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The purpose was to verify ego states as objectively identifiable phenomena and the influence of early parent-child relationships on their identification using an audio tape of recorded examples of ego states, Thompson's Ego State Tape (EST), and the Roe-Siegleman Parent-Child Relations Questionaire (PCR). No relationship was found between SAT scores and scores on the EST, nor between PCR and EST scores. It was concluded that possibly (1) no relationship existed between how children perceive their parents and the identification of ego states, and (2) that the PCR might not be sampling child rearing practices relevant to the identification of ego states.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND HYPOTHESES

Transactional Analysis (TA) is a rapidly developing system of psychotherapy and personality theory. Like many therapeutic systems, it is deficient in research. The ego state was Berne's initial conceptualization of TA theory and forms the basis for TA theory and therapy. Berne noticed that the same person would often vacillate between widely differing modes of behavior. This was a total change, including facial expression, vocabulary, gestures, posture and body functions such as autonomic responses (Harris, 1967). These patterns were the psychological realities Berne called "ego states," complex systems of feeling and behaving which make up an individual's personality (Berne, 1961). He wrote:

... the term ego state is intended merely to denote states of mind and their related patterns of behavior as they occur in nature and avoids in the first instance the use of constructs such as instinct, culture, super-ego, animus, etc. Structural analysis postulates only that such ego states can be classified and clarified ... (Berne, 1961).

In a later book Berne (1966) held that the identification of ego states was the key to therapy and that until they were identified, the therapist was only making empirical guesses about what was going on in his group.
There are three ego states—Parent, Adult, and Child. The Parent ego state is an aggregation of frequently repeated self-verbalizations of unquestioned or imposed external events perceived by the person in his early years, roughly the first five. It comes almost totally from the S's own parents or parent substitutes. Everything a child saw his parents do or say is incorporated and is specific for each person, since that set of early experiences is unique to him (Harris, 1967). Parent data also includes a large body of "how to" information learned to facilitate getting along by oneself. All this experience is incorporated without modification, since the small child is totally dependent and lacks words and meanings to modify, correct, or explain these incoming stimuli; thus, some of it is irrational. This Parent ego state consists of all the admonitions, rules, and laws that the child heard and saw while growing up, ranging from early nonverbal communications through tone of voice, facial expression, and cuddling or non-cuddling, to more elaborate verbal rules and regulations as the child learned language skills. Included are thousands of "no's" to the toddler, repeated "don't's" as the child learns what can or cannot be safely done, and later, still more complicated verbalizations about morals and values. The Parent ego state can be recognized by such behavior as a pointed index finger, foot tapping, hands on hips, head wagging, a horrified indignant
look, tongue clicking, or unique gestures that individuals always associate with their own parents. The Parent uses evaluative, judgmental, critical, or supportive words that fit its automatic, archaic, unthinking responses. It is judgmental in an imitative way, seeking to enforce sets of borrowed standards (Berne, 1961).

The Child ego state is the archaic behavior patterns from childhood-reenactment of the child a person once was, at a definite time in life. Behavior coming from the Child is childlike but not necessarily childish. It comes from the child's perception of internal events that occurred simultaneously with the Parent development; it is the child's response to what he saw and heard. Penfield (1952) concluded that a person not only relived past experiences but actually felt again whatever feelings went with the original experience. The Child has few words and concepts, so most of his reactions are feelings. The child's naive assertions are continually restrained by parental demands for conformity. This is frustrating to the child, resulting in bad feelings which are part of the permanent data of the Child ego state. But the Child is also the source of creativity, curiosity, and the pleasure of an "aha" experience. The Child is sometimes referred to as either the Free Child (FC) or the Adapted Child (AC). The FC is the spontaneous, fun loving, creative part, that gives itself unrestrained expression whenever it feels like doing so.
This FC can be cathexed so that adults sometimes play in a
carefree way (Berne, 1961). The AC is the rebellious,
temperamental, deceiving part of the Child that frequently
uses devious ways to get what it wants, and is character-
ized by inhibition and forced "good manners." The Child
ego state is characterized by words like I wish, I want, I
can't, I guess, I gonna, and many superlatives; correspond-
ing behavior is typified by such things as pouting, delight,
squirming, giggling, temper tantrums, and/or a whining
voice (Harris, 1967).

The Adult ego state is the rational, mechanical aspect
of a person. The Adult takes in information and decides on
the basis of reasonable probabilities what to do and when,
such as when to cross a busy street without having to run,
or to raise or fold on two pairs in a poker game (Berne,
1970). The Adult has no feelings, wants, or wishes. It
simply processes and determines what feelings and/or be-
havior is to be expressed in any given situation. According
to Harris (1967), the Adult starts developing at about ten
months, when the infant is able to locomote and is there-
fore able to seek out stimuli rather than to respond only
to what comes his way. This behavior, arising from his own
awareness and original thought, is beginning Adult func-
tioning. It develops slowly, but the more it is used, the
more it develops. The Adult uses words like how much, in
what way, probable, possible, objective, I think, it is my
opinion. Adult behavior corresponds to its mechanical pur-
poosive nature, resulting in straightforward, moderately an-
imated problem-solving behavior with a minimum of affect
(Harris, 1967).

Implicit in TA theory is a developmental concept, that
what happens to a person in his first few years is central
to the kind of person he becomes as an adult. Therefore,
measures of a person's perceptions of his early Parent-Child
relationships should correlate with current measures that
relate to his present ego states. The purpose of this
study was to verify ego states as objectively indentifiable
phenomena, and to determine what influence early parent-
child relations as sampled by the Roe-Siegelman Parent-
Child Relations Questionaire (PCR), may have on their iden-
tification. As has been previously stated, Berne (1966)
has said that the accurate identification of ego states is
a prerequisite of good therapy; their identification is
also necessary to support the transactional theory of per-
sonality based directly on ego states. It was hypothesized
in this study that

1. There is a positive relationship between accuracy
   in the identification of ego states and SAT scores.
2. There is a significantly positive correlation (.05
   level) between the way Ss perceive how their
   parents treated them as children, and the accuracy
   with which they identify ego states.
a. Ss who experienced their parents as protective, demanding, rejecting, using symbolic love punishment and direct object punishment would either misperceive Parent ego state Adult (P→A), or Adult as Parent (A→P), or both, resulting in error scores significantly different (.05 level) from the rest of the sample.

b. Ss who experienced their parents as neglecting and casual would not as fully develop their Adult functioning and would have significantly higher (.05 level) error scores (P→A, A→P, and total) than the rest of the sample.

c. Ss who experienced their parents as loving, and using symbolic love reward and direct object reward would have lower error scores (P→A, A→P, and total) than Ss not experiencing their parents these ways (.05 level).
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RESEARCH

Only two studies were found in the TA literature dealing with ego states. Hurley and Porter (1967) found that relatively untrained raters could reliably differentiate between FC and AC behavior using Berne's concepts of AC, as characterized by a general inhibition of impulse expression historically grounded on the fear of disturbing others, while the FC is characterized by openly self-indulgent or assertive acts directed against external restraints. College instructors in an undergraduate Study Methods course classified students into AC, FC, or Cannot Say categories. All completed the MMPI Psychopathic deviate (Pd) scale, the Marlowe-Crown Social Desirability Scales (SD), and La Forge's Interpersonal Checklist (ICL), providing scores on the orthogonal factors of Lov (love-hate continuum) and Dom (dominance-submissiveness continuum). It was hypothesized that AC functioning would be linked with lower Pd and Dom scores (reflecting rebellious and dominating tendencies) but with higher SD and Lov scores (reflecting conforming and acceptant tendencies) than characterized FC functioning. Confirmation was found for both sexes on the ICL Lov and Dom factors. Males differed, as expected, on Pd scores. Only the SD measure failed to differentiate reliably
between AC and FC categories. Hurley and Porter concluded that there was support for the construct validity of AC and FC ego states.

Thompson (1972), using an audio tape instrument of recorded examples of ego states, found that ego states could be accurately identified by TA experts, naive normal Ss, and naive psychiatric Ss. Normal Ss were more accurate than depressive and schizophrenic Ss, but not significantly more accurate than those with character disorders. Thompson tested several hypotheses about the direction of errors by his psychiatric Ss, none of which were supported.

Berne wrote that the Parent (P) ego state represents basically that of the historical parent or parent figure. This means that a person's Parent ego state will at times engage in behavior much like that of his own actual parents (Berne, 1961). Allston (1971) in a study of Federal Correction Institute inmates, divided on the basis of aggressive or non-aggressive crimes, found that aggressive inmates perceived their parents, especially their fathers, as more rejecting, neglecting, punishing, demanding, and less loving than did the non-aggressive inmates. Glueck and Glueck (1952, 1962) extensively studied delinquency and concluded that antisocial behavior in the family was a direct influence in subsequent delinquency. Both parents were more inadequate than parents of non-delinquents in such areas as degree of poverty, education, emotional disturbance, and
physical ailments. Parents of delinquents managed money more poorly, showed less aesthetic appreciation, and cultivated less family pride and self-respect. Delinquents received less affection from parents and also from siblings. Delinquents received much more physical punishment than matched non-delinquents, and also did poorly in school and got along poorly with other students. In short, delinquents by their early teens, apparently had incorporated into their personalities qualities that will result in a high probability of their being the same kind of parents to their children as their parents were to them.

According to Skinner (1969), people tend to display aggression toward those who act aggressively and to show affection to those who act in an affectionate way. In studies on imitative learning, Bandura and Huston (1961) found that besides deliberate training, a high amount of incidental learning occurred either through proximity or identification. They observed that children not only quickly learned to imitate the E's intentional actions, especially under conditions of nurturance, but that the imitation included inadvertent moves by the E during the course of doing trials that had no relation to the experiment proper, and this imitation also occurred spontaneously between trials. The more covert reinforcements such behavior draws from parents, the more permanently such actions are incorporated into the personality of the child.
Ander (1962) concluded succinctly after a symposium on child rearing practices that child rearing practices are basic determinants of personality.

While engaged in a study of parent influence techniques and their effects on the child, Hoffman (1960) explored the use of power, defined as an individual's potential to compel another person to act in ways contrary to his own desires. He found that frequent use of unqualified power assertion (power used in such a way as to demand and get immediate compliance) contributed to the development of hostility, power needs, and heightened autonomy strivings, which the child displaced on peers, and, to a lesser extent, toward permissive authority figures. Lloyd (1971) found that Ss perceiving their parents as rejecting, demanding, and punitive preferred malicious or aggressive humor over other types of humor. This vindictiveness and critical attitude is characteristic of that aspect of the Parent ego state described as the Critical Parent (CP). For high school students, Colvin (1971) found a high relationship between scores on the PCR neglecting and rejecting scales and scores on a measure of psychological adjustment. There is support for the conclusion that high demandingness by parents leads to low academic achievement (Jones, 1955; Kimbal, 1953; Morrow and Wilson, 1961; Teahan, 1963). However, other evidence also supports the opposite conclusion that high demand by parents produces high achievement in
their children. However, family morale and the presence or absence of a loving relationship are also important variables. Morrow and Wilson (1961) concluded that an achiever's parents are more sharing of activities, ideas, and confidences; more approving, trusting, affectionate, and encouraging (without pressuring) with respect to achievement; are less restrictive and severe. It was not found that low achievers' parents were more overprotective, high-pressuring for achievement, more irregular about home routines, or different from parents of achievers in their goals for their children. Morrow and Wilson found support for their hypothesis that in high achievers, high family morale was fostered by developing positive attitudes towards school, teachers, and intellectual activities as ends in themselves.

Lloyd (1971) found that Ss scoring high on a neuroticism scale perceive parents as either casual or protective and tended to prefer theatricalism (jokes with an unreal, dramatic quality) and anxious concern (jokes exhibiting a noticeable degree of anxiousness and concern over the outcome of various behaviors) types of humor. Low and inadequate reality testing or low Adult functioning is a major manifestation of neurosis (Hamilton, 1972). Teahan (1967) found that college Ss who perceived their parents as casual and neglecting on the PCR were low in achievement levels, or in Adult functioning. Drews and Teahan (1957) found that the parents of low achievers responded positively to
statements like "children should not annoy their parents with unimportant problems." Again, casual and neglecting parent behavior as measured by the PCR is related to ineffectual Adult functioning. Furtz and Swenson (1951) and Stehbern and Carr (1970) report similar findings. Hurley (1965) found that parents who use coercive methods in dealing with their children or who threaten withdrawal of love are more likely to inhibit the child's exploration of the environment, hence, his development of academic skills (Adult functioning). It appears that Ss who experience their parents as neglecting and/or casual do not develop adequate reality testing or Adult behaviors.

Evidence supporting the superior performance by children of parents perceived as loving comes from many sources. Morrow and Wilson (1961) found that demand in a matrix of high family morale and loving parent-child relationships led to high academic achievement. Brown, Morrison, and Couch (1947) found that families that shared family decisions produced children judged as high in character and public reputation by the community in which they lived. Baumrind (1967) concluded that parents who exert authoritative control plus warmth and expectations for maturity, produce children identified by fellow townspeople as self-reliant, self-controlled, explorative, and content. Numerous studies correlate parental attitudes of warmth, non-restrictiveness, and positive demands for self-sufficiency
with both social maturity and academic success (Bayley and Schaefer, 1964; Winder and Uau, 1962). Colvin (1971) found positive correlations between parents as loving and fathers as using symbolic love reward techniques, and the psychological adjustment and self-concept of the children. It seems, then, that when parents are perceived as loving and using symbolic love reward and direct object reward, children tend to develop some characteristics that could be described as functions of the Adult ego state more than children not experiencing parents these ways.
CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE

Subjects

Subjects were thirty male and thirty-two female volunteer undergraduate students from introductory psychology classes at North Texas State University.

Apparatus

Cassette tape player, Thompson's Ego State Identification Tape (EST), the Roe-Siegelman Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire (PCR) for fathers and mothers as seen by the child, and Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores for each S obtained from school records.

The EST was developed by Thompson (1972). Starting with nine hours of Veterans Hospital therapy groups and student interaction groups in which TA was not used, he selected seventy-six examples of a speaker demonstrating predominantly one ego state. A board of five Teaching Members of the International Transactional Analysis Association (ITAA) then judged the seventy-six segment tape. Four of the five TA experts had to agree to retain each segment, a criterion which was met on forty-six of the seventy-six segments. These were then presented to twenty TA experienced Ss, all members of ITAA but not yet Clinical or Teaching members. Here the criterion was between 50 percent and 90 percent
agreement between judges, which was met on forty-four of the forty-six items. Items with less than 50 percent agreement or more than 90 percent agreement were discarded as being too difficult or too easy. Of the remaining thirty-three items, Thompson selected twenty-four—eight Parent, eight Adult, and eight Child—that had the best technical quality for audio tape use. The order was randomly mixed, three too-obvious segments were included for filler, and three more at the beginning for examples. The thirty segments were then re-recorded from the original tapes to preserve as much fidelity as possible. A duplicate of this tape with matching answer sheets, one-page explanation of ego states, and instructions were obtained from Thompson for this study.

The Roe-Siegelman PCR (1963) consists of two similar forms, one for fathers and one for mothers. The PCR was

...devised to obtain a measure of the characteristic behavior of parents toward their young children, as experienced by the child. It has been used in studies of late adolescents and of adults who have filled it out with reference to their own childhood (p. 355).

There are 130 items for each parent; ten subtests, six of fifteen items each for measuring perceived parental behavior characterized as Loving, Protecting, Demanding, Rejecting, Neglecting, and Casual; and four subtests of ten items each for measuring Symbolic-Love Reward, Direct-Object Punishment, Direct-Object Reward, and Symbolic-Love
Punishment. Each of these subtests can be reduced by factor-analytic methods to three factors: Loving-Rejecting, Casual-Demanding, and Overt Attention--factors generally found in most parent-child studies (Goldin, 1969). The items were adapted from the literature and constructed to fit the ten subtest categories. Judges assigned items to categories, and those items which were not agreed upon were discarded. Tryon reliabilities reported by Roe and Seigelman for subtests range from a low of .687 (symbolic-love punishment) to a high of .896 (loving). Specific behaviors of parents, rather than attitudes, were used to increase the objectivity of results, and Ss were asked to recall these parental behaviors toward them when they were twelve years old or less. Responses range as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tended to be</th>
<th>Tended to be</th>
<th>Tended to be</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very True</td>
<td>Tended</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>Untrue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>Tended to be</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>Untrue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>Tended to be</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Untrue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>Tended to be</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Untrue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store True</td>
<td>Tended to be</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>Untrue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Score totals for the fifteen item subtests range from fifteen to seventy-five, and from ten to fifty on the ten-item subtests. The PCR contains eleven items which are different for the two parents; all other items apply to both parents.

Procedure

Subjects were tested in two groups. They were told they were participating in a Master's thesis on the problem of ego state identification, using an audio tape and a paper-
and-pencil instrument. Instructions for each instrument were read to Ss prior to beginning and were also printed on each answer sheet. They were told to ask questions any time anything was unclear, except during the EST.

The EST was hand scored, resulting in a score for each scale and a total score for each S. Means and S. D.'s were calculated for each scale and for the total sample. The PCR was machine scored, with means and S. D.'s calculated for each scale. The scores from the EST, SAT, and PCR scales involved in the hypotheses were intercorrelated. From the EST answer sheets, error scores on the Parent and Adult scales were analyzed, resulting in the number of times P was misidentified as A, the number of times A was misidentified P, and the sum of the two for each S. Because the PCR scales were not all the same length, the scale scores involved in the hypotheses were first converted to z scores, then summed across scales for each S and ranked. Split at the median, the upper half was taken as the high scorers and the lower half the low scorers for hypotheses 2a, 2b, and 2c. The mean error scores were computed for the high scorers and low scorers and tested for a significant difference, using a t test. The .05 level of significance was required for acceptance of the hypotheses.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Means and standard deviations of the EST scales are compared with Thompson's validating study in Table 1. The scores were all lower than Thompson's normal Ss, but similar.

**TABLE I**

**MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF EST SCORES AND THOMPSON'S NORMAL SUBJECTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N TSU Ss (N=62)</th>
<th>Thompson's Ss (N=62)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S. D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15.71</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S. D.'s indicate a similar degree of variance in the two groups. Experimental Ss were undergraduate psychology students.

The first hypothesis stated that accuracy in identifying ego states co-varies directly with SAT scores. As may be seen in Table 2, the SAT scores correlated \(-.06 (p > .05 \text{ level})\) with the EST total score, so the hypothesis was rejected.
The second hypothesis stated that there is a significantly positive (.05 level) relationship between the way Ss perceive their parents and the accuracy with which they identify ego states. Means and standard deviations of the PCR scales are reported in Table 3. Correlations of PCR scales and EST scores are reported in Table 4. None of the PCR scales correlated significantly with the EST, so the hypotheses was not accepted.

Hypothesis 2a stated that Ss who experienced their parents as protective, demanding, rejecting, using S.L. punishment and D. O. punishment, will either misperceive Parent as Adult (P→A), or Adult as Parent (A→P), or both, resulting in error scores significantly different (.05 level)
from the rest of the sample. From Table 5, it may be seen that t tests on the mean scores of P → A, A → P, and the total for the upper and lower halves of the related PCR scales (median split) did not indicate any significant difference with a t value of 1.30 (p > .05), so the hypothesis was not accepted.

TABLE III
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF PCR SCALES AND TOTAL SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Fathers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Mothers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S. D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S. D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Protecting</td>
<td>46.89</td>
<td>8.04</td>
<td>44.21</td>
<td>7.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Symbolic Love Punishment</td>
<td>32.73</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>31.24</td>
<td>5.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Rejecting</td>
<td>57.16</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>59.29</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Casual</td>
<td>45.44</td>
<td>10.46</td>
<td>45.27</td>
<td>7.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Symbolic Love Reward</td>
<td>26.71</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>25.03</td>
<td>5.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Demanding</td>
<td>42.74</td>
<td>10.94</td>
<td>45.34</td>
<td>10.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Direct Object Punishment</td>
<td>33.36</td>
<td>8.46</td>
<td>32.44</td>
<td>7.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Loving</td>
<td>35.87</td>
<td>12.48</td>
<td>33.84</td>
<td>10.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Neglecting</td>
<td>56.87</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>61.48</td>
<td>8.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Direct Object Reward</td>
<td>31.31</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>30.74</td>
<td>8.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE IV
CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OF PCR SCALES AND EST SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PCR Scale</th>
<th>EST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mothers</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic love punishment</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejecting</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic love reward</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demanding</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct object punishment</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loving</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglecting</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct object reward</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fathers</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic love punishment</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejecting</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic love reward</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demanding</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct object punishment</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loving</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglecting</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct object reward</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 2b stated that Ss who experience their parents as neglecting and casual would not as fully develop
their Adult functioning and would have significantly different (.05 level) error scores (P→A, A→P, and total) from the rest of the sample. From Table 5, it may be seen that $t$ tests between the error scores of Ss high on the casual and neglecting scales and Ss low on these scales resulted in a non-significant $t$ value of .01, so the hypothesis was not accepted.

Hypothesis 2c stated that Ss who experienced their parents as using symbolic love reward and direct object reward and who were loving would be more accurate in identifying ego states, or have lower error scores. From Table 5, it may be seen that a $t$ test between the error scores of Ss high and low on the scales resulted in a non-significant $t$ value of .35, and the hypothesis was not accepted.
TABLE V
DIFFERENCE IN ERROR SCORES FOR ALL SUBJECTS BETWEEN UPPER AND LOWER HALVES OF HYPOTHESIZED PCR SCALES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>P→A</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>A→P</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td></td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td></td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td></td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting, rejecting, S.L. punishment, demanding, and D.O. punishment</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglecting, casual</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.L. reward, loving, and D.O. reward</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The scores on the EST were lower than Thompson's mean scores. Thompson's Ss were nurses, nursing assistants, and building maintenance staff of a VA hospital, and employees of a temporary employment service (N=61) (Thompson, 1971). In the present experiment, Ss were college students from introductory psychology classes (N=62). Any difference based on this information would be expected to favor higher, rather than lower scores by the NTSU Ss. A possible reason for lower scores by the experimental Ss was the EST instrument itself, which was a very poor quality cassette tape. When played on a small cassette tape player in a large room, it was very difficult to hear and understand.

The first hypothesis was that accuracy in identifying ego states is positively related to SAT scores. The EST total scores correlated -.06 (p > .05) with the SAT scores. This could have been due to the poor results from the cassette tape used. Another possible source of error was the SAT scores themselves. A scholastic aptitude test is highly loaded for verbal skills and conceptual abilities. Obviously, verbal skills play a part in identifying ego states. What part is played by other factors, such as intuition, capacity for empathy and empathetic understanding, similar
or dissimilar personal experiences, and the personal adjustment and defensiveness of the testee is as yet unknown. If any of these factors do affect the identification of ego states, the SAT would not be sensitive to them (Anastasi, 1968). Another possibility is that intelligence as measured by the SAT has no effect on the identification of ego states; however, it would be contrary to the literature to suggest that any kind of reality testing behavior, especially an audio version of multiple-choice questions, was not related to intelligence (Hurley, 1973). Thompson has stated (in personal communication) that the only significant factor influencing the identification of ego states is intelligence. This conclusion, along with the hypothesis, was not supported by the evidence; only more research will settle the point.

The second hypothesis states that there is a significantly positive (.05 level) relationship between how Ss perceive their parents and the accuracy with which they identify ego states. The PCR scores did not significantly correlate with any of the other measures. There were many high correlations between scales and combinations of scales; however, this does not indicate anything except the summative effect of similar variables. The EST total score did not correlate significantly (.05 level) with any PCR scale or combination of scales. This cannot be explained by the poor quality of the EST instrument used, since if scores
had been higher, the increase would have been equally distributed across the entire EST, and the effect statistically (like a constant) would not affect the correlation coefficient. Another possibility is that the PCR and EST are totally unrelated behaviors. The EST samples reality testing behavior—the Ss' capacity to perceive and make a decision about the nature of stimuli, whose material may be heavily loaded emotionally for the Ss. The PCR was designed to obtain a measure of the characteristic behavior of parents toward their children, as reported by the child (Roe and Siegelman, 1963). There are an unknown number of intervening variables along a continuum starting with the child's reporting and evaluating his parents' behavior and years later evaluating ego states in a college classroom. These two measures may be too dissimilar to yield significant correlations.

The rationale behind the hypothesis was that the child's ego states, especially Parent, are basically projections of the ego states of his parents as they raised him (Berne, 1961). The healthier the parents, the healthier the children, and the better their reality testing will be as adults themselves; thus the hypothesis of a significant correlation between the way people perceived their parents while children and their ability to function in a current reality testing situation, namely, identifying ego states from an audio tape. It may be that there is not a
significant relationship between how Ss perceive how their parents behaved toward them as children and how as adults they perceive ego states; however, overwhelming experience from TA clinicians supports the hypothesis; so empirical validation is still pending a working hypothesis used successfully by clinicians.

In hypothesis 2a, five scales were combined—protective, demanding, rejecting, symbolic love punishment, and direct love punishment, with predictions concerning the misperception of Parent and Adult ego states. It was hypothesized that Ss experiencing their parents as protective, demanding, rejecting, using S. L. punishment and D. O. punishment, would either misperceive P → A, or A → P, or both, resulting in error scores significantly different from the rest of the sample. The five scales measure behavior that could generally be called Critical Parent behavior. The rationale was that Ss experiencing high amounts of Critical Parent behavior as children will grow up themselves to have over-developed Critical Parent ego states in their own personalities and could thus be expected to confuse and misperceive P → A or A → P more frequently than Ss not experiencing as much Critical Parent behavior as children. When S's scores were summed, ranked, and t tests performed on the mean error scores of the upper and lower halves of the selected PCR scale continuums, there were no significant differences. One possible reason is that the range of the
error scores was so small that no statistically significant results were possible. Error scores ranged from zero to seven, and there were sixteen items on the two scales. Another possibility is that the constructs in the scales include both positive and negative elements; protectiveness carried too far is destructive, yet up to a point, it is basic Adult data about how to survive in the world. Demanding, rejecting, and punishment constructs are essential occasionally in parental dealing with children. Thus the measures contain ambiguity in relation to both Parent and Adult ego states, which could explain the total lack of any significant correlations. Thirdly, it may also be possible that behavior described as protective, demanding, rejecting, symbolic love punishment, and direct object punishment has no effect on the perception of ego states, especially the Parent and Adult ego states.

Hypothesis 2b stated that Ss who experienced their parents as highly neglecting and casual would not as fully develop their Adult functioning as Ss whose parents were less neglecting and casual and would therefore be less accurate in identifying ego states, as reflected by higher error scores. There was no significant difference between the mean error scores of Ss high and Ss low on the neglecting and casual scales. The rationale was that the Adult ego state is developed through use as a child matures. Parents who are casual pay very little attention to the child,
responding only if they have nothing else to do. They make little effort to train the child and have few rules, which are only sporadically enforced. Neglecting parents pay little attention to the child, with a minimum of physical care and no affection. They forget promises made to the child and forget him in general (Roe and Siegelman, 1963). Under these conditions, a child gets little feedback and realistic reality testing data to use in the development of his own reality testing mechanisms or Adult ego state. As noted in the review of research, evidence is far from clear on what parental behaviors directly affect the child's development of reality testing mechanisms, especially academic achievement (Adult ego state). It may be that the hypothesis is wrong, that there actually is not a relationship between parental neglecting and casual behavior and the development of the child's Adult ego state. It may also be that the behavior sampled by the questions on these two scales is sampling some domain more restricted or larger than behavior defined as Adult functioning, thus lowering the correlation.

Hypothesis 2c stated that Ss who experience their parents as loving and using direct object reward and symbolic love reward would have significantly lower (.05 level) error scores than other Ss. The mean error scores of Ss high and Ss low on these scales resulted in a t value of .35 (P > .01). The rationale was that parents seen as high
in these positive characteristics would produce healthier, better functioning children, one indication being accuracy in identifying ego states, or lower error scores. To hypothesize that loving, D. O. reward, and S. L. reward scales of the PCR sample behavior characteristic of high achievers may be expecting too much from those scales; hence the lack of differentiation between the high and low scorers on the EST scores. Another possibility is that these behaviors as sampled by these three PCR scales just do not have any relationship with the identification of ego states.

In conclusion, none of the hypothesized relationships between the PCR and identification of ego states were supported. No relationship was found between scores on the SAT and EST scores. There were no significant correlations between scores on any PCR scale and EST scores. Predictions that Ss scoring high on the more negative scales of the PCR would make significantly more errors identifying P and A ego states were not supported, nor did Ss scoring high on the positive scales make significantly fewer errors. It was concluded that (1) possibly no relationship exists between the behaviors measured (how children perceive their parents) and the identification of ego states; (2) that possibly the PCR might not be sampling those aspects of child rearing practices relevant to the development of the ability to identify ego states; and (3) that the PCR scales contained too much ambiguity in relation to the Parent and Adult ego state
constructs to permit any significant correlations.

The EST needs several changes to be a more useful research instrument. It needs to be longer—twenty-four examples is not enough for a highly reliable instrument. As other researchers have already pointed out, (Hurley, 1973), the instrument is biased toward the negative elements of the Parent and Child ego states and contains no examples of the positive Nurturing Parent or Natural Child ego states. Future research might possibly have better results by selecting smaller parts of given ego states and correlating these smaller constructs with appropriate measures of Parent-Child relations. The correlation of total scores between different instruments, as was done in the present experiment, may result in too much overlapping of constructs, resulting in ambiguous variables and poor statistical results. In line with the developmental concept inherent in TA theory, future research could more profitably single out smaller parts of each ego state, such as Free Child or Adapted Child, or Nurturing Parent or Critical Parent, rather than just Child or Parent ego states, to correlate with measures of Parent-Child relations.
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