvall, E.M. Conceptions of parenthood. American Journal of Sociology, 1946, 52, 193-203.
- Edwards, M.E. Failure and success in the adoption of toddlers. Case Conference, 1954, 1, 3-8.
- Elonen, A.S., and Schwartz, E.M. A longitudinal study of the emotional, social, and academic functioning of adopted children. Child Welfare, 1969, 48, 72-78.
- Essman, C. Sibling relations as socialization for parenthood. The Family Coordinator, 1977, 26, 259-262.
- Finch, S. Fundamentals of child psychiatry. New York: W.W. Norton, 1960.
- Finney, J. Some maternal influences on children's personality and character. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1961, 63, 203-273.

- Gildea, M., Glidewell, J., and Kantor, M. Maternal attitudes and general adjustment. In J. Glidewell (Ed.), Conference on community mental health research. St. Louis: Washington University, 1961.
- Glatzner, H.T. Adoption and delinquency. Nervous child, 1955, 11, 52-56.
- Glueck, S., and Glueck, E. Unraveling juvenile delinquency. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1950.
- Goodman, J., Silberstein, M.R., and Mandell, W. Adopted children brought to child psychiatric clinics. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1963, 9, 451-456.
- Grow, L., and Shapiro, D. Black children-white parents. A study of transracial adoption. New York: Child Welfare League of America, 1974.
- Healy, W., and Bronner, A. New light on delinquency and its treatment. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936.
- Hetherington, E.M. Effects of father-absence on personality development in adolescent daughters. Developmental Psychology, 1972, 7, 313-326.
- Hetherington, E.M., and Deur, J.L. The effect of father absence on child development. Young Children, 1971, 233-248.
- Hoffman, M.S. Early identification of learning problems. Academic Therapy, 1971, 7(1), 23-35.
- Humphrey, M. Sex differences in attitudes to parenthood. Human Relations, 1977, 30(8), 737-749.

- Johnson, R.C., and Medinnus, G. Child psychology: behavior and development. New York: Wiley, 1965.
- Jonasson, K., and Fish, A. Are adopted children especially vulnerable to stress? Archives of General Psychiatry, 1966, 14, 291-298.
- Jourard, S., and Remy. Perceived parental attitudes, the self, and security. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1955, 19, 361-366.
- Kadushin, A. Adopting older children. New York: Columbia University Press, 1970.
- Keith, J.A. Child rearing attitudes and perceived behavior patterns of natural parents and stepparents. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University, 1977.
- Keshet, H., and Rosenthal, K. Fathering after marital separation. Social Work, 1978, 296-301.
- Kirk, H.D. Shared fate. New York: Free Press, 1964.
- Kirk, H.D., Jonasson, K., and Fish, A.D. Are adopted children especially vulnerable to stress? Archives of General Psychiatry, 1966, 14, 291-298.
- Klecka, W. Discriminant analysis. In N. Nie, C. Hull, J. Jenkins, K. Steinbrenner, and D. Bent (Eds.), Statistical package for the social sciences (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.
- Kohn, M. Social class and parent-child relationships: an interpretation. American Journal of Sociology, 1963, 68, 471-480.

- Krige, P. Patterns of interaction in family triads with high achieving and low achieving children. Psychological Reports, 1976, 29, 1291-1299.
- Ladner, J. Mixed families. New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1977.
- Lamanna, M. The value of children to natural and adoptive parents (Doctoral dissertation, University of Notre Dame, 1977). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1977, 1687-A. (University Microfilms No. 77-19, 147).
- Lamb, M.E. Fathers: forgotten contributors to child development. Human Development, 1975, 18, 245-266.
- Lamb, M.E., and Lamb, J.E. The value and importance of the father-infant relationship. The Family Coordinator, 1976, 25(4), 379-385.
- Lawder, E., Lower, K., Andrews, R., Sherman, E., and Hill, J. A followup study of adoptions: post-placement functioning of adoption families. New York: Child Welfare League of America, 1969.
- Lawton, J.J., and Gross, S.Z. Review of psychiatric literature on adopted children. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1964, 11, 635-644.
- Leahy, A.M. Some characteristics of adoptive parents. American Journal of Sociology, 1933, 38, 548-563.
- Leichty, M. The effects of father absence during early childhood upon the oedipal situation as reflected in young adults. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly of Behavior and Development, 1960, 6, 212-217.

- Levin, P. There are babies and babies. New York Times Magazine, 1965, 10-15.
- Lewis, D., Balls, D., and Gore, R. The treatment of adopted versus neglected delinquent children in the court: a problem of reciprocal attachment? American Journal of Psychiatry, 1975, 132, 142-145.
- Lewis, M., and Rosenblum, L. The effect of the infant on its caretaker. New York: Wiley, 1974.
- Maas, H.S. The successful adoptive parent applicant. Social Work, 1960, 5(1), 14-20.
- Maas, H. The young adult adjustment of twenty wartime residential nursery children. Child Welfare, 1963, 42, 57-72.
- Martin, A.R. A study of parental attitudes and their influence upon personality development. Education, 1942-1943, 63, 597-608.
- McCord, W., McCord, J., and Zola, I. Origins of crime. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.
- McWhinnie, A.M. Who am I? Child Adoption, 1970, 62, 36-40.
- McWhinnie, A.M. Adopted children and how they grow up. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967.
- Medinnus, G., and Curtis, F. The relation between maternal self-acceptance and child acceptance. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1963, 27, 542-544.
- Meier, E. Current circumstances of former foster children. Child Welfare, 1965, 44, 78-84.

- Mendes, H. Single fathers. The Family Coordinator, 1976, 25(4), 101-103.
- Morris, W. (Ed.) The american heritage dictionary of the english language. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1978.
- Mower, O.H. Identification: a link between learning theory and psychotherapy. In O.H. Mower (Ed.), Learning theory and personality dynamics. New York: Ronald, 1950.
- Mussen, P.H. Early socialization: learning and identification. In T.M. Newcomb (Ed.), New directions in psychology III. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973.
- National Center for Social Statistics. Adoptions in 1973. DHEW Pub. No. (SRS) 75-03259, NCSS Report E-10. Washington, D.C.: Social and Rehabilitation Service, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.
- Newell, H.W. Psychodynamics of maternal rejection. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1934, 4, 387-395.
- Offord, D.R., Aponte, J.F., and Cross, L.A. Presenting symptomatology of adopted children. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1969, 20, 110-116.
- Olson, T. Family constellation as related to personality and achievement. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 33(10-B), 5000-5001.
- Pannor, R., and Nerlove, E. Fostering understanding between adolescents and adoptive parents through group experience. Child Welfare, 1977, 56(8), 537-545.

- Parsons, T.F. Social structure and the development of personality: Freud's contribution to the integration of psychology and sociology. Psychiatry, 1958, 21, 321-340.
- Parsons, T.F., and Bales, R.F. Family, socialization, and interaction process. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1955.
- Paulson, M., Lin, T., and Hanssen, C. Family harmony an etiological factor in alienation. Child Development, 1972, 43, 591-603.
- Pederson, F. Relationship between father-absence and emotional disturbance in male military dependents. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly of Development and Behavior, 1966, 12, 321-331.
- Peterson, D.R., Becker, W.C., Hellmer, L.A., Shoemaker, D.J., and Quay, H.C. Parental attitudes and child adjustment. Child Development, 1959, 30, 119-130.
- Phipps, P. Adoption: a study of the problems involved in child guidance cases from the point of view of a psychiatric social worker. Mental Health, 1953, 12, 98-106.
- Pines, M. Superkids. Psychology Today, 1979, 12(8), 53-63.
- Pines, M., and Rosenblum, L.A. The effect of the infant on its caretaker. New York: Wiley, 1974.
- Porter, J. Black child, white child. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971.

- Pringle, M.L. Adoptions--facts and fallacies. London: Longmans, Green and Co., Ltd., 1967.
- Raleigh, B. Adoption as factor in child guidance. Smith Studies in Social Work, 1954, 25, 53-71.
- Rathbun, C. A group work approach in cross-cultural adoptions. Children, 1967, 14(3), 41-44.
- Rathbun, C. Later adjustments of children following radical separation from family and culture. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Orthopsychiatric Association, Chicago, 1964.
- Raymond, L. Adoption and after. New York: Harper and Row, 1955.
- Reiss, A. Occupations and social status. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1961.
- Ripple, L. A followup study of adopted children. Social Science Review, 1968, 42, 42-53.
- Robertson, D. Parental socialization patterns in interracial adoption (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 5553-A.
- Rode, A. Perceptions of parental behavior among alienated adolescents. Adolescence, 1971, 6, 19-38.
- Schaefer, E. Children's reports of parental behavior: an inventory. Child Development, 1965, 36(2), 413-424.
- Schechter, M.D. Observations on adopted children. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1960, 3, 21-32.

- Scheck, D., Emerick, R., and El-Assal, M. Adolescent's perceptions of parent-child relations and the development of internal-external control orientation. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1973, 11, 643-654.
- Segal, J., and Yahraes, H. Bringing up mother. Psychology Today, 1978, 12(6), 90-96.
- Seglow, J., Pringle, M., and Wedge, P. Growing up adopted. Windsor, England: National Foundation for Educational Research in England and Wales.
- Serot, N., and Teevan, R.C. Perception of the parent-child relationship and its relation to child adjustment. Child Development, 1961, 32, 373-378.
- Shaffer, L. In O.K. Buros (Ed.), The fifth mental measurements yearbook. Highland Park, New Jersey: The Gryphon Press, 1959.
- Simon, R. An assessment of racial awareness, preference, and self identity among white and adopted non-white children. Social Problems, 1974, 22(1), 43-57.
- Sims, V. In O.K. Buros (Ed.), The fifth mental measurements yearbook. Highland Park, New Jersey: The Gryphon Press, 1959.
- Sims, V. In O.K. Buros (Ed.), The seventh mental measurements yearbook. Highland Park, New Jersey: The Gryphon Press, 1972.
- Sorosky, A., Baran, A., and Pannor, R. Identity conflicts in adoptees. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1975, 45, 18-27.

- Sorosky, A., Baran, A., and Pannor, R. The effects of the sealed record in adoption. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1976, 133, 900-904.
- Sorosky, A., Baran, A., and Pannor, R. The adoption triangle. Garden City, New York: Anchor/Doubleday, 1978.
- Stinnett, N., and Taylor, S. Parent-child relationships and perceptions of alternate life styles. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1976, 129, 105-112.
- Sutton-Smith, B., and Rosenberg, B. The sibling. New York: Holt, 1970.
- Swanson, G.E. The development of an instrument for rating child-parent relationships. Social Forces, 1950, 29(1), 84-90.
- Symonds, P.M. The dynamics of parent-child relationships. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1959.
- Teichmann, H., Gollnitz, G., and Gohler, I. The origin and effects of school children of high parental demands for achievement. International Journal of Mental Health, 1975, 4, 83-106.
- Theis, S. Van. How foster children turn out. New York: State Charity Aid Association, 1924.
- Thomas, A., and Chess, S. Temperament and development. New York: Brunner/Mazel, 1977.
- Tiegs, E.W., Clark, W., and Thorpe, L.P. Manual, California test of personality. Monterrey, California: California Test Bureau/McGraw Hill, 1953.

- Tod, J. Adoption of real children. Social Work, 1972, 7, 29-38.
- Toussieng, P.W. Thoughts regarding the etiology of psychological difficulties in adopted children. Child Welfare, 1962, 41, 59-71.
- Toussieng, P.W. Realizing the potential in adoptions. Child Welfare, 1971, 50, 322-327.
- Walsh, R. Parental rejecting attitude and control in children. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1968, 24, 185-186.
- Welter, M. Adopted older foreign and american children. New York: International Social Service, 1965.
- Wilborn, B.L., and Smith, D. Early identification of children with learning problems. Academic Therapy, 1974, 9(5), 363-371.
- Witmer, H.L., and Herzog, E., Weinstein, E.A., and Sullivan, M.E. Independent adoptions: a followup study. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1963.
- Yarrow, M. Problems of methods in parent-child research. Child Development, 1963, 34, 215-226.
- Yarrow, M. Research in dimensions of early maternal care. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly of Behavior and Development, 1963, 9, 101-115.
- Zur Nieden, M. The influence of constitution and environment upon the development of adopted children. The Journal of Psychology, 1951, 31, 91-95.