A COMPARISON OF PARENT JUDGMENTS AND CHILD FEELINGS CONCERNING THE SELF ADJUSTMENT AND SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT OF TWELVE YEAR OLD CHILDREN

by

LOUISE MORGAN LANGFORD

A. B., University of Kansas, 1929

A THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Education and Psychology

KANSAS STATE COLLEGE
OF AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE

1951

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The problem for this research was to learn how well parents could judge the feelings of their twelve-year-old children with regard to self adjustment and social adjustment. It was recognized that parental understanding of children could not, in reality, be measured quantitatively unless some definite tool were accepted and that the reliability of the findings would depend upon the representativeness of the subject group and upon the validity of the particular questionnaire or personality test employed. A secondary problem was to learn how well teachers could estimate the responses given by these children to the questions of the inventory.

Areas considered for exploration were: comparisons of father and mother judgments for the entire group of children; comparisons of father-son, father-daughter, mother-son, and mother-daughter relationships; and comparisons of parents' and teachers' judgments for those children whose parents' estimates were extremely close and for those children whose parents' estimates were most divergent.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE[1]

Justification of the Study

It is our premise that the better parents understand their children the more capable they are of guiding them. There is a growing recognition that all through the struggle toward mature adjustment the individual needs encouragement and guidance. It is recognized that the family, as the primary social unit and as the matrix of individual personalities, provides the laboratory in which self-concepts are formed and in which many social experiments are attempted.

Personality reactions to home situations, especially those caused by parents' attitudes toward the child, seem to transfer into general tendencies in other situations but children vary in the extent of specificity of such transfers. Anderson has stated:

> In the recent literature dealing with the development of children's behavior and personality, it appears that more and more recognition is being given to the importance of the interplay of personalities within the family group.....As Burgess has pointed out in reporting the White House Conference of Child

---

1 Titles other than those herein discussed will be found in the Bibliography. These studies are relevant, but somewhat peripheral to the main objectives of this investigation.

> Health and Protection, the externals of home life are not nearly so significant as the more subtle personal relationships in their influence on the personality of the child.[1]

According to Myers, Ogburn in reporting the White House Conference of 1930 has written:

> Two outstanding conclusions are indicated by the data on changes in family life. One is the decline of the institutional functions of the family, as for example, its economic functions.....
>
> The other outstanding conclusion is the resulting predominant importance of the personality functions of the family, that is, those that provide for the mutual adjustments among husbands, wives, parents, and children and for the adaptation for each member of the family to the outside world. The family has always been responsible to a large extent for the formation of character. It has furnished social contacts and group life. With the decline of its institutional functions, these personality functions have come to be its most important contribution to society. The chief concern over the family nowadays is not how strong it may be as an economic organization but how well it performs services for the personalities of its members.[2]

Most writers have approached parent-child relationships by studying inter-personal attitudes and behavior. Such studies, however, have not attempted to measure specific areas of parent understanding of children and little research has been done concerning how well parents understand the child's beliefs concerning his own attitudes and behavior. Information in this area has been implied or indirect.

---

1 John Peyton Anderson, A Study of the Relationships Between Certain Aspects of Parental Behavior and Attitudes and the Behavior of Junior High School Pupils, p. 1.

2 Theodore R. Myers, Intra-Family Relationships and Pupil Adjustment, p. 5.

Choice of Subjects for Investigation

In considering the choice of subjects for a study of this kind several factors must be considered. Cattell has written that it would seem desirable to have a group of subjects highly homogeneous as to age for a cross-sectional study.[1] If one age group were to be chosen, early adolescence would seem to be a period worthy of research as regards parent-child understanding since psychologists concur that it marks the period of psychological weaning from parental ties.

Hurlock has said, "Adolescence extends from the beginning of puberty, between eleven and thirteen, to the age of maturity."[2] Goodenough has declared that the most significant responses to questions are likely to come from children in the early adolescent or pre-adolescent period.[3] This age group has also been recommended for study by Kingsbury who stated that between the ages of ten and sixteen the naivete and frankness of the ten-year-olds in admitting feelings of personal and social inferiority decrease.[4]

As further justification for the choice of this age group, statistical research, as reviewed by Cole, shows

---

1 Raymond B. Cattell, Description and Measurement of Personality, p. 299.
2 Elizabeth B. Hurlock, Child Development, p. 45.
3. Florence L. Goodenough, "The Diagnostic Significance of Children's Wishes", Mental Hygiene, 9 (1925) 345.
4 Barrest A. Kingsbury, Adolescent Character and Personality, p. 293-294.

that there is little improvement in pupils' difficulties of adjustment during high school years.[1] This would lead to the conclusion that personal adjustment might reach a measureable state by junior high school years.

It is probable, however, that with subjects in this age group a wide range as to type and degree of adjustment may be expected. According to Bayley and Tuddenham, adjustments may be strained seriously for those children who mature early and are over-size or for those who are late in reaching pubescence and are much smaller than their associates.[2] Conversely, Murphy, Murphy, and Newcomb have stated that "There are some traits which are characteristic of age levels but much which seems at first to be a reflection of physiological age is really a reflection of social opportunities and requirements which confront the child at a given period."[3]

Areas of Investigation

For any research problem which concerns the study of personality it is imperative that certain specific areas

---

1 Luella Cole, Psychology of Adolescence, p. 156-157.
2 Nancy Bayley and Read Tuddenham, Adolescent Changes in Body Build, Forty-Third Yearbook, National Society for the Study of Education, p. 53.
3 Gardner Murphy, Lois Barclay Murphy, and Theodore M. Newcomb, Experimental Social Psychology, p. 336.

of investigation be chosen. Sanford found that

> the best evidence that a subjective outlook was more pronounced in our older subjects----- and probably in our youngest subjects----than in our middle subjects is afforded by the General Concepts Experiment, a proceduro designed to reveal the child's way of looking at his world. The results from this experiment showed that when the age of sevon through fifteen years was considered, there was a decrease in the tendency to use concepts of physical structure, an increase in Subjective, Sentient, and Anthropocentric concepts. There seemed to be adequate support for the generalization that with increasing age during the period under study the responses of children became more personal, more flavored by emotion, more frequently determined by inner processes. The older the child, it seemed, the moro inclined was he to put something of himself into his reactions.[1]

It would seem very important, then, that parents understand the inner child.

Much has been written concerning the innermost self, the self image, the self concept, and the self-regarding sentiment. Conklin has stated, "What the individual thinks of himself influences his interpretations of situations and this, in turn, affects the course of his imagination, his emotional reactions, and his overt responses."[2] Tschochtelin has written, "An issue of fundamental importance to the well-being of the child is his own opinion of himself."[3]

---

1 Novitt Sanford and others, Physique, Personality, and Scholarship, Monograph, Society for Research in Child Development, 8 (1933) 645.

2 Edmund S. Conklin, Principles of Adolescent Psychology, p. 139.

3 S. M. Tschechtelin, "Self-Appraisal of Children", Journal of Educational Research, 39 (1945) 25-32.

If parent-child relationships and child self concepts are basic factors about which more knowledge is desirable, it would seem important to endeavor to learn how well each parent understands the feelings of his particular child.

According to Stagner, however, personality does not develop a single, unified, internally consistent self-image; each man is composed of many selves.[1] It has often been said that human society is a society of selves. According to McKinney, the development of self is made possible only by the process of role-taking; that is, by recognition of self in relationship to others.[2]

It is obvious that parents are primarily influential in establishing the child's early social adjustment. They provide a pattern for emulation and they train the child to accept their own peculiar social patterns. According to the American Council on Education:

> Every family has its own way of life. Each regards certain customs, habits, and manners as desirable and requires all members of the family group to observe them as part of the daily routine. Usually these habits are the ways of their relatives and friends, of the social group of which they are a part.[3]

---

1 Ross Stagner, Psychology of Personality, p. 170.
2 John C. McKinney, "A Comparison of the Social Psychology of G. H. Mead and J. L. Moreno", Sociometry, 19 (1947) 338-349.
3 American Council on Education, Helping Teachers Understand Children, p. 58.

We must recognize, however, that the family is not omnipotent; that by the time the child reaches pubescence, many intervening variables have been influential. Conformity to peers and, sequentially, adulation of young adults as demonstrated in a study by Havighurst, Robinson, and Dorr are replacing family sovereignity.[1] According to Hollingworth, parental attitudes are most important and have the possibility of acting in opposition to attitudes which must be evolved in the normal child.[2] With regard to parental understanding Wittenberg has said, "The most difficult fact for parents to accept is that the pre-adolescent does not perform consistently in any direction.[3]

In view of these opinions of persons interested in the field of personality development of children, it would seem important that parent understanding of child feelings in two general areas, those of self adjustment and social adjustment, be investigated. Obviously, the results of such an investigation would involve parent understanding of the child's level of maturity and sexual differences would also

---

1 Robert J. Havighurst, Myra Z Robinson, and Mildred Dorr, "The Development of the Ideal Self in Childhood and Adolescence", Journal of Educational Research, 40 (1946) 241-257.

2 Leta S. Hollingworth, The Psychology of the Adolescent, p. 38.

3 Rudolph Wittenberg, "Before the Teens -What to Expect of Our Children", Child Study, Fall, 1948, p. 9.

be important. According to Terman, "Girls surpass boys at nearly all ages in social interest and boys surpass girls at most ages in activity level."[1]

A number of writers have stressed the presence of cross-sexual understanding or have postulated the need for such understanding if children are to become well adjusted. Frank has emphasized cross-sexual relations in his discussion of the adolescent and the family.[2] Therefore, it would seem that father-daughter and mother-son relationships should be carefully observed.

Methodology of Investigation

Personality data are so numerous and so diverse that any study must select its technique in accordance with the needs of the particular phases to be explored. Although most writers have approached parent-child relationships by studying inter-personal attitudes and behavior, a variety of techniques have been employed.

Long obtained parental reports concerning the undesirable behavior of children and the training methods employed. Her subjects included 338 children from three to

---

1 Lewis M. Terman, Genetic Studies of Genius, Volume I, p. 482.

2 Lawrence K. Frank, Adolescence A Period of Transition, Forty-Third Yearbook, National Society for the Study of Education, P. 241-250.

eighteen years of age. Parents were requested to answer a questionnaire containing fifty seven descriptions of undesirable behavior and a list of twenty training methods commonly associated with the treatment of such behavior in the ordinary conduct of family life. She found that "The occurence of some types of behavior at all age levels, however infrequently they are met, suggests that factors other than age contribute heavily to their presence."[1]

Laws employed rating scales which were filled in by parents and by other adult observers. She found that "Parents tend to rate themselves in their relation to their children and their practices concerning them somewhat lower than observers rate them."[2] Laws also stated:

> Parents tend to rate the responses of their children somewhat higher than observers rate them, except when the response of the child is a source of continued irritation to the parent, or when it is subjected to higher standards by the parent than by observers, or when the response is one in which a child is likely to make a better showing before persons outside of his family.[3]

Champney attempted to "relieve the rating scale of its unearned stigma of hopeless unreliability" in a study which concerned the attitudes and practices of parents thought to have an important bearing on the social development of chil-

---

1 Alma Long, "Parents' Reports of Undesirable Behavior in Children", Child Development, 12 (1941) 43-62.
2 Gertrude Laws, Parent-Child Relationships, p. 20.
3 Ibid., p. 22.

dren. His premise was that significant correlations between the ratings made by two or more people would test the reliability of such ratings. Several raters attempted to rate parents on the following points:

> Always sees subtleties of child's motivation; shows accurate appreciation of child's interests and degree of maturity.
>
> Usually shows thorough understanding of the child; occasionally fails to see the point.
>
> Has a good grasp of everyday situations, but often misses the subtle angles.
>
> Usually shows common sense where the point is obvious, but is incapable of keen analysis.
>
> Is entirely lacking in subtlety; often misses the obvious.
>
> Completely fails to see child's viewpoint, capacities, limitations.
>
> Expects entirely too much or too little. Fails to meet the child on child's own ground.

Evaluations of parents were then evolved by computing the correlations between judgments of different raters. Champney concluded that:

> Parent-child behavior is too complex to be handled by the objective approach. The perceptual and integrative powers of the home visitor must be utilized, and provided with an instrument for their quantitative expression. The rating scale is ideal for this purpose if it can be made sufficiently accurate.[1]

A somewhat more comprehensive study of family relationships was that of Havighurst and Taba who devised a "family

---

1 H. Champney, "The Measurement of Parent Behavior", Child Development, 12 (1941) 121-166.

relationships" questionnaire in which the following ten areas of family life were considered:

1. Common participation in work and play
2. Degree of approval-disapproval
3. Regularity in the home
4. Confidences shared
5. Sharing in family decisions
6. Child's acceptance of home standards
7. Trust and faith in child by parents
8. Parental attitude toward peer activity
9. Interparental relations
10. Signs of tension

Their thirteen-year-old subjects could answer each of the several questions in each area in one of five ways ranging from "very often" to "almost never". Scores on the questionnaire were then correlated with individual scores on a character-reputation rating made by adults outside the family and with the scores of personality inventories.[1]

Symonds employed a combination of questionnaire and ratings in a study the purpose of which was to ascertain which parent's behavior appeared to be most influential in relation to the child's behavior. Teachers' ratings were used to prove the validity of child responses.[2] He stated:

---

1 R. J. Havighurst and H. Taba, Adolescent Character and Personality, p. 233-242.

2 P. M. Symonds, Psychology of Parent-Child Relationships, p. 23.

> Few reliable differences were found to indicate that either parent was more influential than the other in relation to the child's behavior..... However, there was a slight tendency, evident in a few questionnaire items, for the mother to have a stronger relationship to the behavior of boys in certain affectional areas, with the reverse being true for the girls in that the father's behavior and attitudes had the closer association.[1]

It seems probable that detailed statements regarding the reasons for choice of techniques aid the reader in evaluating any piece of research. An emphasis on methodological aspects of study seems to be justified on the basis of the wide diversity of opinion concerning available techniques.

Much has been written which is derogatory to the use of personality inventories. Terman has stated:

> The psychologist stands aghast at the self-assurance with which the professional school counselors of America diagnose the personality faults of little children and at the boldness with which they undertake the delicate task of adjustment..... The student of genius who is familiar with the motivating influences that have their origin in the quirks of childhood personality shudders to think what the result would have been if school counselors had had a chance to "adjust" the personalities of the budding geniuses of history. One can imagine them, freed from all their peculiarities and complexes, adjusted to the world as it was and becoming indistinguishable from the common herd.[2]

Such statements, however, would not prove the worthlessness of such inventories for some purposes if these

---

1 P. M. Symonds, op. cit., p. 169.
2 Lewis M. Terman, "The Measurement of Personality", Science, 80 (1934) 605.

were carefully chosen. Carl Rogers has written:

> The problem of adjustment of a personality to its environment is a difficult field to enter with tools of measurement.....Few people will give truthful answers when directly questioned about their feelings. To ask, "Are you unhappy because you do not have more friends?" is not apt to be productive of truthful replies. Most children (and adults) will be apt to say, "no". Suppose, however, the child is asked how many friends he would like to have and the reply is "Hundreds". (Earlier he was asked how many friends he has, and named one or two). It is quite evident then that he feels keenly his need for a wider circle of friends although a question concerning the matter has never been directly asked or answered.[1]

Thus, it would seem advisable to find a questionnaire with a high threshold of child-recognition as to type of questions. Fromme, in discussing questionnaires, has said, "Yes-no responses are neither sufficient nor reliable indicators of attitude; stimulus values or meanings of questions may not be held constant; we cannot judge whether or not questions mean the same to all subjects for the subject frequently considers other related issues in connection with any item."[2] While this is undoubtedly true, the evidence was not considered entirely applicable to this study; knowledge was sought as to how well parents could judge not only the child's expressions of his feelings but also how well they could predict the way in which he would

---

1 Carl R. Rogers, Measuring Personality Adjustment in Children, p. 107.

2 Allan Fromme, "On the Use of Certain Qualitative Methods of Attitude Research: a Study of Opinions on the Methods of Preventing War", Journal of Social Psychology, 13 (1941) 429-459.

interpret the questions.

Supplementary Study

Most writers concede the importance of parent-child understanding and there is a growing recognition of the importance of teacher-child relationships. Levy, in working with a group of adolescents, found that many of their problems had to do with learning to get along in the school situation.[1]

According to Murphy, Murphy, and Newcomb:

> The biases which have shaped the development of research on elementary school children have been largely formed by the needs of teachers who are handling large groups of children and need to find some general, safe principles for such wide application as to be usable with most children in any normal school set-up. Consequently there is a heavy emphasis on the study of groups and generalizations about groups of children at the expense, on the one hand of understanding individual children, and, on the other, of knowledge of the effects of institutions on children.[2]

Baker has written of the need for teacher understanding of children as follows:

> Before intelligent and effective provision can be made for such --(individual pupil) --differences, teachers and school administrators must know the

---

1 Sidney J. Levy, "Nondirective Techniques in the Study of Developmental Tasks of Adolescence", The School Review, 57 (1949) 300-309.

2 Murphy, Murphy, and Newcomb, op. cit., p. 621.

> nature of these differences and the traits and characteristics of the pupils with whom they work.[1]

Some teachers, of course, have more personal contacts with their pupils by reason of the type of subject matter taught or through extra-class activities than do others and the elements of teacher objectivity and interest are, no doubt, influential factors. According to Baker, "High school teachers vary greatly in their knowledge of their pupils. Some teachers know at least four times as much as others and probably twice as much as the average."[2]

The level of teacher understanding of child feelings in regard to self adjustment and social adjustment and the comparison of teacher judgments and parent judgments would, therefore, seem pertinent as an area for supplementary study.

SUBJECTS

Twenty twelve-year old girls and twenty twelve-year-old boys, their eighty parents, and two teachers for each of sixteen of these children were chosen as subjects for this study. The choice of children was limited by four factors: (1) only those children who were twelve years old

---

1 Harry Leigh Baker, "High-School Teachers' Knowledge of Their Pupils", The School Review, 46 (1938) 175.

2 Ibid., p. 167.

were interviewed; (2) broken families could not be included since mother, father, and child must all respond to the questionnaire; (3) not all children and parents asked to co-operate would be willing to take part in such a study; and (4) with teacher judgments in mind, the investigator wished to interview only those children for whom such judgments might be obtained.

Tho families interviewed live in an urban area of twenty thousand population. Located in the town is the state college of agriculture and applied science. Table 1 illustrates the occupational status of fathers in the study.

Table 1. Occupational status of fathors in the study.

Occupational level	Number of fathers
Profossional	19
Businessman (owner or executive)	8
Businessman (employed)	2
Skilled workman	7
Unskilled workman	4

Source of classification: F. W. Taussig, Principles of Economics

It was recognized that the socio-economic level of the families was definitely skewed toward the professional classes due to the nature of the community and to the fact that working mothers, broken homes, and transient families limited the possibility of procuring subjects in other groups.

Between forty-five and fifty family units were called and few parents or children refused to participate. Contacts were made by means of names obtained from school administrators, Sunday school teachers, and from parents and children who had already been interviewed. These names were completely unselected except that each child had to be living with both parents. In only three instances did refusals to take part in the study seem to depend upon personal bias. This fact seemed important in view of further studies which might be made by this investigator and by others. The wife of one unskilled workman reported that her husband thought "the whole thing was silly" but that she would be glad to help in any way possible; one mother reported that her child was too timid to participate; and one mother said that she considered herself too well informed in the subject field.

There were six refusals in all and the other three were for the following reasons: one appointment was canceled when the mother became ill and entered the hospital; one family could not co-operate since the father had, by reason of his type of employment, been sent to another state to work; and one family was moving into a recently completed home and could not arrange time for the interview within the time limits set by the investigator.

Three sets of inventories were discarded when the supplementary study was planned. These children attended the par-

ochial school and, with teacher estimates in view, it seemed more practical if all of the subjects attended the same school.

Table 2 shows the number of siblings of children interviewed. Of these, ten sisters were older than the subjects, seventeen sisters were younger, seventeen brothers were older, and twelve brothers were younger.

Table 2. Number of siblings of subjects.

Number of families	Number of siblings
5	0
24	1
4	2
5	3
1	4
1	5

Grade placement was as follows: One child was in the sixth grade; nine children were in the eighth grade; and thirty of the subjects were in the seventh grade or first year of junior high school. Two teachers for each of sixteen of these children were interviewed, also. These teachers had instructed the subjects for one hour each school day for periods of time ranging from four to nine months.

Due to the many demands made on the time and energy of teachers in the public schools, it seemed unreasonable to ask for teacher judgments for all of the children in this study. As a basis for choosing those subjects for which

teacher judgments would be obtained, the range of parent-child raw scores on the inventory was computed.

The eight children having the scores closest to parent judgment scores and the eight children having the scores which varied the most from scores of parent estimation were chosen for this supplementary study. In the former group were four girls and four boys. The latter group was composed of three girls and five boys. Occupational status of fathers for these selected groups is shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Occupational status of fathers of subjects in close and divergent groups.

Close group		Divergent group	
Occupational level	Number	Occupational level	Number
Professional	3	Professional	5
Business executive	1	Business executive	0
Skilled workman	4	Skilled workman	2
Unskilled workman	0	Unskilled workman	1

Of the group whose scores were close to parent judgments, one girl was in the eigth grade and tho other seven children were in the seventh grade. In the divergent group four of the children were in the eigth grade and four in the seventh grade.

PROCEDURES

The inventory chosen for this study was the California Test of Personality, Elementary Series, Form B, A Profile of Personal and Social Adjustment, devised by Thorpe, Clark and Tiegs. The questions in this test are indirect ones in which the subjects are asked how other people should act or less indirect ones in which the subjects express their own sentiments. In none of the questions are the children asked to evaluate their own behavior nor to compare themselves with others. Thus, each parent in answering the inventory as he or she thought his or her particular child would answer it would have to judge to how great an extent and in what nature the child would employ evaluation. It was estimated that indirect questions of this type would provide more valid information and that the children would be less likely to feel that they were being exploited.

The questionnaire was devised for children in grades four to nine or for individuals ranging in age from nine through fifteen years. For purposes of this research, the writer did not consider its qualifications as a test of personality although it seemed reasonable that there must be a basis for selection and that a standardized test should be employed. The authors of the inventory state that the test is based upon a study of over one thousand specific

adjustment patterns or modes of response to specific situations which confront children of these ages. They state that the items were selected on the basis of:

> a. Judgments of teachers and principals regarding their relative validity and significance.
>
> b. The reactions of pupils expressing the extent to which they felt competent and willing to give correct responses.
>
> c. A study of the extent to which pupil responses and teacher appraisals agreed.
>
> d. A study of the relative significance of items by means of the bi-serial r technique.[1]

This test seemed well-suited to this study since it is divided into two sections: self adjustment and social adjustment. Section one was devised to indicate how the child feels and thinks about himself, his self-reliance, his estimate of his own worth, his sense of freedom, and his sense of belonging. In this section, also, the child supposedly reveals certain withdrawing and nervous tendencies which he may possess. According to the authors, a reliability coefficient of correlation of .883 was obtained on this part of the inventory with three hundred and thirty four cases by the split-halves method corrected by the Spearman-Brown Formula.[2]

The second part of the California Test of Personality, Elementary Series, consists of social adjustment components.

---

1 Louis P. Thorpe, Willis W. Clark, and Ernest W. Tiegs, Manual of Directions, California Test of Personality, Elementary Series, p. 2.

2 Ibid., p. 4.

It purportedly shows how the child functions as a social being; his knowledge of social standards; his social skills; his freedom from anti-social tendencies; and his family, school, and community relationships. The reliability coefficient of correlation for this section, according to the authors, is .867.[1]

The reliability coefficient of correlation for the total test is reported as .933. The authors also state that the correlation between parts one and two is .66.[2] The small size of this correlation would seem to endorse the decision to study the two fields of adjustment separately. Each of the two parts of the test is divided into six sub-tests and each sub-test includes twelve questions to each of which the subject must make an affirmative or a negative response.

The California Test of Personality also includes an Interests and Activities Questionnaire which was submitted to the children. This questionnaire provides four kinds of information: (1) the things the child likes or would like very much to do but does not do; (2) the things the child likes or would like to do and actually does; (3) the things the child does not like or does not want to do but actually does; and (4) the things the child neither likes

---

1 Thorpe, Clark, and Tiegs, op. cit., p. 4.
2 Loc. cit.

nor does. There are seventy-four interests and activities listed, forty six of which are primarily individual in nature and forty eight of which are predominantly social. Another area of investigation considered was that of individual choice predominance on these types of activities.

The writer is aware that girls usually reach pubescence at an earlier age than do boys. That fact, however, was not given prominence in this study since it was expected that each set of parents would be considering the feelings of the particular child. Moreover, the authors of the inventory state:

> There was-----a slight tendency, possibly significant in two or three of the components, for the girls' responses to average slightly higher than those of the boys.....Sex differences may be due to several factors, including the possibly greater docility and willingness of girls to adjust to certain types of situations. Such differences may, on the other hand, be accounted for by the fact that the school environment and other factors have combined to provide conditions which lead to better adjustment patterns in certain areas in the case of girls.
>
> The authors believe that in the light of present knowledge the same standards of adjustment for boys and girls is a defensible ideal and that teachers and parents alike would be opposed to separate standards for the sexes.[1]

It was the plan of the investigator to ask the children in the study to answer the questions of the test and

---

1 Thorpe, Clark, and Tiegs, op. cit., p. 14.

to ask their parents to respond to the questions as they thought their particular child would respond. Families were all contacted by telephone. An attempt was made to forestall initial uneasiness, self consciousness, or defensive feelings on the part of the subjects by giving a factual statement concerning the purpose of the study and the number of families to be interviewed. The investigator stated that she would call regarding a definite appointment after the family had considered the proposition. Parents were informed that it would be better if interviews of the child and both parents were to run concurrently and this was done in all except five cases. In those instances parents were interviewed at one time and the child at another within a two day period. The one hundred and fifty two interviews were completed within a period of four months.

Since parents and children had been informed concerning the nature of the study and had unanimously agreed to participate, there was no apparent tension during the actual interviews. The investigator handed to each parent a typewritten note of instructions as follows:

> I am not using this test as a personality inventory. My purpose is to investigate how well parents of children in this age group can guess what their child will answer to these questions.
>
> I am not asking that parents do anything with the "play activities" part of the questionnaire. Simply write "Mother" or "Father" and underline

"boy" or "girl" on the front of the test blank, turn to question # 1 and circle either "Yes" or "No" for each of the 144 questions.

Please keep in mind that you are not answering these questions as you feel about them but as you think your particular child will answer them. Thank you for your kind co-operation.

Each parent was then given a copy of the inventory and the investigator asked that she be allowed to start the child on the activities and interests part of the questionnaire. While the child was working on that part of the test, parents had an opportunity to ask any questions desired. None were asked except for those concerning the mechanics for filling in the inventory. Mothers seemed more likely to make subjective remarks when the appointments were made by telephone. These were few in number, however. Examples were: "I fear we expect too much of our child" or "I think all parents have their children overestimated."

The only verbal instructions issued to parents consisted of a repetition of the warning placed on the typewritten sheets: "Please remember that you are answering this questionnaire as you think your child will answer it, not as you, yourself, feel." Test blanks were numbered in sets of three: even numbers for the girls and odd numbers for the boys. No names were placed on the test blanks; subjects were merely asked to designate those factors mentioned in the typewritten instructions. Since anonymity

was promised all subjects, numbers were subsequently transferred at random but the sets of three for each family were retained as units as were the odd and even numbers for boys and girls respectively.

In most cases there was almost no conversation during the interview although a few comments of parents are discussed later in the study when individual cases are considered. One or both parents during each interview did make the statement that some of the answers were "pure guesswork". Children were asked to answer the questions quickly; were requested to answer all questions; and were told that the investigator wanted to know how the child first felt about the questions. Administrative procedures as recommended in the manual of directions were followed explicitly.

The investigator did not employ the usual technique of saying that there were no right or wrong answers because scores comprised of the number of significant answers were to be employed in comparing parent-child and teacher-child scores.[1] Each child knew that his parents were making judgments concerning his responses but, to the

---

1 Significant answers to which reference is frequently made are those answers which the authors of the inventory indicate as pertinent to good adjustment. The adjective, significant, used in this sense should not be confused with statistical terminology.

investigator's knowledge, this did not create feelings of uneasiness. It was the writer's impression that all-family decisions to take part in the study made the child feel that he was free to express himself as he desired.

No time limitations were set. Several families completed the questionnaires in twenty to thirty minutes and in only two instances did the time exceed one hour. In both of these cases reading difficulties on the part of the child were responsible. One of the mothers explained the child's reading retardation when the appointment was made and the investigator acted as if reading the questions aloud to the child were the ordinary procedure. In the other instance the child appeared to be tired and, at the end of about fifty minutes, the investigator asked if she desired the questions read. When this was done, the questions were answered quickly. Such difficulties were not foreseen since the authors of the test state that "the language has been evaluated by means of the Lewerenz Vocabulary Grade Placement Formula, teacher reactions, and pupil responses and has, in general, been kept at the third grade level."[1]

---

1 Thorpe, Clark, and Tiegs, op. cit., p. 3.

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Raw scores for child responses and for parent estimates of those responses were computed from the test blanks. Tabulation was made of the number of mothers and the number of fathers overestimating or underestimating child scores for each of the sub-tests and for each of the two main parts of the test. Pearson product moment coefficients of correlation were then computed between parent and child scores for those same divisions in order that specific areas of parent-child agreement or disagreement might be observed quantitatively.

Table 4. Comparisons of raw scores on Section I: self adjustment.

Estimates of scores	Mothers	Fathers
Higher than child	11	12
Lower than child	28	28
Higher than spouse	19	20

Table 4 illustrates comparisons of raw scores for Section I of the test. These data indicate that parents were likely to underestimate child responses concerning feelings of self adjustment. It seems worthy of notice that the same numbers of mothers' and fathers' estimates were lower than children's scores really were and that,

in both instances, the number was twenty out of a possible forty. Almost the same numbers of mothers and fathers made estimates higher than those of their children and there was slight difference between the number of wives estimating higher than their husbands and the number of husbands estimating higher than their wives.

Table 5. Comparisons of raw scores on Section II: social adjustment.

Estimates of scores	Mothers	Fathers
Higher than child	19	19
Lower than child	18	18
Higher than spouse	22	16

The data in Table 5 show comparisons of total raw scores for Section II, social adjustment. More mothers and fathers overestimated child responses in this section than in the one pertaining to self adjustment. The number of mothers and the number of fathers who overestimated were equal as were the numbers of those who underestimated. Mothers in the study were more likely to estimate child responses pertaining to social adjustment higher than their husbands did than husbands were likely to estimate such responses higher than did their wives.

Data in Table 6 indicate that parents were more likely to underestimate total child scores than to overestimate them. Numbers of mothers and fathers in each cate-

gory were equal or nearly equal although three more wives than husbands estimated higher than did their spouses.

Table 6. Comparisons of raw scores for the total test.

Estimates of scores	Mothers	Fathers
Higher than child	13	14
Lower than child	26	26
Higher than spouse	21	18

In considering coefficients of correlation between parent expectations and child scores for the various sub-tests it is evident that there are more significant correlations in the area concerning social adjustment than in the one pertaining to self adjustment. As shown in Table 7, there are more highly significant coefficients of correlation in the father-son relationship than in any other. Four out of six of these correlations were in areas of self adjustment whereas only two were in social adjustment. There were four significant correlations that were high in mother-son relationships, two in self adjustment and two in social adjustment. The only highly significant coefficient of correlation in the father-daughter relationship was a negative one in the sub-test pertaining to social standards. There were no highly significant mother-daughter coefficients of correlation in self

adjustment components but three in sub-tests pertaining to social adjustment.

Table 7. Highly statistically significant coefficients of correlation.[1]

Father-son	self-reliance	.726**
	freedom from nervous symptoms	.686**
	sense of personal freedom	.593**
	school relations	.571**
	family relations	.539**
	feeling of belonging	.522*
Mother-son	freedom from nervous symptoms	.834**
	community relations	.732**
	family relations	.641**
	sense of personal freedom	.537*
Father-daughter	social standards	-.869**
Mother-daughter	school relations	.663**
	family relations	.560*
	community relations	.514*

** significant at the 1% level of confidence.
* significant at the 5% level of confidence.

1 Correlations shown in Table 7 are the highly significant ones; these and other coefficients of correlation are presented in Table 8.

Table 8. Coefficients of correlation between raw scores for each of the sub-tests for the several parent-child comparisons.

Test divisions	Parent-child relationships[1]					
	fs	ms	fd	md	fc	mc
self-reliance	.374	.158	.260	-.440	.163	-.207
sense of personal worth	.726**	.243	.191	.249	.477**	.198
sense of personal freedom	.593**	.537*	.125	.394	.416**	.501**
feeling of belonging	.522*	.197	.084	.153	.351	.100
freedom from withdrawing tendencies	.331	.094	-.276	.018	.070	.051
freedom from nervous symptoms	.686**	.834**	.268	-.013	.499**	.647**
Self adjustment	.675**	.413*	.300	.250	.394**	.169
social standards	-.339	.236	-.869**	.050	-.381	.015
social skills	.403	-.026	-.105	.060	.215	.158
freedom from anti-social tendencies	.411	.080	.236	.271	.123	.159
family relations	.539**	.641**	.209	.560**	.250	.598**
school relations	.571**	.333	.358	.663**	.452**	.486**
community relations	.139	.732**	-.074	.514**	.037	.570**
Social adjustment	.570**	.408	-.615**	.312	.170	.420**

* significant at the 5% level of confidence.
** significant at the 1% level of confidence.
1 Parent-child relationships:
fs -father-son ms -mother-son fc -father-child
fd -father-daughter md -mother-daughter
mc -mother-child

Sub-test IA, Self-reliance

According to the authors of the inventory a child "May be said to be self-reliant when his actual actions indicate that he can do things independently of others, depend upon himself in various situations, and direct his own activities. The self-reliant boy or girl is also characteristically stable emotionally, and responsible in his behavior."[1]

Table 9 lists the percentages of subjects giving significant answers or judgments for the questions of this sub-test. The same number of fathers and mothers gave judgments of significant responses for question 1 as children who responded significantly. This question is: "Do you usually help other boys and girls decide what to do?" More parents expected significant answers for questions 2, 4, 5, and 7 than were given. These questions are:

2. Do you feel that you can do well when things are not going right?

4. Can you usually do what you ought to when you get mad?

5. Are you often the leader when playing with other children?

7. Do you usually keep at your work even when other children want you to stop?

The highest percentage of significant responses were those of children for question 9: "Is it usually some one else's fault when things go wrong?"

---

1 Thorpe, Clark, and Tiegs, op. cit., p. 3.

Table 9. Percentages of subjects giving significant answers or judgments for the questions in subtest IA, self-reliance.

Question	Children	Fathers	Mothers
1	70	70	70
2	45	57.5	52.5
3	72.5	72.5	67.5
4	42.5	60	50
5	47.5	67.5	72.5
6	65	62.5	55
7	60	65	67.5
8	67.5	65	75
9	77.5	57.5	50
10	75	42.5	52.5
11	62.5	65	57.5
12	65	37.5	50

At least twice as many mothers and fathers estimated their sons' scores lower than those scores really were in comparison with those who judged them higher. This was also true of mothers and daughters but eight fathers judged daughters' responses higher than they were as compared to ten who judged them lower. As illustrated in Table 10, neither mothers nor fathers of sons, as a group, seemed to be consistently likely to estimate higher than the other parent; seven fathers judged higher than mothers and eight mothers judged higher than did fathers. When parents of daughters were considered eleven fathers estimated higher than mothers and only eight mothers estimated higher than fathers.

Table 10. A comparison of parent judgments with the responses of their children and with the judgments of their spouses.

Number of parents	Higher than			
	Sons	Daughters	Other parent (sons)	Other parent (daughters)
Mothers	5	6	8	8
Fathers	5	8	7	11

Table 8 indicates that there are no highly significant statistical correlations in this sub-test although father-son, father-daughter, and, consequently, father-child relationships appeared to be closer than did mother-child. Negative correlations existed between mother-daughter scores. With no highly significant correlations, the investigator concluded that with this limited group of subjects and with this specific set of questions, parents did not make accurate judgments of child responses.

Sub-test IB, Sense of Personal Worth

The authors of the test state that a child "Possesses a sense of being worthy when he feels he is well regarded by others, when he feels that others have faith in his future success, and when he believes that he has average or better than average ability. To feel worth means to

feel capable and reasonably attractive."[1]

Table 11. Percentages of subjects giving significant answers or judgments for the questions in sub-test IB, sense of personal worth.

Question	Children	Fathers	Mothers
13	80	77.5	72.5
14	60	52.5	55
15	87.5	62.5	65
16	95	95	87.5
17	75	60	65
18	77.5	65	70
19	72.5	52.5	60
20	90	87.5	82.5
21	70	70	65
22	90	85	85
23	90	87.5	77.5
24	87.5	87.5	72.5

Table 11 shows the percentage of children who gave significant responses to questions in this sub-test and the percentages of parents who indicated expectations of such responses. The percentage of children giving significant answers was greater than the percentages of mothers or fathers on all questions except numbers 16, 21, and 24 which read as follows:

16. Do people seem to think that you do well in life?

21. Do you often feel that the other children are better than you are?

24. Do the other pupils do nice things for you as often as they should?

---

1 Thorpe, Clark, and Tiegs, op. cit., p. 3.

On these questions the number of fathers who expected significant responses from their children was the same as the number of children who responded in that manner. The percentage of mothers expecting significant answers was lower for every question of this sub-test than was the percentage of children who answered significantly.

Table 12. A comparison of parent judgments with the responses of their children and with the judgments of their spouses for questions in sub-test IB.

Number of parents	Higher than			
	Sons	Daughters	Other parent (sons)	Other parent (daughters)
Mothers	9	4	11	4
Fathers	6	7	5	11

As indicated in Table 12, nine of the twenty mothers of sons overestimated their sons' responses and eleven of the twenty mothers of sons estimated their sons' scores higher than did the fathers while only six of the twenty fathers estimated sons' responses higher than they were and only five of the fathers estimated sons' responses higher than did mothers. Conversely, the number of fathers higher than daughters exceeded the number of mothers higher than daughters. The number of fathers of daughters whose estimates were higher than their wives' was almost three times the number of mothers of daughters whose estimates

exceeded their husbands' judgments.

While no definite conclusions can be drawn from this limited study, the data show that these fathers overestimated their daughters' scores on questions regarding sense of personal worth and that mothers overestimated their sons' scores in this component. Correlations as shown in Table 6 verify these findings although father-child judgments are noticibly more similar to child responses than are mother-child estimates.

Sub-test IC, Sense of Personal Freedom

According to the authors of the inventory, a child "enjoys a sense of personal freedom when he is permitted to have a reasonable share in the determination of his conduct and in setting the general policies that shall govern his life. Desirable freedom includes permission to choose one's own friends and to have at least a little spending money."[1]

As shown in Table 13, question 25 was answered affirmatively by all forty of the children. This question is: "Are you allowed to help plan your own affairs?" Fewer children than were expected by parents gave significant answers to question 26. This question reads: "Would you

---

1 Thorpe, Clark, and Tiegs, op. cit., p. 3.

Table 13. Percentages of subjects giving significant answers or judgments for the questions in sub-test IC, sense of personal freedom.

Question	Children	Fathers	Mothers
25	100	97.5	92.5
26	40	65	65
27	45	52.5	52.5
28	85	70	72.5
29	95	67.5	70
30	95	80	62.5
31	87.5	72.5	70
32	95	82.5	82.5
33	90	80	77.5
34	57.5	62.5	57.5
35	97.5	75	87.5
36	95	70	52.5

like to do things that older people think you should not?" The same was true of question 27: "Do some people try to rule you so much that you don't like it?" The numbers of mothers and children estimating and giving significant responses to question 34 were equal but were less than the number of fathers expecting significant answers. This question is: "Do you often have to stand up for your rights?"

Two mothers of sons as compared to one father of a son estimated that the child would give more significant responses than were indicated. Four mothers of daughters compared to one father of a daughter estimated child scores higher than they really were on this sub-test. Mothers of sons estimating higher than their husbands

were the same in number as fathers of sons estimating higher than their wives. Eleven mothers of daughters, however, estimated higher than their husbands while only seven fathers of daughters estimated higher than did their wives.

Table 14. A comparison of parent judgments with the responses of their children and with the judgments of their spouses for questions in sub-test IC.

Number of parents	Higher than			
	Sons	Daughters	Other parent (sons)	Other parent (daughters)
Mothers	2	4	9	11
Fathers	1	1	9	7

Statistical correlations for this sub-test as shown in Table 8 show more highly significant relationships than did those on the first two sub-tests. Father-son correlations were higher than father-daughter correlations and mother-son correlations were higher than mother-daughter correlations. These correlations together with the data shown in Table 14 indicate that the mothers had a greater tendency to overestimate children on this component than did the fathers and that parents showed a better understanding of their sons' feelings than of their daughters' feelings.

Sub-test ID, Feeling of Belonging

According to the authors of the test a child feels that he belongs "when he enjoys the love of his family, the well-wishes of good friends, and a cordial relationship with people in general. Such a pupil will as a rule get along well with his teachers and usually feels proud of his school."[1]

Table 15 illustrates that the percentage of children making significant responses exceeded the percentages of parents expecting such responses on all questions of this sub-test except number 39 for which the percentage of fathers exceeded that of children. This question is: "Do you feel that many of those you go around with are not real friends?"

Table 15. Percentages of subjects giving significant answers or judgments for the questions in sub-test ID, feeling of belonging.

Question	Children	Fathers	Mothers
37	92.5	90	87.5
38	95	90	85
39	75	85	65
40	92.5	77.5	85
41	92.5	92.5	85
42	67.5	55	55
43	95	90	77.5
44	100	97.5	97.5
45	92.5	92.5	97.5
46	85	77.5	82.5
47	95	92.5	90
48	97.5	97.5	95

1 Thorpe, Clark, and Tiegs, op. cit., p. 3.

The percentages of children giving significant answers and of fathers expecting such answers were equal for questions 41 and 45 but the percentage of mothers making significant judgments was less than those of fathers or children. These questions are:

41. Do the other children usually like the things you are doing?

45. Do you feel bad because you have so few friends?

All forty children gave the significant reply to question 44: "Do many of the children at school seem to like you? Parental expectancy was also high for this question.

Table 16. A comparison of parent judgments with the responses of their children and with the judgments of their spouses for questions in sub-test ID.

Number of parents	Higher than			
	Sons	Daughters	Other parent (sons)	Other parent (daughters)
Mothers	7	6	9	7
Fathers	5	6	5	7

As shown in Table 16, the numbers of mothers of daughters and of fathers of daughters who overestimated their children's responses were identical as were the number of mothers of daughters who estimated higher than fathers and

the number of fathers of daughters who estimated higher than did their wives. Seven mothers of sons as compared to five fathers of sons overestimated their children. Nine mothers of sons placed higher estimates of significant responses than did their husbands while only five fathers of sons estimated higher than did their wives.

Correlations as presented in Table 8 show closer relationships for father-son judgments than for father-daughter judgments and slightly higher correlations for mother-son than for mother-daughter. The father-son correlation was the only highly significant correlation for this sub-test, however, and that is significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Sub-test IE, Freedom From Withdrawing Tendencies

The authors of the inventory state that a child "is said to withdraw if he substitutes the joys of a fantasy world for actual successes in real life. Such a child is characteristically sensitive, lonely, and given to self-concern. Normal adjustment is characterized by reasonable freedom from these tendencies."[1]

The percentage of children giving significant answers in this sub-test exceeds that of parents expecting signi-

---

1 Thorpe, Clark, and Tiegs, op. cit., p. 3.

Table 17. Percentages of subjects giving significant answers or judgments for the questions in sub-test IE, freedom from withdrawing tendencies.

Question	Children	Fathers	Mothers
49	82.5	72.5	62.5
50	75	50	60
51	65	47.5	55
52	97.5	82.5	80
53	67.5	52.5	47.5
54	90	70	75
55	97.5	92.5	95
56	95	95	95
57	55	57.5	47.5
58	92.5	82.5	75
59	75	70	45
60	95	90	82.5

ficant answers on all questions except question 56 for which the numbers of children, fathers, and mothers were identical. This question is: "Do your friends think that your feelings are too easily hurt?" On question 57, "Could you easily hate people you don't like?", the percentage of children exceeded that of mothers but was less than that of fathers. The smallest percentage of subjects expressing expectation of significant answers was that of mothers on question 59, "Do you often feel like giving up when people think you are not doing well?"

Data in Table 18 appeared to indicate that mothers were likely to overestimate child responses of sons and that fathers were likely to overestimate child responses

of daughters. Of particular interest was the fact that nine fathers of sons and fifteen of the twenty fathers of daughters made higher estimates in this component than did their wives while only seven mothers of sons and five mothers of daughters exceeded their husbands' estimates.

Table 18. A comparison of parent judgments with the responses of their children and with the judgments of their spouses for questions in sub-test IE.

Number of parents	Higher than			
	Sons	Daughters	Other parent (sons)	Other parent (daughters)
Mothers	5	3	7	5
Fathers	4	7	9	15

While none of the statistical correlations in this sub-test were highly significant, a slightly negative correlation was evident in the father-daughter category. Since the correlations were smaller than in the other components discussed, it appeared that the parents in this study showed poor insight into child feelings expressed in answering these specific questions concerning their freedom from withdrawing tendencies.

Sub-test IE, Freedom From Nervous Symptoms

As shown in Table 19, all forty children gave significant replies to question 69, "Do you believe that you have more bad dreams than most of the boys and girls?" The percentage of children giving significant responses exceeded that of parents expecting such responses for all questions except questions 64 and 71:

64. Is is hard for you to keep from being restless much of the time?

71. Do you seem to have more headaches than most children do?

Table 19. Percentages of subjects giving significant answers or judgments for the questions in sub-test IF, freedom from nervous symptoms.

Question	Children	Fathers	Mothers
61	87.5	80	87.5
62	85	82.5	70
63	87.5	82.5	90
64	57.5	67.5	65
65	60	65	47.5
66	80	57.5	62.5
67	85	85	75
68	95	90	80
69	100	92.5	97.5
70	82.5	75	65
71	82.5	90	87.5
72	50	50	60

On question 63, "Do you sometimes feel as if you are going to faint?", the percentage of children giving significant answers exceeded that of fathers but was less

than that of mothers expecting such answers. Conversely, the percentage of significant child responses for question 65, "Do you often feel tired soon after you get up?", was more than that of mothers who expected such answers but was less than that of fathers who indicated them. The percentage of significant child responses for question 72, "Do you get too restless when you have to wait for someone?", was identical to that of fathers estimating them but was less than that of mothers who indicated such expectancy.

In this component, as indicated in Table 20, fathers tended to overestimate significant responses of daughters, but mothers displayed a lesser tendency to overestimate significant responses of sons. The number of mothers who estimated sons' scores higher than did their husbands was almost twice that of fathers of sons who estimated higher child responses than did their wives. Conversely, the number of fathers of daughters who estimated child responses higher than did their wives was ten as compared to six mothers of daughters who estimated higher than did their husbands.

The data in Table 20 might seem to indicate that fathers were likely to overestimate daughters and mothers to overestimate sons, but if such a relationship existed it was not great enough to warrant quantitative

Table 20. A comparison of parent judgments with the responses of their children and with the judgments of their spouses for questions in sub-test IF.

Number of parents	Higher than			
	Sons	Daughters	Other parent (sons)	Other parent (daughters)
Mothers	8	8	11	6
Fathers	5	10	6	10

measurement. There were highly significant correlations between fathers and sons and even higher between mothers and sons. Both of these coefficients of correlations are significant at the .01 level of confidence. Parent-daughter correlations are not highly significant and the mother-daughter correlation is slightly negative. Mother-child and father-child correlations are higher for this sub-test, however, than for any other. It is possible, then, that parents in this study had a better understanding when feelings were overt as in this component than in less obvious behavorial areas. The authors of the test state: "The pupil who is classified as having nervous symptoms is the one who suffers from one or more of a variety of physical symptoms such as loss of appetite, frequent eye strain, inability to sleep, or a tendency to be chronically tired. Children of this kind may be exhibiting physical expressions of emotional conflicts."[1]

1 Thorpe, Clark and Tiegs, op. cit., p. 3.

Sub-test IIA, Social Standards

According to the authors of the test, "The pupil who recognizes desirable social standards is the one who has come to understand the rights of others and who appreciates the necessity of subordinating certain desires to the needs of the group. Such a pupil understands what is regarded as being right or wrong."[1]

Table 21. Percentages of subjects giving significant answers or judgments for the questions in sub-test IIA, social standards.

Question	Children	Fathers	Mothers
73	75	77.5	75
74	85	85	85
75	82.5	75	80
76	92.5	80	87.5
77	92.5	90	90
78	95	90	92.5
79	90	80	90
80	95	87.5	90
81	97.5	92.5	95
82	95	92.5	95
83	92.5	82.5	92.5
84	92.5	92.5	95

As shown in Table 21, on none of the questions in this sub-test did all of the children give significant responses but at least seventy-five percent of the children gave significant answers to all questions. On none of the questions was the percentage of children giving

1 Thorpe, Clark and Tiegs, op. cit., p. 3.

significant answers less than that of parents except in comparison with fathers on question 73 and in comparison with mothers on question 84. These questions are:

73. Do people really need to know what is right and what is wrong?

84. Should elementary school children live up to school rules?

The percentages of responses of children, mothers, and fathers were identical for question 74: "Is it all right to look down on people who do not know very much?"

Table 22. A comparison of parent judgments with the responses of their children and with the judgments of their spouses for questions in sub-test IIA.

Number of parents	Higher than			
	Sons	Daughters	Other parent (sons)	Other parent (daughters)
Mothers	9	9	8	7
Fathers	9	8	2	1

Table 22 shows that nine out of twenty mothers of sons overestimated child responses. A more detailed analysis showed that ten mothers estimated total scores for the sub-test to be the same as their sons' total scores really were and that only one mother underestimated her son's responses. Nine mothers of daughters overestimated child responses and seven gave estimates identical with

real scores. Nine fathers of sons and eight fathers of daughters overestimated child responses and five fathers of sons and four fathers of daughters judged exact total sub-test scores for their children. Eight mothers of sons and seven mothers of daughters estimated higher than their husbands on this sub-test and only two fathers of sons and one father of a daughter estimated higher than did their wives.

Statistical analyses for this sub-test as shown in Table 8 were as follows: father-son, -.339; mother-son, .236; father-daughter, -.869; and mother-daughter, .050. These correlations would seem to indicate that the parents did not understand the social standards of their children as well as they understood child feelings in other components. The father-daughter correlation would seem to indicate very poor father understanding of the social standards of this group of twelve-year-old girls.

Sub-test IIB, Social Skills

The authors of the test state that a child "may be said to be socially skillful or effective when he shows a liking for people, when he inconveniences himself to be of assistance to them, and when he is diplomatic in his dealings with both friends and strangers. The so-

cially skillful boy or girl subordinates his or her egoistic tendencies in favor of interest in the problems and activities of his associates."[1]

Table 23. Percentages of subjects giving significant answers or judgments for the questions in sub-test IIB, social skills.

Question	Children	Fathers	Mothers
85	87.5	75	80
86	82.5	65	55
87	45	57.5	57.5
88	92.5	87.5	87.5
89	97.5	95	92.5
90	75	50	50
91	77.5	80	70
92	40	60	52.5
93	42.5	60	57.5
94	92.5	87.5	80
95	97.5	97.5	95
96	75	70	77.5

As shown in Table 23, the percentage of children giving significant answers to the various questions of this sub-test ranged from forty percent on question 92, "Do you usually argue with people who do not agree with you?" to ninety-seven and one-half percent on questions 89 and 95 which are:

89. Do you like to notice the things your friends are doing?

95. Do you get along well with the other children?

---

1 Thorpe, Clark, and Tiegs, op. cit., p. 3.

The percentage of children giving significant answers was less than those of mothers or fathers on questions 87, 92, and 93 and was less than the percentage of mothers on question 91.

87. Do you usually keep from showing your temper when you are angry?

92. Do you usually argue with people who do not agree with you?

93. Is it hard for you to admit it when you are wrong?

91. Do you sometimes let your own things go so you can do someone a favor?

These questions seem worthy of notice since they are examples of parent overestimation of child responses. Both mothers and fathers overestimated child responses on more questions in this sub-test than in any other with the exception of that having to do with social standards.

Table 24. A comparison of parent judgments with the responses of their children and with the judgments of their spouses for questions in sub-test IIB.

Number of parents	Higher than			
	Sons	Daughters	Other parent (sons)	Other parent (daughters)
Mothers	7	3	7	2
Fathers	6	6	10	12

Table 24 shows that six fathers and seven mothers of sons overestimated child responses and that six fath-

ers and three mothers of daughters overestimated child responses. Twenty two of the forty fathers estimated child responses higher than their wives as compared to nine mothers who estimated higher than their husbands.

Statistically, none of the parent-child correlations in this sub-test are highly significant but father-daughter and mother-son correlations are slightly negative. These are probably not large enough, however, to indicate better understanding between fathers and sons and between mothers and daughters than in cross-soxual relationships.

Sub-test IIC, Freedom from Anti-social Tendencies

The authors of the test say that a child "would normally be regarded as anti-social when he is given to bullying, frequent quarreling, disobedience, and destructiveness to property. The anti-social child is the one who endeavors to get his satisfactions in ways that are damaging and unfair to others. Normal adjustment is characterized by reasonable froedom from these tendencies."[1]

Table 25 indicates that the percentage of children giving significant answers was less than the percentage of mothers or fathers expecting those answers on questions 97 and 105. These questions are:

> 97. Are the younger children often so mean that you have to got tough to handle them?

---

1 Thorpe, Clark, and Tiegs, op. cit., p. 3.

105. Do many people make you feel like fighting?

The percentage of children was lower than the percentages of parents for questions 98, 104, and 99 in that more fathers expected significant replies than were given for questions 98 and 104 and more mothers expected such replies than children gave for question 99.

98. Have unfair people often said that you made trouble for them?

104. Do people often treat you so mean that you have to use bad language?

99. Are many people so stubborn that they make you quarrel with them?

Table 25. Percentages of subjects giving significant answers or judgments for the questions in sub-test IIC, freedom from anti-social tendencies.

Question	Children	Fathers	Mothers
97	55	65	67.5
98	62.5	67.5	60
99	57.5	55	65
100	70	62.5	60
101	75	67.5	72.5
102	85	80	82.5
103	85	85	75
104	87.5	90	87.5
105	70	77.5	72.5
106	90	87.5	80
107	80	77.5	70
108	90	87.5	82.5

The comparison of parent judgments as shown in Table 26 is unique in that the number of mothers of sons and the number of fathers of sons overestimating child responses are identical as are the number of mothers of sons estimating higher than their husbands and the number of fathers of sons estimating higher than their wives. The number of fathers of daughters making high estimates is slightly larger than that of mothers and is slightly larger than that of their respective wives.

Table 26. A comparison of parent judgments with the responses of their children and with the judgments of their spouses for questions in sub-test IIC.

Number of parents	Higher than			
	Sons	Daughters	Other parent (sons)	Other parent (daughters)
Mothers	11	8	8	5
Fathers	11	10	8	7

There were no highly significant statistical correlations for this sub-test but the father-son correlation was the highest as shown in Table 8.

Sub-test IID, Family Relations

According to the authors of the test a child "who exhibits desirable family relationships is the one who

feels that he is loved and well-treated at home, and who has a sense of security and self-respect in connection with the various members of his family. Superior family relations also include parental control that is neither too strict nor too lenient."[1]

Table 27. Percentages of subjects giving significant answers or judgments for the questions in sub-test IID, family relations.

Question	Children	Fathers	Mothers
109	82.5	85	85
110	97.5	97.5	95
111	87.5	87.5	85
112	95	85	85
113	90	72.5	77.5
114	67.5	60	62.5
115	100	100	95
116	92.5	67.5	70
117	90	60	75
118	95	97.5	95
119	80	77.5	82.5
120	90	90	80

Table 27 differs from similar tables for other sub-tests in that all forty children and all forty fathers gave and estimated significant responses for one of the questions. This question is: "Would you prefer that school lasted longer so you would not need to be home so much?" The percentage of children giving significant

1 Thorpe, Clark and Tiegs, op. cit., p. 3.

responses for question 109 was lower than those of either mothers or fathers expecting such answers and the percentage of children was less than that of fathers for question 118 and less than that of mothers for question 119. These questions are:

109. Are you made to feel that you are as good as anyone else in your family?

118. Is there someone in your home who will talk things over with you?

119. Is it hard to talk things over with your folks because they don't understand you?

Table 28. A comparison of parent judgments with the responses of their children and with the judgments of their spouses for questions in sub-test IID.

Number of parents	Higher than			
	Sons	Daughters	Other parent (sons)	Other parent (daughters)
Mothers	5	6	10	8
Fathers	4	8	6	8

As shown in Table 28, fourteen parents overestimated the responses of sons as compared to nine parents who overestimated those of daughters. The number of husbands who estimated daughters higher than their wives did was identical to the number of mothers who estimated daughters' scores higher than did their husbands. Ten mothers of sons, however, estimated child responses higher than did

their husbands as compared to six fathers of sons who estimated boys' scores higher than did their wives.

There were high correlations in this component with father-son, mother-son, and mother-daughter correlations being significant at the .01 level of confidence. It would be interesting to test father-daughter understanding with regards to the feelings of girls concerning family relationships in a somewhat less limited study.

Sub-test IIE, School Relations

The authors of the test state that the child who is satisfactorily adjusted to his school "is the one who feels that his teachers like him, who enjoys playing with other children, and who finds the school work adapted to his level of interest and maturity. Good school relations involve the feeling on the part of the pupil that he counts for something in the life of the institution."[1]

The percentage of children giving significant answers is not less than the percentages of both mothers and fathers estimating significant responses on any of the questions in this sub-test. As shown in Table 29, however, the percentage of children giving significant responses

---

1 Thorpe, Clark and Tiegs, op. cit., p. 3.

is less than that of fathers estimating such responses on question 124 and less than that of mothers on questions 126, 127, 129, and 130. These questions are:

124. Do you like most of the things you have to do in school?

126. Do the boys and girls at school often say things that make you feel bad?

127. Do you feel that any of the teachers are mean to children?

129. Does someone at school make you feel that you are not very bright?

130. Does it bother you to have your teacher tell you what you should do?

The percentage of children making significant responses ranged from sixty percent to ninety-seven and one-half percent on this sub-test.

Table 29. Percentages of subjects giving significant answers or judgments for the questions in sub-test IIE, school relations.

Question	Children	Fathers	Mothers
121	75	70	65
122	87.5	75	75
123	90	85	85
124	87.5	90	85
125	72.5	67.5	67.5
126	72.5	65	77.5
127	60	57.5	70
128	72.5	72.5	70
129	85	85	87.5
130	92.5	85	97.5
131	95	90	95
132	97.5	97.5	95

Data presented in Table 30 verify the fact that mothers were likely to make higher estimates than fathers on this component. The number of mothers, however, who estimated higher than sons' scores and the number of mothers who estimated higher than daughters' scores were identical to the number of fathers estimating higher than sons' scores and the number of fathers estimating higher than daughters' scores.

Table 30. A comparison of parent judgments with the responses of their children and with the judgments of their spouses for questions in sub-test III.

Number of parents	Higher than			
	Sons	Daughters	Other parent (sons)	Other parent (daughters)
Mothers	6	10	9	9
Fathers	6	10	7	4

Statistically significant correlations at the .01 level of confidence existed in the father-son and mother-daughter relationships. It appeared, then, that in this study mothers had greater insight as to girls' feelings regarding school relations and that fathers had better understanding of sons' feelings concerning this group of questions.

Sub-test IIF, Community Relations

According to the authors of the test, "the pupil who may be said to be making good adjustments in his community is the one who mingles happily with his neighbors, who takes pride in community improvements, and who is tolerant in dealing with both strangers and foreigners. Satisfactory community relations include as well the disposition to be respectful of laws and of regulations pertaining to the general welfare."[1]

Table 31. Percentages of subjects giving significant answers or judgments for the questions in sub-test IIF, community relations.

Question	Children	Fathers	Mothers
133	77.5	67.5	77.5
134	85	82.5	87.5
135	35	60	65
136	70	77.5	77.5
137	85	77.5	75
138	85	80	77.5
139	97.5	95	95
140	85	82.5	70
141	95	80	65
142	97.5	92.5	95
143	95	95	92.5
144	95	90	82.5

The percentage of children giving significant answers to the questions of this sub-test was equal to or more than the percentage of parents expecting significant responses on all questions except question 135,

"Would you like to have things look better around your house?"

A number of pilot interviews with fourteen-year-old children were conducted. These were followed by parent interviews and efforts at analysis. The investigator and others interested in child psychology were puzzled by the large number of affirmative answers given by children to this question. Sixty-five percent of the children in the present study answered this question affirmatively. This percentage was the largest representative of non-significant responses for any question on the entire test. Could it be, then, that child interpretation of this question might be at variance with adult interpretation? Could it be possible that the question denoted physical improvement to parents but a need for greater orderliness to children? If so, could parental pressures, perhaps, have made the child feel a need for "things to look better around the house"?

Table 32. A comparison of parent judgments with the responses of their children and with the judgments of their spouses for questions in sub-test IIF.

Number of parents	Higher than			
	Sons	Daughters	Other parent (Sons)	Other parent (daughters)
Mothers	9	4	7	5
Fathers	7	3	6	9

In Table 32 a comparison of parent judgments with the responses of their children and with the judgments of their spouses for questions in this sub-test is presented. The only highly significant statistical correlations in this sub-test were for mother-son and mother-daughter relationships. These were both significant at the .01 level of confidence with the mother-son correlation a little higher than the mother-daughter one. It would seem, then, that mothers in the study were more aware than fathers of child feelings regarding the neighborhood situation since most of the questions in this sub-test pertain to neighborhood relationships.

Interests and Activities Inventory

The activities and interests part of the California Test of Personality, Elementary Series, was presented to the children in this study as a possible means of discovering whether or not these twelve-year-old girls might be more advanced in level of interest-maturity than were the boys. Data for these scores is presented in Table 33. It is evident that the girls, by expressing an average liking for three hundred and ninety three out of a possible nine hundred and sixty of the social activities listed, surpassed the boys who expressed an average liking for only thirty three percent of these activities.

The girls also reported that they participated, on the average, in thirty three percent of the activities listed while the boys reported an average of any twenty three percent.

Table 33. Activities reported by children in the study.

Children	Individual Activities		Social Activities	
	would like to do	actually do	would like to do	actually do
Girls	522 (57%)	422 (46%)	393 (41%)	317 (33%)
Boys	399 (42%)	329 (36%)	314 (33%)	224 (23%)

Girls expressed more desire to do and more participation in the individual activities as well as in the social ones. Over-all data show that these twelve-year-old children would like to do more of both kinds of activities than they actually do. Eight boys and five girls, however, reported that they did more of the individual type activities than they would like to do. The fact that the list of activities which are primarily individual includes the studying of various school subjects might provide a basis for some of the reports which were made. Two boys and one girl reported doing more social activities than they liked to do. This list of social

activities, however, includes church and Sunday school attendance which may represent adult pressures for a few of the children in this age group. Further analysis could provide data worthy of study.

These findings would seem to be in partial disagreement with those reported by Terman. He stated that "Girls surpass boys at nearly all ages in social interest and boys surpass girls at most ages in activity level."[1]

Evaluation of Findings of the Main Study

In summarizing the findings from this study, several dangers become apparent. It is probable that the age of these subjects limits the possibility for generalization. The acceleration of development at this early adolescent period and the unevenness of such acceleration would place limitations on the expectation of easily classified results.

It is also true that experimental methods for investigation of problems of interpersonal understanding yield data to which rather tentative interpretations must be given. In choosing a certain inventory as a basis for observation, the investigator was aware that all conclusions could be expressed only on the basis of that parti-

---

1 Lewis M. Terman, Genetic Studies of Genius, Volume I, p. 483.

cular set of questions. In line with current thinking on the study of personality, the brief interview method, also, limits conclusions to a narrow range of time. Thus, we can only say that at a particular time these subjects responded in a certain manner and must admit that at another time and in another situation responses might have been different. The method is not without merit, however, since data are comparable from case to case and can be handled quantitatively.

It was evident that parents were likely to underestimate child responses in areas of self adjustment and to overestimate child responses in areas of social adjustment but that parent estimates were more accurate when social adjustment was considered. It is probable that this comparative accuracy might have been due to the fact that social adjustment is more easily discerned than is self adjustment and that patterns of social adjustment of children would be more similar to parental patterns than would those of self adjustment.

When comparisons of father-son, father-daughter, mother-son, and mother-daughter relationships were made, the same rank order existed in both areas of adjustment with father-son being the most similar and mother-son, mother-daughter, and father-daughter following in the order named from high to low. The extent of father-daughter understanding was strikingly slight. Such findings

were of especial interest in view of the fact that many writers have postulated the need for cross-sexual understanding. Some previous studies have reported definite patterns of father-daughter and mother-son agreement.

It is true that the majority of these girls had reached puberty. Could it be, then, that their advanced maturity and the recency of such rapid maturation made parental insight more difficult? As a means of ascertaining the maturity level of the children in the study the interests and activities section of the questionnaire was employed. Results as to the comparative levels of maturity for the sexes seemed inconclusive. The only significant finding appeared to be the fact that the girls, as compared to the boys, expressed a desire to do more of both the individual type and the social type of activities than they actually did.

It has been the premise of many writers that with increasing age the number of interests and activities becomes more limited. Could it be that there is a general spreading out and a desire for exploration in many things during pubescence and that these girls had reached that stage while the activity level of the boys was less advanced? When certain relationships are contemplated, we can simply raise questions which seem to warrant further investigation under conditions which offer additional case

material. Further research as to the characteristic likes and dislikes of activities for this age group might reveal pertinent factors.

When the findings of the study were evaluated, the investigator recognized that a longitudinal study wherein the same children and parents might be interviewed several times from the time the children were nearing pubescence through the adolescent period might provide the answers to many inconclusive factors.

Analysis of Close and Divergent Groups

The eight children having the scores closest to parent judgment scores and the eight children having the scores which varied the most from scores of parent estimation were chosen for supplementary study. For these subjects, estimates of child scores were obtained from two teachers and were compared with parent estimates. It was the purpose of the investigator to determine how teacher judgments might compare with parent judgments and, also, to learn what characteristics of child scores or parent estimates made these particular cases extreme as to the range of scores and estimates.

On one questionnaire total parent-child scores had a range of only two points and there were seven other family sets with a range of nine points or less. These

data and identification numbers for the subjects in this close group are shown in Table 34. Those eight family sets with most divergent scores showed a spread of twenty nine to forty two points in total raw score differences between parent estimates and child scores. Identification numbers for these subjects may also be seen in Table 34.

Table 34. Identification of subjects for which teacher-judgments were obtained.

Close parent-child scores		Divergent parent-child scores	
Case number	Range of scores	Case number	Range of scores
8	2	14	42
36	3	35	41
3	5	5	38
11	5	39	35
15	7	37	32
29	7	16	30
2	9	27	29
22	9	34	29

Each of the two teachers interviewed asked that she be excused from responding to sub-test F, Section I, freedom from nervous symptoms; and to sub-test F, Section II, community relations. It would seem that child scores for the first of these could have been estimated as easily as for other sub-tests but that teacher knowledge concerning the child's feelings about the questions in Section II,

sub-test F, might be slight. Since both teachers responded to only ten sub-tests, however, data were compared for only those tests with this smaller group of children and parents.

Teacher-child coefficients of correlation are shown in Table 35. On only two of the sub-tests were teacher-child correlations highly significant for both teachers. These were negative on sub-test E, Section I, freedom from withdrawing tendencies, and positive on sub-test B, Section II, social skills. Table 8 illustrates that father-child and mother-child correlations were not highly significant on either of these sub-tests. Teacher-child correlations for neither teacher seemed to be consistently higher than for the other teacher-child combination.

Small, negative correlations existed for both teachers in the sub-test denoting sense of personal freedom and both teacher-child correlations were negative on the sub-test having to do with school relations. One of these was noticibly higher than the other. There were nine highly significant coefficients of correlation when considering the two teachers and this small group of children as compared to six for parents and all forty of the children when only the same ten sub-tests were employed.

Table 35. Coefficients of correlation between raw scores of children and estimates of teachers for each of ten sub-tests.

Sub-tests	ct_1 [1]	ct_2 [2]
Self-reliance	.548**	.269
Sense of personal worth	-.029	.096
Sense of personal freedom	-.170	-.028
Feeling of belonging	.471**	.125
Freedom from withdrawing tendencies	-.310*	-.581**
Social standards	-.120	.534**
Social skills	.327*	.810**
Freedom from anti-social tendencies	.225	-.142
Family relations	-.112	.442**
School relations	-.190	-.674**

* significant at the 5% level of confidence.
** significant at the 1% level of confidence
1 ct_1 -child and teacher number 1.
2 ct_2 -child and teacher number 2.

Close Group

Case Study Number 8. Number 8 was a girl in the seventh grade, the daughter of a skilled workman. Her family was one of the largest in the study. Her older siblings ranged as old as twenty four years and she had one younger sibling. The subject's name was obtained from other children who were interviewed and her parents were very co-operative. This subject seemed serious, quiet, and older in appearance than many of the other children in the study.

Studied insight with regard to the child's development was shown by the father in the following conversation. The mother stated, "I think these questions are too young for _____." The father replied, "Perhaps, but just a few months ago they wouldn't have been." This conversation together with the fact that the interviewer was not addressed by either parent at the time would seem to indicate a family practice of talking over matters pertaining to the child and to demonstrate rapport between husband and wife.

As seen in Table 36, the child's raw score was lower than the estimates of parents or teachers for Section I but the range for the five raw scores was only from 50 to 56 points. Mother, father, and one of the teachers had identical raw scores for Section II. These scores were two

points lower than the child's score and two points higher than that of the other teacher. Total raw scores for the five persons had a range of only five points with the teachers' estimates identical and slightly higher than those of the parents.

Table 36. Raw scores for subject Number 8.

Test divisions	Child	Father	Mother	T1 [1]	T2 [2]
Self-reliance	7	8	10	10	8
Sense of personal worth	11	12	11	11	12
Sense of personal freedom	10	9	10	12	12
Feeling of belonging	12	12	12	12	12
Freedom from withdrawing tendencies	10	12	8	11	8
Self adjustment	50	53	51	56	52
Social standards	12	12	12	12	12
Social skills	12	10	8	11	12
Freedom from anti-social tendencies	12	12	12	11	12
Family relations	12	11	12	12	12
School relations	10	11	12	10	12
Social adjustment	58	56	56	56	60
Total adjustment	108	109	107	112	112

1 T1 -Teacher number 1.
2 T2 -Teacher number 2.

Case Study Number 36. A girl in the eighth grade who was the daughter of a skilled workman was number 36 in this study. She had one sibling of the opposite sex who was two years her senior. Her case was chosen for special study and for teacher judgments because the range of parent-child raw scores on the test was only three points.

This interview was worthy of consideration because each parent remarked several times that he or she wished it were possible to know how the other parent was responding to the questions. It was the only interview in which a parent seemed to be more interested in the responses of the other parent than in those of the child and the only case in which parent estimates of child responses were only one point at variance in Section I and were identical for Section II.

Table 37 shows raw score comparisons for the ten subtests for which the teachers responded. When only these ten units were considered, parent estimates were lower than child scores on Section I but higher on Section II. Teachers estimated higher responses than the child gave for total scores on both parts of the test.

Table 37. Raw scores for subject Number 36.

Test divisions	Child	Father	Mother	T1 [1]	T2 [2]
Self-reliance	7	8	4	11	11
Sense of personal worth	11	8	12	12	12
Sense of personal freedom	10	4	8	12	10
Feeling of belonging	12	9	12	12	12
Freedom from withdrawing tendencies	10	10	8	10	9
Self adjustment	50	39	44	57	54
Social standards	10	12	12	12	12
Social skills	9	12	11	9	12
Freedom from anti-social tendencies	10	12	11	11	12
Family relations	11	11	11	12	12
School relations	8	11	12	12	12
Social adjustment	52	58	57	55	60
Total adjustment	102	97	101	112	114

1 T1 -Teacher number 1.
2 T2 -Teacher number 2.

Case Study Number 3. Case study number 3 was a boy in the seventh grade. He had one younger sibling of the opposite sex. His father was employed in the teaching profession. Almost no conversation took place during the interview with this family, perhaps because the child and the parents were hurrying in order to attend other meetings.

Table 38 shows total scores for this subject group. The range of parent estimates and child scores for all sub-tests was three points for Section I and eight points for Section II or a range for total scores of five points. This case is unique in the fact that estimates of both teachers were lower than those of parents and lower than child scores for the total test. For no other case considered were the estimates of both teachers so low in comparison with other scores.

In this case some discrepancies in teacher estimates seem worthy of consideration. For example, could it be that what teacher number 1 deemed poor social skills may have been attributed to poor school relations and to withdrawing tendencies by teacher number 2?

Table 38. Raw scores for subject Number 3.

Test divisions	Child	Father	Mother	T1[1]	T2[2]
Self-reliance	10	7	8	11	10
Sense of personal worth	11	10	12	10	11
Sense of personal freedom	12	11	9	8	10
Feeling of belonging	10	11	12	12	11
Freedom from withdrawing tendencies	11	11	9	10	7
Self adjustment	54	50	50	51	49
Social standards	12	12	12	11	12
Social skills	8	9	8	5	9
Freedom from anti-social tendencies	8	12	11	11	11
Family relations	11	12	12	12	11
School relations	12	12	11	12	7
Social adjustment	51	57	54	51	50
Total adjustment	105	107	104	102	100

1 T1 -Teacher number 1.
2 T2 -Teacher number 2.

Case Study Number 11. This subject was a boy in the seventh grade. His father was a member of the professional class and the subject had one younger sibling of the opposite sex. There was no conversation regarding the test between parents or between either parent and child during the interview.

The range of parent estimates and child scores for the sub-tests having to do with self adjustment was five points; the range for the social adjustment sub-tests was three points; and range for total scores for the entire test was five points. Table 39 shows raw scores for ten of these sub-tests. On these particular sub-tests, the range of parent-child scores was only four points on self adjustment; only two points on social adjustment; and only two points on total adjustment. Thus, this case can truly be considered one in which parent judgments were close to child scores.

Both of the teacher estimates were higher than child scores and higher than parent estimates on all but two of the groups of questions and both teachers' estimates equaled or exceeded at least two of the other respondents on those. Teacher estimates of total scores were identical and were twenty points above the child's actual score.

Table 39. Raw scores for subject Number 11.

Test divisions	Child	Father	Mother	T1 [1]	T2 [2]
Self-reliance	6	3	5	9	9
Sense of personal worth	11	9	10	10	11
Sense of personal freedom	8	7	5	10	12
Feeling of belonging	10	12	12	12	12
Freedom from withdrawing tendencies	8	8	8	11	9
Self adjustment	43	39	40	52	53
Social standards	11	12	12	12	12
Social skills	7	5	6	10	9
Freedom from anti-social tendencies	6	12	9	11	11
Family relations	11	8	9	12	12
School relations	11	11	12	12	12
Social adjustment	46	48	48	57	56
Total adjustment	89	87	88	109	109

1 T1 -Teacher number 1.
2 T2 -Teacher number 2.

Case Study Number 29. The father of subject number 29 was a business executive. There was one younger boy in the family. This boy was in the seventh grade in school. Although the parents and child were co-operative, it was impossible to arrange for concurrent interviews. The child filled in the questionnaire one day and his parents responded on the following day.

Father-son scores appeared to be closer than did mother-son scores for Section I and the opposite seemed to be true for Section II. As shown in Table 40, all five scores were strikingly similar for the sub-test, self-reliance. Teacher number two made a very low estimate on the questions having to do with freedom from withdrawing tendencies and the other teacher and both parents underestimated child scores on this sub-test to a lesser degree.

Both of the teachers and the parents estimated below the child's score for total self adjustment. All estimates were, however, higher than the child's score for social adjustment with the exception of the father's. His estimate was exactly the same as the child's score. For total adjustment, teacher number two and the father underestimated; the mother's estimate was identical to the child's score; and teacher number one was higher by five points.

Table 40. Raw scores for subject Number 29.

Test divisions	Child	Father	Mother	T1 [1]	T2 [2]
Self-reliance	8	9	7	8	8
Sense of personal worth	9	9	12	10	8
Sense of personal freedom	10	7	8	12	12
Feeling of belonging	12	11	12	12	12
Freedom from withdrawing tendencies	12	10	8	8	2
Self adjustment	51	46	47	50	42
Social standards	7	12	12	12	11
Social skills	9	7	9	11	10
Freedom from anti-social tendencies	12	10	12	12	11
Family relations	12	12	12	12	11
School relations	12	11	11	11	12
Social adjustment	52	52	56	58	55
Total adjustment	103	98	103	108	97

1 T1 -Teacher number 1.
2 T2 -Teacher number 2

Case Study Number 15. The father of subject number 15 was a college professor and the subject's mother had studied at the graduate level. The only sibling was of the opposite sex and was younger than the subject. This case was of particular interest because the child's scores on the inventory were the lowest received from any respondent. Yet, he was included in the close-agreement group since parent estimates showed keen insight as to his responses.

Teacher estimates for this subject were at about the same level as for other children who gave a far greater number of significant responses. When only the ten sub-tests judged by the teachers were considered, the parents' estimates and the child's scores varied only seven points on self adjustment and the three persons' scores were identical for social adjustment.

When teacher estimates were studied, a range from child scores of seventeen points for teacher number one and a range of fifteen points for teacher number two existed for Section I. An overestimate of child scores by twenty points for teacher number one and an overestimate of nineteen points for teacher number two were evident for Section II. This teacher judgment of child scores seemed particularly significant for the sub-test on school relations since parent estimates were much nearer child scores. The range of scores for total ad-

justment as shown in Table 41 was only seven points when parents and child were considered but was forty four points when teacher estimates were included.

Table 41. Raw scores for subject Number 15.

Test divisions	Child	Father	Mother	T1 [1]	T2 [2]
Self-reliance	8	5	6	10	10
Sense of personal worth	7	8	5	12	12
Sense of personal freedom	8	5	4	10	9
Feeling of belonging	10	9	8	11	10
Freedom from withdrawing tendencies	4	7	7	11	11
Self adjustment	37	34	30	54	52
Social standards	10	11	11	10	10
Social skills	8	7	3	9	9
Freedom from anti-social tendencies	6	5	5	12	12
Family relations	7	6	8	12	11
School relations	4	6	9	12	12
Social adjustment	35	35	35	55	54
Total adjustment	72	69	65	109	106

1 T1 -Teacher number 1.
2 T2 -Teacher number 2.

Case Study Number 22. The subject whose assigned number was 22 was a girl in the seventh grade whose father was a skilled workman. This subject had one younger sister. There was little conversation during the interview except that both parents expressed the believ that the felt they knew how their daughter would respond to questions having to do with ethical standards. These comments seemed to agree with the extent of activity of this family in church work. Such questions are interspersed in most of the sub-tests. As shown in Table 42, parent estimates and child scores were close for both sections of the test, especially for Section II, social adjustment. In this case, as in almost all of the others, the teachers estimated child responses on almost all of the sub-tests higher than they really were.

This father and daughter had identical scores on the sub-test, sense of personal freedom, with the mother and both teachers estimating higher on that component. The only other unusual feature was the low estimate of the mother on the sub-test, social skills, and the less divergent low estimate of the father on the sub-test having to do with family relations. Teachers were, again, higher than parent estimates and higher than child scores.

Table 42. Raw scores for subject Number 22.

Test divisions	Child	Father	Mother	T1[1]	T2[2]
Self-reliance	6	9	8	12	10
Sense of personal worth	11	10	11	11	11
Sense of personal freedom	9	9	11	11	12
Feeling of belonging	12	11	12	11	11
Freedom from withdrawing tendencies	12	10	11	10	10
Self adjustment	50	49	53	55	54
Social standards	10	11	12	12	12
Social skills	9	9	6	11	10
Freedom from anti-social tendencies	11	10	11	12	12
Family relations	12	10	12	12	12
School relations	12	12	12	12	12
Social adjustment	54	52	53	59	58
Total adjustment	104	101	106	119	112

1 T1 -Teacher number 1.
2 T2 -Teacher number 2.

Case Study Number 2. This subject was a seventh grade girl who had one sibling of the opposite sex. Her father was a skilled workman whose type of employment made this family more transient than the other families in this study. The interviewer was aware during the interview, however, of the intra-family rapport that existed with this family as it did for the other seven families in this group. With this family rapport might have been more noticible because of the comparatively less convenient and less attractive nature of the home environment.

Although total raw score estimates and scores for the two sections and for the total test were close, as shown in Table 43, there seemed to be rather poor agreement on several of the sub-tests. For example, the child responded with significant answers to all twelve questions denoting social standards while the father's estimate was only seven points and the mother's estimate was ten points. Conversely, the child's score for the sub-test, freedom from anti-social tendencies was only six points while the father and the mother estimated twelve and eleven points respectively. The parent estimates and the child score were identical for the sub-test, school relations.

Teacher estimates were relatively higher on most of the sub-tests for subject number 2 with both teachers estimating higher than other respondents for total scores in

social adjustment. The only unusual teacher estimates were those of teacher number one for the sub-test, sense of personal worth, and a slightly less divergent estimate by the same teacher for the sub-test, freedom from withdrawing tendencies.

Table 43. Raw scores for subject Number 2.

Test divisions	Child	Father	Mother	T1 [1]	T2 [2]
Self-reliance	4	9	8	5	7
Sense of personal worth	10	11	10	5	10
Sense of personal freedom	10	10	4	11	12
Feeling of belonging	8	11	11	11	12
Freedom from withdrawing tendencies	9	10	9	6	8
Self adjustment	41	51	42	38	49
Social standards	12	7	10	12	12
Social skills	10	7	10	8	11
Freedom from anti-social tendencies	6	12	11	11	12
Family relations	11	12	9	12	12
School relations	11	11	11	12	11
Social adjustment	51	49	51	55	58
Total adjustment	92	100	93	93	107

1 T1 -Teacher number 1.
2 T2 -Teacher number 2.

Teacher Estimates for the Close Group

Data in Table 44 show that for five out of the eight children in the close group teacher number one overestimated child scores on Section I of the test; that she estimated higher than both parents for seven of the eight children; that in no case was she lower than one parent and higher than the other; and that she estimated child responses higher than did teacher number two for six of the eight children.

Teacher number one overestimated child scores for six of the eight children when social adjustment was considered; she estimated higher than both parents for five of these children; in no instance was she lower than one parent and higher than the other; and she estimated child responses higher than did teacher number two for four of the eight children.

For six of the eight children in the close group teacher number two overestimated child responses when self adjustment was considered; for four of these children she estimated higher than both parents; in two cases she was higher than one parent and lower than the other; and for two of the children she estimated higher than did teacher number one.

Teacher number two overestimated child scores for seven of the eight children when social adjustment was

considered; she estimated higher than both parents for six of these children; in one instance she estimated higher than one parent and lower than the other; and she estimated child responses higher than did teacher number one in four instances.

Table 44. Comparison of teacher estimates with parent estimates and child scores for the close group.

Teacher	Higher than			
	Child	Both parents	One parent	Other teacher
		Self adjustment		
Number one	5	7	0	6
Number two	6	4	2	2
		Social adjustment		
Number one	6	5	0	4
Number two	7	6	1	4

Divergent Group

Case Study Number 14. This child was a seventh grade girl who had no siblings. Her father was a skilled workman. The child seemed to be more mature than many of the other respondents but parental attitudes did not reflect a recognition of this maturity. The interviewer was shown

the child's room which was decorated in a manner usually adopted for much younger children.

Parent estimates and child scores showed a greater range for this subject than for any of the other thirty nine children in the study. Scores as shown in Table 45 illustrate that parent estimates were lower than child scores on all sub-tests except for the father's estimate on questions having to do with family relations in which the father overestimated by one point and for the sub-test, school relations, for which the mother overestimated by one point.

The range of parent estimates and child scores was twenty eight points for self adjustment as compared to fourteen points for social adjustment. When only the ten sub-tests for which teacher's estimates were obtained were considered, the parent-child range was twenty three points for self adjustment and eight points for social adjustment.

The teachers' estimates followed child scores more closely. Both teachers underestimated child scores slightly when considering self adjustment and overestimated slightly when considering social adjustment. The range of teacher estimates and child scores was only three points for self adjustment and only four points for social adjustment.

Table 45. Raw scores for subject Number 14.

Test divisions	Child	Father	Mother	T1 [1]	T2 [2]
Self-reliance	11	10	6	10	10
Sense of personal worth	12	12	7	12	11
Sense of personal freedom	11	4	6	12	10
Feeling of belonging	12	11	8	12	12
Freedom from withdrawing tendencies	11	8	7	9	11
Self adjustment	57	45	34	55	54
Social standards	12	11	11	12	11
Social skills	11	8	7	11	11
Freedom from antisocial tendencies	11	8	8	12	12
Family relations	11	12	11	12	12
School relations	10	10	11	12	12
Social adjustment	55	49	47	59	58
Total adjustment	112	94	81	114	112

1 T1 -Teacher number one.
2 T2 -Teacher number two.

Case Study Number 35. This subject was a boy in the eighth grade who had one older sister. He was very small for his age and was immature in manner. His father was a college professor.

Parents' estimates and child scores had a range of twenty six points in self adjustment with the father underestimating child scores by twelve points and the mother overestimating by sixteen points. The same general trend was evident in social adjustment with the father estimating child responses fourteen points lower than they were but the mother overestimating by only one point.

As shown in Table 46 scores for the ten sub-tests for which teacher estimates were obtained had the same relationship as to parent and child scores as did those of the complete test. Teachers' estimates were closer to parent estimates for this child than for most of the other subjects in the close and divergent groups.

Unusual aspects of this case were the child's scores for the sub-test, freedom from withdrawing tendencies and for the sub-test, school relations. Child scores were higher than the four estimates for those two groups of questions. This was the only subject for which any estimate was as low as one point on any sub-test. The father estimated a score of only one point on the sub-test, sense of personal freedom, and teacher number one estimated only one point for the sub-test, feeling of belonging.

Table 46. Raw scores for subject Number 35.

Test divisions	Child	Father	Mother	T1 [1]	T2 [2]
Self-reliance	7	5	9	6	9
Sense of personal worth	4	3	9	4	8
Sense of personal freedom	7	1	6	5	10
Feeling of belonging	3	8	10	1	10
Freedom from withdrawing tendencies	12	5	11	6	10
Self adjustment	30	22	45	22	47
Social standards	11	9	12	12	10
Social skills	9	7	10	6	6
Freedom from anti-social tendencies	9	9	12	4	9
Family relations	9	6	10	9	11
School relations	12	8	10	5	10
Social adjustment	50	39	54	36	46
Total adjustment	80	61	99	58	93

1 T1 -Teacher number one.
2 T2 -Teacher number two.

Case Study Number 5. This subject was a seventh grade boy. He had one younger sibling of the opposite sex. His father was a skilled workman. This interview differed from all others in that the child was more timid than other subjects; he was co-operative but did not seem to approach the experience in a spirit of fun as did the other children.

This case differed from five of the others in this divergent group due to the fact that the wide range between parent estimates and child scores could be attributed to the divergence of the mother's estimates while the father's estimates were relatively close to the child's scores. This was true of two other cases in this group: case Number 39 and case Number 16.

The trend of the father's estimates from one sub-test to another paralleled child scores throughout the section concerning self adjustment as did the mother's estimates although the latter were at a lower level. The trend of the father's estimates for the section, social adjustment, was also parallel to child scores but the mother's estimates were particularly divergent on the sub-test which denotes social skills and on the one concerning freedom from anti-social tendencies.

As shown in Table 47, the teachers' estimates were also unusual for this case since both of the teachers estimated lower than total child scores in both sections of the test. The interviewer would be likely to attribute these estimates

to the child's obvious timidity. No belief in a preponderance of withdrawing tendencies was evidenced by any of the respondents so, apparently, his shyness was not defined as a type of withdrawal.

Table 47. Raw scores for subject Number 5.

Test divisions	Child	Father	Mother	T1[1]	T2[2]
Self-reliance	10	8	8	8	7
Sense of personal worth	12	12	10	9	9
Sense of personal freedom	10	9	6	9	5
Feeling of belonging	12	10	8	9	10
Freedom from withdrawing tendencies	12	11	8	7	10
Self adjustment	56	50	40	42	41
Social standards	11	10	11	12	11
Social skills	12	12	7	10	12
Freedom from anti-social tendencies	10	10	5	11	8
Family relations	12	12	9	12	9
School relations	12	11	8	8	7
Social adjustment	57	55	40	53	47
Total adjustment	113	105	80	95	88

1 T1 -Teacher number one.
2 T2 -Teacher number two.

Case Study Number 39. This subject was the son of a college professor. The child had one younger sibling of the opposite sex. Like case Number 35, he was an eighth grade pupil and was undersize for his age. Unlike subject Number 35, however, he was not immature in actions nor in appearance. In this case the mother's estimates were the divergent factor.

For social adjustment both the mother's and the father's estimates followed the child's score trends from one sub-test to the next except for the sub-test, sense of personal freedom, in which the father overestimated the child's scores more than in other components. The trend of the mother's estimates was identical to that of child scores but was at a much lower level.

As shown in Table 48, the father's estimates were similar to child scores for Section II but were slightly higher on the first three sub-tests of that section. The mother's estimates were lower than the child's scores on all components with the exception of those concerning social standards and freedom from anti-social tendencies. Worthy of notice is the mother's estimate of only two points for the sub-test, sense of personal freedom, which is seven points lower than the child's score and nine points lower than the father's estimate.

Teacher estimates were consistently higher than those

of the other three respondents in this case. There is a possibility that this response by teachers could be explained by the fact that the child seemed very serious and was probably amenable to school routines.

Table 48. Raw scores for subject Number 39.

Test divisions	Child	Father	Mother	T1 [1]	T2 [2]
Self-reliance	7	7	5	10	10
Sense of personal worth	11	10	10	12	12
Sense of personal freedom	9	11	2	11	12
Feeling of belonging	11	11	10	12	12
Freedom from withdrawing tendencies	6	4	2	9	10
Self adjustment	46	45	29	54	56
Social standards	11	12	12	12	12
Social skills	7	10	3	11	10
Freedom from anti-social tendencies	8	11	9	12	12
Family relations	12	12	8	12	12
School relations	11	10	7	12	12
Social adjustment	49	55	39	59	58
Total adjustment	95	100	68	113	114

1 T1 -Teacher number one.
2 T2 -Teacher number two.

Case Study Number 37. This eighth grade boy was the son of a college professor and had one older sibling of the opposite sex. As with three of the other cases in this group of children, the divergence of the mother's estimates from the child's scores was the contributory factor in the selection of this subject for special study. Unlike those other cases, however, the mother demonstrated good insight as to the child's feelings in answering the questions pertaining to social adjustment; she apparently had a poor understanding when self adjustment components were considered.

Divergent estimates in the area of self adjustment were the mother's low estimate and the father's high estimate on the sub-test, freedom from nervous symptoms. This was unusual since coefficients of correlation between parent estimates and child scores were higher in this sub-test than in other sub-tests when all forty children were considered.

As shown in Table 49, the estimates of both of the teachers equaled or exceeded child scores on both of the main sections of the inventory except for that of teacher number two for the section having to do with self adjustment. Both teachers estimated higher than the other respondents when considering school relations. As in the case of subject Number 39, this may have been due to the serious nature of the child.

Table 49. Raw scores for subject Number 37.

Test divisions	Child	Father	Mother	T1[1]	T2[2]
Self-reliance	8	8	6	11	10
Sense of personal worth	11	12	11	12	12
Sense of personal freedom	10	9	2	6	4
Feeling of belonging	12	12	11	12	12
Freedom from withdrawing tendencies	9	12	6	10	9
Self adjustment	50	53	36	51	47
Social standards	12	12	12	11	12
Social skills	7	10	10	10	9
Freedom from anti-social tendencies	11	12	10	12	12
Family relations	12	12	9	10	10
School relations	9	10	10	12	11
Social adjustment	51	56	51	55	54
Total adjustment	101	109	87	106	101

1 T1 -Teacher number one.
2 T2 -Teacher number two.

Case Study Number 16. This child was the seventh grade daughter of an unskilled workman. She had one younger sibling of the opposite sex. As shown in Table 50, the father's estimates were close to scores made by the child with an overall range of only six points. The mother, however, underestimated child scores by thirty points when all sub-tests were considered and by twenty eight points when the ten sub-tests to which teachers responded were considered.

While father estimates were close to the child's scores, generally, in the area of self adjustment there was little evident agreement as to scores on the various sub-tests. The mother's estimates were lower than child scores for every sub-test of the inventory except for a one point overestimate on the sub-test, school relations. The most striking divergence was the mother's estimate on the sub-test concerning sense of personal worth.

Both of the teachers estimated higher on both sections of the test than the child's scores actually were. The teachers' estimates were higher than child scores for each of the various sub-tests except for those of teacher number one for the sub-test, sense of personal worth, and for the sub-test, sense of personal freedom. The range of the five respondents for the total test was forty two points which was exceeded only by those persona responding for case Number 39.

Table 50. Raw scores for subject Number 16.

Test divisions	Child	Father	Mother	1 T1	2 T2
Self-reliance	8	10	6	9	9
Sense of personal worth	11	7	3	12	9
Sense of personal freedom	9	4	8	11	8
Feeling of belonging	10	11	6	12	10
Freedom from withdrawing tendencies	6	8	4	10	10
Self adjustment	44	40	27	54	46
Social standards	12	12	11	11	12
Social skills	10	9	6	9	10
Freedom from anti-social tendencies	8	9	7	12	12
Family relations	11	9	6	12	11
School relations	10	9	11	12	12
Social adjustment	51	48	41	56	57
Total adjustment	95	88	68	110	103

1 T1 -Teacher number one.
2 T2 -Teacher number two.

Case Study Number 27. This eighth grade student was the son of a college professor. There was one younger sibling of the same sex. This case is unique due to the fact that while the mother's estimates were the divergent factor they were higher rather than lower that the child's scores. This is the only case in the divergent group in which the child's scores were lower than both parents' estimates. As shown in Table 51, the only sub-test for which both parents estimated lower than actual child scores was that pertaining to social standards. The trend of parent overestimation for this subject was particularly noticible in the sub-tests having to do with sense of personal worth, freedom from anti-social tendencies, and school relations.

On the total test the father's estimate was thirteen points above the child's score and the mother's estimate was twenty nine points above the child's score. When only the sub-tests to which teachers responded were considered, the differences were ten and twenty six points respectively.

Like the mother, the teachers estimated far higher than this child's scores actually were on both sections of the test. The teacher estimates most similar to actual scores were those of teacher number one on the sub-tests, feeling of belonging, freedom from withdrawing tendencies, and social skills. This teacher's estimates for

the total test were nearer the child's scores and the father's estimates than were the estimates of the mother or those of teacher number two.

Table 51. Raw scores for subject Number 27.

Test divisions	Child	Father	Mother	T1[1]	T2[2]
Self-reliance	7	8	7	10	9
Sense of personal worth	6	11	12	11	12
Sense of personal freedom	9	6	11	12	10
Feeling of belonging	8	9	11	8	12
Freedom from withdrawing tendencies	7	10	11	8	9
Self adjustment	37	42	52	49	52
Social standards	12	11	11	12	12
Social skills	8	6	8	9	12
Freedom from anti-social tendencies	4	12	12	8	11
Family relations	12	10	12	12	12
School relations	8	10	12	12	12
Social adjustment	44	49	55	53	59
Total adjustment	81	91	107	102	111

1 T1 -Teacher number one.
2 T2 -Teacher number two.

Case Study Number 34. This seventh grade girl was one of three children in her family; she had a younger brother and a younger sister. Her father was a professional man, self-employed. As shown in Table 52, parent estimates on both sections of the test were lower than child scores. This underestimation was especially marked on sub-tests pertaining to sense of personal freedom and to community relations. The scores for the latter sub-test, which are not given in Table 52, were eleven points for the child, six for the father, and five for the mother. The father's estimates were as close or closer to child scores than were the mother's estimates on all of the sub-tests except the first one mentioned above.

The teachers' estimates for this subject were interesting due to the fact that the child's total score and the estimate of teacher number two varied by only one point. For this subject, however, the estimates of teacher number one were lower than those of all other respondents in the area of self adjustment and exceeded only those of the father when social adjustment was considered.

Table 52. Raw scores for subject Number 34.

Test divisions	Child	Father	Mother	[1] T1	[2] T2
Self-reliance	7	6	4	4	10
Sense of personal worth	12	7	5	5	12
Sense of personal freedom	10	9	9	8	12
Feeling of belonging	12	12	9	11	12
Freedom from withdrawing tendencies	12	9	7	5	6
Self adjustment	53	43	34	33	52
Social standards	9	11	11	11	12
Social skills	11	9	6	7	11
Freedom from anti-social tendencies	12	7	10	5	12
Family relations	12	7	10	12	12
School relations	12	10	12	12	11
Social adjustment	56	44	49	47	58
Total adjustment	109	87	83	80	110

1 T1 -Teacher number one.
2 T2 -Teacher number two.

Teacher Estimates for the Divergent Group

Table 53 illustrates some aspects of teacher estimates for the two sections of the test for this selected group of children. When the estimates of teacher number one were compared with the thirty two estimates and scores made by other respondents in this divergent group, teacher number one had made higher estimates than the others in seventeen instances when judging answers having to do with self adjustment and in eighteen instances when considering social adjustment.

Table 53. Comparison of teacher estimates with parent estimates and child scores for the divergent group.

Teacher	Higher than			
	Child	Both parents	One parent	Other teacher
		Self adjustment		
Number one	4	3	3	4
Number two	4	6	2	4
		Social adjustment		
Number one	4	3	4	4
Number two	5	5	3	4

Teacher number two estimated higher than eighteen of the other thirty two respondents on self adjustment

and higher than twenty two of them on social adjustment. It would seem, then that as with the other group of eight children, teachers in this study were likely to overestimate the child's responses concerning his self adjustment and his social adjustment. The overestimation was greater, however, with this divergent group in social adjustment than in self adjustment.

Comparisons of Close and Divergent Groups

In summarizing data for the two small groups of children it may be interesting to draw some generalizations by comparing the characteristics of the respondents for the various children. A comparison of the tables showing the status of teachers' estimates, Table 44 and Table 53, shows that the tendency to overestimate child scores existed with both the close and the divergent groups. These data show that neither teacher was likely to overestimate in more cases than the other although with the close group teacher number one estimated higher than teacher number two in six cases while teacher number two estimated higher than did teacher number one on total scores for self adjustment.

In all cases except that of Number 3 in the close group the range of parent estimates and child scores

was less on social adjustment than on self adjustment. In all cases except that of case Number 5 in the divergent group the range of parent estimates and child scores was less on social adjustment than on self adjustment.

Table 54. Mean scores of children and mean differences between parent and child scores for the close group.

Section of test	Mean score child	Mean differences father	mother
Self adjustment	56.5	-2.25	-2.62
Social adjustment	60	1.25	2.63

Tables 54 and 55 show that, on the average, the parents in both close and divergent groups underestimated child scores on self adjustment but that in subtests concerning social adjustment the parents of the close group overestimated child scores while those of the divergent group underestimated them. The underestimation of the parents in the divergent group was greater in amount than was the overestimation of the parents in the close group. It is interesting that one group of children did not, when mean scores were computed, score lower than the other. Mean scores for the two sections of the test varied not more than 1.13

points. Therefore, neither especially high nor especially low scores made by children appeared to be responsible for divergent parent estimates.

Table 55. Mean scores of children and mean differences between parent and child scores for the divergent group.

Section of test	Mean score child	Mean differences father	mother
Self adjustment	56.25	-4.75	-10.50
Social adjustment	61.13	-2.63	-6.88

The participating teachers demonstrated a sincere willingness to co-operate and their ensuing comments indicated that the experience made them aware of the need for greater insight as to the feelings of individual pupils. This seemed to indicate a number of possibilities for study in this field.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to learn how well parents could judge the feelings of their twelve-year old children with regard to self adjustment and social adjustment. Five relationships were considered: (1) father and son; (2) mother and son; (3) father and daughter;

(4) mother and daughter; and (5) teacher and child.

Names of the forty children were obtained from school administrators, Sunday school teachers, and parents and children who had already been interviewed. These children were unselected except that each child had to be living with both parents.

In the presence of the interviewer the children were asked to respond to the questions of the California Test of Personality, Elementary Series, and their parents were asked to answer these questions as they thought their particular child would answer them. The children, but not the parents, were also requested to fill in the interests and activities part of the questionnaire.

When parent and child interviews were completed, two teachers for each of sixteen of the children were asked to respond to the questions of the test as they thought each particular child would respond. These cases for teacher judgments were chosen in the following manner: the eight children having scores closest to parent judgment scores became the "close" group and the eight children whose scores varied the most from scores of parent estimation became the "divergent" group.

Raw scores for child responses and for parent estimates of those responses were computed from the test blanks. Tabulation was then made as to the number of

mothers and the number of fathers overestimating or underestimating child scores for each of the twelve sub-tests and for each of the two main parts of the test. Pearson product-moment coefficients of correlation were then computed between parent and child scores for the sub-tests and main divisions of the test in order that specific areas of parent-child agreement or disagreement might be observed.

Teacher estimates for the small groups were handled in the same manner except that comparisons were also made between parent and teacher estimates. Individual case studies for these sixteen children were considered.

When data were analyzed several conclusions became evident:

1. Parents were likely to underestimate child feelings concerning self adjustment. In ranking the accuracy of parent estimates from high to low the father-son relationship was the closest with mother-son, mother-daughter, and father-daughter following in the order named.

2. Data indicated that when the child's feelings concerning his social adjustment were considered his parents were likely to overestimate those feelings. The ranking as to the accuracy of parent estimates of feelings in this category was from high to

low as follows: father-son, mother-son, mother-daughter, and father-daughter.

3. Parent estimates of child responses were more accurate when the questions involved social adjustment than when feelings regarding self adjustment were considered. It appeared to the investigator that this might be due to the fact that social adjustment is a more overt type of adjustment. This conclusion would seem to be verified by the comparatively close estimates made by parents on the sub-test, freedom from nervous symptoms, included under self adjustment. It is obvious that these symptoms would be more overt than would those of the other sub-tests in that section of the test. Then, too, the fact cannot be ignored that the child probably reflects parental social patterns and that many of these patterns, having been adopted from parents, are easily recognized and understood by those parents.

4. When close and divergent groups as concerned parent estimates and child scores were considered, relationship trends were the same for the close group as for the group of forty children as a whole. Parents in the divergent group, however, seemed likely to underestimate children more than most parents on sub-tests dealing with self adjustment and to underestimate rather than

to overestimate when social adjustment was contemplated. Since the mean scores of the two groups of children for both sections of the test were almost the same, divergence of parent estimation apparently did not depend upon the level of child adjustment.

5. The two teachers interviewed were likely to overestimate child responses in areas of both self adjustment and social adjustment. When close and divergent groups as defined above were compared, teacher overestimation for the divergent group was greater in social adjustment than in self adjustment.

A tentative conclusion would be that teachers overestimated children's responses to questions pertaining to adjustment because their opinions rested largely upon observations and judgments formed in the classroom and that children are likely to endeavor to conceal feelings of poor adjustment when they are in the school situation. It is also probable that children tend to reflect what is expected of them at school.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Indebtedness is gratefully acknowledged to Dr. O. W. Alm, Professor of Psychology, for his interest in and direction of this study and to Dr. H. Leigh Baker, Head of the Department of Education and Psychology, and Dr. Lois R. Schulz, Head of the Department of Child Welfare and Euthenics, for their encouragement and guidance. Appreciation is also expressed to Dr. M. C. Moggie, Professor of Education, for his advice regarding statistical procedures and to the children, parents, and teachers whose co-operation made this study possible.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Council on Education. Helping Teachers Understand Children. Washington D. C., 1945.

Anderson, John E. Child Development and the Growth Process. National Society for the Study of Education, Thirty-Eighth Yearbook. Bloomington: Public School Publishing Company, 1939.

Anderson, John Peyton. A Study of the Relationships Between Certain Aspects of Parental Behavior and Attitudes and the Behavior of Junior High School Pupils. Teachers' College Columbia University Contributions to Education, Number 809. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers' College, Columbia University, 1940.

Andrews, T. G. "An Introduction to Psychological Methodology." Methods of Psychology. Edited by T. G. Andrews. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1948.

Anerson, Harold H., and H. F. Brandt, "A Study of Motivation Involving Self-Announced Goals of Fifth Grade Children and the Concept of Level of Aspiration", Journal of Social Psychology, 10 (1939) 209.

Baker, Harry Leigh. "High-School Teachers' Knowledge of Their Pupils." The School Review, 46 (1938) 175-190.

Bayley, Nancy, and Read D. Tuddenham, Adolescent Changes in Body Build. National Society for the Study of Education, Forty-Third Yearbook. Chicago: The Department of Education, The University of Chicago, 1944.

Bonney, Merl E. "Sociometric Study of Agreement Between Teacher Judgments and Student Choices." Sociometry, 10 (1947) 133-146.

Cattell, Raymond B. Description and Measurement of Personality. Yonkers: World Book Company, 1946.

Champney, H. "The Measurement of Parent Behavior." Child Development, 12 (1941) 121-166.

Cole, Luella, Psychology of Adolescence. Third Edition. New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1948.

Conklin, Edmunc S. Principles of Adolescent Psychology. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1935.

Crosby, R. C., and A. L. Winson. "The Validity of Students' Estimates of Their Interests." Journal of Applied Psychology, 25 (1941) 408-414.

Edwards, Allen L. Statistical Analysis. New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1946.

Fisher, R. A. Statistical Methods for Research Workers. London: Oliver and Boyd, 1925.

Frank, Lawrence K. Adolescence a Period of Transition. National Society for the Study of Education, Forty-Third Yearbook. Chicago: The Department of Education, the University of Chicago, 1944.

Fromme, Allan. "On the Use of Certain Qualitative Methods of Attitude Research: a Study of Opinions on the Methods of Preventing War." Journal of Social Psychology, 13 (1941) 429-459.

Furfey, P. H. "Pubescence and Play Behavior." American Journal of Psychology, 41 (1929) 109-111.

Garrett, Henry E. Statistics in Psychology and Education. Third Edition. New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1949.

Goodenough, Florence L. "The Diagnostic Significance of Children's Wishes." Mental Hygiene, 9 (1925) 345.

Groves, E. R. Personality and Social Adjustment. New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1931.

Havighurst, Robert J. Developmental Tasks and Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948.

Havighurst, Robert J., Myra Z. Robinson, and Mildred Dorr. "The Development of the Ideal Self in Childhood and Adolescence." Journal of Educational Research, 40 (1946) 241-257.

Havighurst, Robert J., and H. Taba. Adolescent Character and Personality. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1949.

Hollingworth, Leta S. The Psychology of the Adolescent. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1928.

Hurlock, Elizabeth B. Child Development. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc., 1932.

Kerr, Margaret. "A Study of Social Acceptability." Journal of Educational Research, 35 (1945) 257.

Kingsbury, Forrest A. "Methods of Studying Personal-Social Adjustment." Adolescent Character and Personality. Edited by R. J. Havighurst and H. Taba. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1949.

Laws, Gertrude. Parent-Child Relationships. Teachers' College Contributions to Education, Number 283. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers' College, Colubia University, 1927.

Lehman, Harvey C., and Paul A. Witty, The Psychology of Play Activities. New York: A. S. Barnes and Company, 1927.

Lehner, George F. J. Explorations in Personal Adjustment. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1949.

Levy, Sidney J. "Nondirective Techniques in the Study of Developmental Tasks of Adolescence." The School Review, 57 (1949) 300-309.

Long, Alma. "Parents' Reports of Undesirable Behavior in Children." Child Development, 12 (1941) 43-62.

McKinney, John C. "A Comparison of the Social Psychology of G. H. Mead and J. L. Moreno." Sociometry, 10 (1947) 338-340.

Murphy, Gardner, Lois Barclay Murphy and Theodore M. Newcomb. Experimental Social Psychology. Revised edition. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1937.

Myers, Theodore R. Intra-Family Relationships and Pupil Adjustment. Teachers' College Contributions to Education, Number 651. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers' College, Columbia University, 1935.

Newcomb, Theodore M. "Studying Social Behavior." Methods of Psychology. Edited by T. G. Andrews. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1948.

Ojemann, Ralph H. "The Effects on the Child's Development of Changes in Cultural Influences." Journal of Educational Research, 40 (1946) 262.

Pullias, E. V. "Notes on Personality Development." Mental Hygiene, 32 (1948) 261-270.

Rogers, Carl R. Measuring Personality Adjustment in Children Nine to Thirteen Years of Age. Teachers' College Contributions to Education, Number 458. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers' College, Columbia University, 1931.

Rose, Arnold M. "The Selection of Problems for Research." The American Journal of Sociology, 54 (1948) 219-227.

Sanford, R. Nevitt, and others. Physique, Personality and Scholarship. Monograph, Society for Research in Child Development, Volume 8, Serial number 34. Washington D. C.: Society for Research in Child Development, National Research Council, 1943.

Snygg, Donald, and Arthur W. Combs. Individual Behavior. Edited by Gardner Murphy. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949.

Stagner, Ross. Psychology of Personality. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1948.

Symonds, Percival M. The Psychology of Parent-Child Relationships. New York: D. Appleton Company, 1939.

Taussig, R. W. Principles of Economics. Two volumes. Third edition. New York: Macmillan Company, 1925.

Terman, Lewis M. Genetic Studies of Genius. Two volumes. Stanford: University Press, 1925.

Terman, Lewis M. "The Measurement of Personality." Science, 80 (1934) 605-608.

Thorpe, Louis P., Willis W. Clark, and Ernest W. Tiegs. Manual of Directions, California Test of Personality, Elementary Series. Los Angeles: California Test Bureau, 1942.

Tschechtelin, S. M. "Self Appraisal of Children." Journal of Educational Research, 39 (1945) 25-32.

Tyler, R. W. "Co-operation and Conflict in the Mental Development of the Child." Mental Hygiene, 32 (1948) 253-360

Wittenberg, Rudolph. "Before the Teens -What to Expect of Our Children." Child Study, Fall (1948) 9.

Woodside, Moya. "The Research Interview." The Sociological Review, 37 (1945) 28-36.

Young, Pauline S. "The Validity of Schedules and Questionnaires." Journal of Educational Research, 14 (1940) 22-26.

APPENDIX

B Elementory Series
Grodes 4-9

CALIFORNIA TEST OF PERSONALITY—ELEMENTARY FORM B

A PROFILE OF PERSONAL AND SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT

Devised by Louis P. Thorpe, Ernest W. Tiegs, ond Willis W. Clork

Name..... Grade..... Sex: Boy-Girl

School..... Age..... Birthday.....

Teacher..... Date.....

COMPONENTS	Possible Score	Pupil's Score	Percentile Rank	PERCENTILE (Chart Pupil's Percentile Rank Here) 1 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 99
1. Self Adjustment	72			
A. Self-relionce	12			
B. Sense of Personal Worth .	12			
C. Sense of Personol Freedom .	12			
D. Feeling of Belonging . . .	12			
E. Withdrowing Tendencies (Freedom from) .	12			
F. Nervous Symptoms (Freedom from) . . .	12			
2. Social Adjustment . . .	72			
A. Sociol Standards	12			
B. Sociol Skills	12			
C. Anti-sociol Tendencies (Freedom from) . .	12			
D. Family Relotions	12			
E. School Relotions	12			
F. Community Relotions . . .	12			
TOTAL ADJUSTMENT . .	144			1 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 99 PERCENTILE

INSTRUCTIONS TO PUPILS

After each of the following questions, make a circle around the **YES** or **NO**.

For example, if you have a dog at home make a circle around **YES**. Do the other one the same way.

A. Do you have a dog at home? **YES** **NO**

B. Can you ride a bicycle? **YES** **NO**

On the next pages are more questions.

The answers are not right or wrong, but show what you think, how you feel, or what you do about things.

Go right on from one page to another until you have finished them all.

INTERESTS AND ACTIVITIES

First look at each activity in the list below. Make a circle around the **L** for each one you like or would very much like to do. Then make a circle around the **D** for the ones you really do.

1. L D Play the radio
2. L D Read stories
3. L D Go to movies
4. L D Study reading
5. L D Study arithmetic
6. L D Study history
7. L D Study science
8. L D Study spelling
9. L D Study geography
10. L D Study trees
11. L D Study birds
12. L D Study animals
13. L D Study butterflies
14. L D Draw
15. L D Paint
16. L D Model
17. L D Design
18. L D Sing
19. L D Play the piano
20. L D Make a scrapbook
21. L D Keep a diary
22. L D Write
23. L D Speak pieces
24. L D Play a harmonica
25. L D Take pictures
26. L D Collect stamps

27. L D Collect coins
28. L D Collect autographs
29. L D Collect pictures
30. L D Cut out pictures
31. L D Practice writing
32. L D Sew
33. L D Knit
34. L D Make boats
35. L D Make airplanes
36. L D Use building toys
37. L D Work with tools
38. L D Make a garden
39. L D Play on sand piles
40. L D Play with pets
41. L D Visit rivers
42. L D Go fishing
43. L D Climb
44. L D Skate
45. L D Ride a bicycle
46. L D Ride a horse

47. L D Play cards
48. L D Play dominoes
49. L D Play checkers
50. L D Play chess

51. L D Go to church
52. L D Go to Sunday School
53. L D Belong to a club
54. L D Belong to YMCA or YWCA
55. L D Go to parks
56. L D Go to a carnival
57. L D Go to a circus
58. L D Sing in a chorus
59. L D Sing in a glee club
60. L D Belong to a gang
61. L D Play ping pong
62. L D Play croquet
63. L D Play baseball
64. L D Go hunting
65. L D Play tennis
66. L D Go hiking with a group
67. L D Play in a band
68. L D Play in an orchestra
69. L D Go to a church social
70. L D Go to a party
71. L D Go to a dance
72. L D Be an officer in a club
73. L D Belong to the Scouts
74. L D Go camping

SECTION 1 A

1. Do you usually help other boys and girls decide what to do? YES NO
2. Do you feel that you can do well when things are not going right? YES NO
3. Can you often get boys and girls to do what you want them to? YES NO
4. Can you usually do what you ought to when you get mad? YES NO
5. Are you often the leader when playing with other children? YES NO
6. Are you afraid of some of the older boys and girls? YES NO
7. Do you usually keep at your work even when other children want you to stop? YES NO
8. Can you play alone happily when there is no one else to play with? YES NO
9. Is it usually some one else's fault when things go wrong? YES NO
10. Do you usually keep at your work or play until it is done? YES NO
11. If you are a boy, do you talk to new girls? If you are a girl, do you talk to new boys? YES NO
12. Do you usually ask people to bring back the things they have borrowed? YES NO

Score Section 1 A.....

SECTION 1 B

13. Are other boys or girls usually interested in what you are doing? YES NO
14. Do the boys and girls often ask you to help them with their problems? YES NO
15. Do you feel bad because you don't have good times at parties? YES NO
16. Do people seem to think that you do well in life? YES NO
17. Do you often feel bad because people do not notice your good points? YES NO
18. Do the boys and girls notice your ability as much as they should? YES NO
19. Do the other pupils often forget to ask you to help them? YES NO
20. Are you invited to the parties that you would like to attend? YES NO
21. Do you often feel that the other children are better than you are? YES NO
22. Do people seem to like to have you with them? YES NO
23. Do you feel that you are well liked by both boys and girls? YES NO
24. Do the other pupils do nice things for you as often as they should? YES NO

Score Section 1 B.....

SECTION 1 C

25. Are you allowed to help plan your own affairs? YES NO

26. Would you like to do things that older people think you should not? YES NO

27. Do some people try to rule you so much that you don't like it? YES NO

28. Are the rules in your grade better suited to younger children? YES NO

29. Are you allowed enough time for play? YES NO

30. Are you having a hard time because someone tries to boss you? YES NO

31. Are you troubled because you have to obey too many rules? YES NO

32. Do you have as many rights as most other boys and girls? YES NO

33. Are you allowed to do enough of the things you like? YES NO

34. Do you often have to stand up for your rights? YES NO

35. Are you kept away from too many interesting places? YES NO

36. Do people try to boss you too much? YES NO

Score Section 1 C.....

SECTION 1 D

37. Do other children like to have you around with them? YES NO

38. Do your friends usually help you when you are in trouble? YES NO

39. Do you feel that many of those you go around with are not real friends? YES NO

40. Are you usually asked to parties where children have the most fun? YES NO

41. Do the other children usually like the things you are doing? YES NO

42. Is it hard to find friends who will keep your secrets? YES NO

43. Do you feel that many of the boys and girls do not pay enough attention to you? YES NO

44. Do many of the children at school seem to like you? YES NO

45. Do you feel bad because you have so few friends? YES NO

46. Are things at home often so bad that you would like to leave when you get a little older? YES NO

47. Do the boys and girls usually invite you to their parties? YES NO

48. Do the other children seem to like to talk to you? YES NO

Score Section 1 D.....

SECTION 1 E

49. Is it hard for you to talk when you are with people? YES NO

50. Do you often forget what people expect of you? YES NO

51. Does it make you shy to have everyone look at you when you enter a room? YES NO

52. Do people think you are too careful in choosing friends? YES NO

53. Does it usually hurt your feelings when people talk about you? YES NO

54. Do you usually feel shy when you are around people? YES NO

55. Would you rather stay away from most parties? YES NO

56. Do your friends think that your feelings are too easily hurt? YES NO

57. Could you easily hate people you don't like? YES NO

58. Do you believe that you worry more than most children? YES NO

59. Do you often feel like giving up when people think you are not doing well? YES NO

60. Do your friends seem to think that you say things about them? YES NO

Score Section 1 E.....

SECTION 1 F

61. Do your eyes seem to hurt more than other children's do? YES NO

62. Do you find that you are not hungry most of the time? YES NO

63. Do you sometimes feel as if you are going to faint? YES NO

64. Is it hard for you to keep from being restless much of the time? YES NO

65. Do you often feel tired soon after you get up? YES NO

66. Are you often afraid of things without knowing why? YES NO

67. Do some of your friends seem to think that you are too restless? YES NO

68. Do you seem to have more aches and pains than other children? YES NO

69. Do you believe that you have more bad dreams than most of the boys and girls? YES NO

70. Do you sometimes feel as if your muscles are jerking? YES NO

71. Do you seem to have more headaches than most children do? YES NO

72. Do you get too restless when you have to wait for someone? YES NO

Score Section 1 F.....

SECTION 2 A

73. Do people really need to know what is right and what is wrong? YES NO

74. Is it all right to look down on people who do not know very much? YES NO

75. Do boys and girls need to be careful of the property of rich people? YES NO

76. Should a person try to get even with someone who has been unfair? YES NO

77. Is it necessary to be nice to people who have a different religion? YES NO

78. Is it all right to talk back to teachers who have favorites? YES NO

79. Is it necessary to be fair to people one does not like? YES NO

80. Is it all right to break promises when you wish you had not made them? YES NO

81. Do children need to be nice to foreign people? YES NO

82. Should one be nicer to pupils who are rich than to others? YES NO

83. Should boys and girls who get low marks be kept out of the fun in school? YES NO

84. Should elementary school children live up to the school rules? YES NO

Score Section 2 A.....

SECTION 2 B

85. Should one make a practice of telling others about the mistakes they make? YES NO

86. Do you let people know you are right no matter what they say? YES NO

87. Do you usually keep from showing your temper when you are angry? YES NO

88. Should one tell others about their bad points? YES NO

89. Do you like to notice the things your friends are doing? YES NO

90. Do you tell other children what you think of them when they bother you? YES NO

91. Do you sometimes let your own things go so you can do someone a favor? YES NO

92. Do you usually argue with people who do not agree with you? YES NO

93. Is it hard for you to admit it when you are wrong? YES NO

94. Do the boys and girls seem to think you are nice to them? YES NO

95. Do you get along well with the other children? YES NO

96. Would you rather do nice things for your friends than have them do things for you? YES NO

Score Section 2 B.....

SECTION 2 C

97. Are the younger children often so mean that you have to get tough to handle them? YES NO

98. Have unfair people often said that you made trouble for them? YES NO

99. Are many people so stubborn that they make you quarrel with them? YES NO

100. Do people often treat you so bad that you lose your temper? YES NO

101. Are some of the boys and girls so stuck-up that you have to get even with them? YES NO

102. Do you have to watch people much of the time so they won't take advantage of you? YES NO

103. Do you often have to get even with people who haven't treated you right? YES NO

104. Do people often treat you so mean that you have to use bad language? YES NO

105. Do many people make you feel like fighting? YES NO

106. Do you often have to get even with people who talk about you behind your back? YES NO

107. Do many people seem to hate you without good reason? YES NO

108. Are some people so mean that you have to be unfair to them? YES NO

Score Section 2 C.....

SECTION 2 D

109. Are you made to feel that you are as good as anyone else in your family? YES NO

110. Do your folks go out so much that you do not have enough good times at home? YES NO

111. Do many of your friends stay away from your home? YES NO

112. Do people at home often say bad things about you? YES NO

113. Do you feel that your folks let you play enough? YES NO

114. Does someone in your family quarrel with you too much? YES NO

115. Would you prefer that school lasted longer, so you would not need to be home so much? YES NO

116. Do you feel that your folks fuss at you instead of helping you? YES NO

117. Do you feel that too many people at home try to boss you? YES NO

118. Is there someone in your home who will talk things over with you? YES NO

119. Is it hard to talk things over with your folks because they don't understand you? YES NO

120. Do most of your friends seem to have better times at home than you do? YES NO

Score Section 2 D.....

SECTION 2 E

121. Do you often feel bad because you get low marks in school? YES NO

122. Do you like to stay away from pupils of the other sex at school? YES NO

123. Do you think that the teachers like you as well as other children? YES NO

124. Do you like most of the things you have to do in school? YES NO

125. Have you found that some of the teachers do not like to be with the boys and girls? YES NO

126. Do the boys and girls at school often say things that make you feel bad? YES NO

127. Do you feel that any of the teachers are mean to children? YES NO

128. Would you like it better if you could stay at home instead of going to school? YES NO

129. Does someone at school make you feel that you are not very bright? YES NO

130. Does it bother you to have your teacher tell you what you should do? YES NO

131. Do the boys and girls seem to think that you get along well with them at school? YES NO

132. Do many of the children at school try to keep away from you? YES NO

Score Section 2 E.....

SECTION 2 F

133. Do you like to have new houses or other buildings go up near your home? YES NO

134. Does it seem to you that your neighbors are not interesting people? YES NO

135. Would you like to have things look better around your home? YES NO

136. Are there lots of friendly boys and girls for you to play with near your home? YES NO

137. Are some of the people who live near you so unkind that you don't like them? YES NO

138. Do you often play with both boys and girls who live near your home? YES NO

139. Does it seem to you that the people near your home quarrel a great deal? YES NO

140. Do you know some of the people near your home well enough to visit them often? YES NO

141. Do you have enough time for games in your neighborhood? YES NO

142. Do some of the people near your home look down on you because you haven't much money? YES NO

143. Do you feel that most of the people near your home are worth knowing? YES NO

144. Do you have many good times near where you live? YES NO

Score Section 2 F.....

On the following pages are the raw scores for the children, the fathers, and the mothers in this study. Self adjustment scores are identified by the number I; social adjustment scores are identified by the number II; and total adjustment scores are identified by the letter T. Specific sub-test scores for divisions I and II are indicated by their corresponding letters, A through F inclusive.

The three subjects in each family unit are referred to as a case with code letters under each case being C for child, F for father, and M for mother. Since teacher scores were shown in tables accompanying individual case studies they are not included in the Appendix.

Raw Scores of Subjects

	Case 1			Case 2			Case 3		
	C	F	M	C	F	M	C	F	M
I	57	46	66	48	59	50	62	59	60
A	8	6	9	4	9	8	10	7	8
B	11	10	12	10	11	10	11	10	12
C	9	6	11	10	10	4	12	11	9
D	11	10	12	8	11	11	10	11	12
E	9	6	11	9	10	9	11	11	9
F	9	8	11	7	8	8	8	9	10
II	46	54	64	61	59	61	60	68	65
A	12	11	12	12	7	10	12	12	12
B	7	7	9	10	7	10	8	9	8
C	3	9	12	6	12	11	8	12	11
D	10	8	12	11	12	9	11	12	12
E	10	10	11	11	11	11	12	12	11
F	4	9	8	11	10	10	9	11	11
T	103	100	130	109	118	111	122	127	125

	Case 4			Case 5			Case 6		
	C	F	M	C	F	M	C	F	M
I	68	57	58	66	60	47	64	51	50
A	9	6	5	10	8	8	9	5	5
B	12	10	10	12	12	10	10	10	11
C	11	10	12	10	9	6	11	6	9
D	12	11	12	12	10	8	12	11	11
E	12	8	11	12	11	8	10	8	5
F	12	12	8	10	10	7	12	11	9
II	71	67	65	66	64	47	64	55	61
A	12	11	12	11	10	11	10	12	12
B	11	11	10	12	12	7	10	7	9
C	12	12	12	10	10	5	12	11	11
D	12	11	12	12	12	9	10	7	11
E	12	12	12	12	11	8	11	9	10
F	12	10	7	9	9	7	11	9	8
T	139	124	123	132	124	94	128	106	111

	Case 7			Case 8			Case 9		
	C	F	M	C	F	M	C	F	M
I	66	60	62	60	65	62	60	47	54
A	10	7	6	7	8	10	9	6	6
B	10	12	12	11	12	11	9	9	11
C	11	9	11	10	9	10	10	2	5
D	11	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
E	12	11	10	10	12	8	12	8	8
F	10	9	11	10	12	11	8	10	12
II	67	63	64	70	67	68	65	53	53
A	12	11	12	12	12	12	12	9	12
B	9	6	7	12	10	8	9	7	6
C	12	11	12	12	12	12	11	10	8
D	12	12	12	12	11	12	12	7	8
E	12	12	12	10	11	12	10	12	9
F	10	11	9	12	11	12	11	8	10
T	133	123	126	130	132	130	125	100	107

	Case 10			Case 11			Case 12		
	C	F	M	C	F	M	C	F	M
I	66	48	59	54	48	49	48	55	52
A	10	6	9	6	3	5	6	8	5
B	12	9	10	11	9	10	7	9	7
C	12	8	7	8	7	5	11	7	11
D	12	11	12	10	12	12	9	9	11
E	11	5	9	8	8	8	6	10	9
F	9	9	12	11	9	9	9	10	9
II	65	66	68	56	57	59	54	63	59
A	12	10	12	11	12	12	11	12	12
B	12	12	12	7	5	6	7	11	11
C	12	12	12	6	12	9	11	12	11
D	11	12	12	11	8	9	11	8	12
E	8	10	9	11	11	12	5	9	3
F	10	10	11	10	9	11	9	11	10
T	131	114	127	110	105	108	102	118	111

	Case 13			Case 14			Case 15		
	C	F	M	C	F	M	C	F	M
I	64	52	45	68	52	40	45	38	37
A	8	8	3	11	10	6	8	5	6
B	12	8	10	12	12	7	7	8	5
C	9	8	4	11	4	6	8	5	4
D	12	12	12	12	11	8	10	9	8
E	12	8	7	11	8	7	4	7	7
F	11	8	9	11	7	6	8	4	7
II	42	53	48	66	55	52	45	45	46
A	6	12	11	12	11	11	10	11	11
B	8	6	4	11	8	7	8	7	3
C	6	5	10	11	8	8	6	5	5
D	6	9	5	11	12	10	7	6	8
E	7	10	7	10	11	11	4	6	9
F	9	11	11	11	5	5	10	10	11
T	106	105	93	134	107	92	90	83	83

	Case 16			Case 17			Case 18		
	C	F	M	C	F	M	C	F	M
I	51	48	33	57	47	41	63	55	48
A	8	10	6	6	8	6	11	8	7
B	11	7	3	9	7	9	12	9	8
C	9	4	8	10	6	6	11	12	8
D	10	11	6	12	8	9	12	8	7
E	6	8	4	12	10	5	11	9	8
F	7	8	6	8	8	6	6	9	10
II	60	57	48	57	61	54	64	64	59
A	12	12	11	12	12	12	12	12	12
B	10	9	6	9	9	6	12	7	4
C	8	9	7	11	12	10	8	12	12
D	11	9	6	8	9	8	12	12	10
E	10	9	11	8	10	9	8	11	11
F	9	9	7	9	9	9	12	10	10
T	111	105	81	114	108	95	127	119	107

	Case 19			Case 20			Case 21		
	C	F	M	C	F	M	C	F	M
I	57	34	38	61	42	34	61	57	56
A	4	4	4	6	4	2	7	8	8
B	10	8	8	11	9	5	8	10	10
C	10	4	7	10	7	7	12	9	9
D	12	9	12	11	11	10	12	12	11
E	10	5	4	11	4	3	11	8	9
F	11	4	3	12	7	7	11	10	9
II	56	60	64	60	50	60	68	57	62
A	9	11	12	11	9	12	11	11	12
B	8	10	9	10	7	7	12	8	8
C	5	10	12	8	6	9	12	10	10
D	12	11	12	12	9	11	11	8	10
E	11	8	9	9	10	12	11	10	10
F	11	10	10	10	9	9	11	10	12
T	113	94	102	121	92	94	129	114	118

	Case 22			Case 23			Case 24		
	C	F	M	C	F	M	C	F	M
I	62	58	64	57	62	67	54	43	43
A	6	9	8	5	8	10	10	8	7
B	11	10	11	9	11	12	8	9	6
C	9	9	11	11	10	11	8	7	5
D	12	11	12	12	12	12	9	8	9
E	12	10	11	10	11	11	11	6	8
F	12	9	11	10	10	11	8	5	8
II	65	62	65	60	67	66	60	55	53
A	10	11	12	10	12	10	12	9	12
B	9	9	6	9	9	11	7	8	6
C	11	10	11	8	11	11	7	7	3
D	12	10	12	11	12	11	12	12	10
E	12	12	12	12	12	11	12	11	11
F	11	10	12	10	11	12	10	8	11
T	127	120	129	117	129	133	114	98	96

	Case 25			Case 26			Case 27		
	C	F	M	C	F	M	C	F	M
I	39	30	43	51	51	44	44	52	64
A	5	4	6	7	7	4	7	8	7
B	7	6	8	9	7	7	6	11	12
C	3	3	1	8	7	3	9	6	11
D	8	8	11	12	11	12	8	9	11
E	9	5	10	9	10	8	7	10	11
F	7	4	5	6	9	10	7	8	12
II	42	46	51	48	70	49	54	59	63
A	11	11	11	12	11	12	12	11	11
B	5	6	6	8	12	6	8	6	8
C	1	4	7	9	12	11	4	12	12
D	7	7	7	5	12	6	12	10	12
E	7	7	10	9	12	11	8	10	12
F	11	11	11	5	11	3	10	10	8
T	81	76	94	99	121	93	98	111	127

	Case 28			Case 29			Case 30		
	C	F	M	C	F	M	C	F	M
I	44	56	41	63	56	57	48	57	66
A	4	8	9	8	9	7	5	8	10
B	5	10	4	9	9	12	6	11	11
C	8	8	7	10	7	8	11	10	11
D	9	12	10	12	11	12	10	12	12
E	10	10	5	12	10	8	9	8	11
F	8	8	6	12	10	10	7	8	11
II	54	60	44	63	63	68	59	66	67
A	10	10	10	7	12	12	9	12	12
B	9	6	6	9	7	9	9	9	9
C	7	10	6	12	10	12	8	11	12
D	9	12	5	12	12	12	11	12	12
E	8	11	7	12	11	11	11	11	11
F	11	11	10	11	11	12	11	11	11
T	98	116	85	126	119	125	107	123	133

	Case 31			Case 32			Case 33		
	C	F	M	C	F	M	C	F	M
I	63	56	57	67	60	54	62	40	47
A	9	7	8	8	7	8	7	7	7
B	9	10	9	12	11	10	10	8	4
C	11	9	8	11	8	10	12	4	6
D	12	12	12	12	11	8	12	9	12
E	11	6	8	12	11	8	11	5	8
F	11	12	12	12	12	10	10	7	10
II	68	65	67	69	60	56	60	57	65
A	12	10	12	12	11	11	9	12	12
B	11	11	10	9	7	4	8	11	10
C	11	12	10	12	9	11	10	10	11
D	11	10	12	12	12	11	12	7	11
E	12	11	12	12	11	12	10	6	9
F	11	11	11	12	10	7	11	11	12
T	131	121	124	136	120	110	122	97	112

	Case 34			Case 35			Case 36		
	C	F	M	C	F	M	C	F	M
I	65	52	43	42	30	56	58	51	52
A	7	6	4	7	5	9	7	8	4
B	12	7	5	4	3	9	11	8	12
C	10	9	9	7	1	6	10	4	8
D	12	12	9	3	8	10	12	9	12
E	12	9	7	12	5	11	10	10	8
F	12	9	9	8	8	11	8	12	8
II	66	54	59	60	46	61	60	69	69
A	9	11	11	11	9	12	10	12	12
B	11	9	6	9	7	10	9	12	11
C	12	7	10	9	9	12	10	12	11
D	12	7	10	9	6	10	11	11	11
E	12	10	12	12	8	10	8	11	12
F	10	10	10	10	7	7	12	11	12
T	131	106	102	102	76	117	118	120	121

	Case 37			Case 38		
	C	F	M	C	F	M
I	60	65	44	51	62	66
A	8	8	6	7	7	11
B	11	12	11	10	11	11
C	10	9	2	10	10	11
D	12	12	11	10	12	12
E	9	12	6	5	11	10
F	10	12	8	9	11	11
II	58	67	56	57	65	68
A	12	12	12	11	12	12
B	7	10	10	9	11	11
C	11	12	10	8	12	12
D	12	12	9	12	10	12
E	9	10	10	7	10	11
F	7	11	5	10	10	10
T	118	132	100	108	127	134

	Case 39			Case 40		
	C	F	M	C	F	M
I	54	53	37	60	65	60
A	7	7	5	10	7	8
B	11	10	10	12	12	12
C	9	11	2	10	10	9
D	11	11	10	10	12	12
E	6	4	2	9	12	9
F	10	10	8	9	12	10
II	59	66	47	48	68	63
A	11	12	12	11	12	12
B	7	10	3	7	10	7
C	8	11	9	4	12	12
D	12	12	8	9	12	12
E	11	10	7	10	12	12
F	10	11	8	8	10	8
T	113	119	84	109	133	123

A COMPARISON OF PARENT JUDGMENTS AND CHILD FEELINGS CONCERNING THE SELF ADJUSTMENT AND SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT OF TWELVE YEAR OLD CHILDREN

by

LOUISE MORGAN LANGFORD

A. B., University of Kansas, 1929

AN ABSTRACT OF A THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Education and Psychology

KANSAS STATE COLLEGE
OF AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE

1951

The purpose of this study was to learn how well parents could judge the feelings of their twelve-year-old children with regard to self adjustment and social adjustment. Five relationships were considered: (1) father and son; (2) mother and son; (3) father and daughter; (4) mother and daughter; and (5) teacher and child.

Names of the forty children were obtained from school administrators, Sunday school teachers, and parents and children who had already been interviewed. These children were unselected except that each child had to be living with both parents.

In the presence of the interviewer the children were asked to respond to the questions of the California Test of Personality, Elementary Series, and their parents were asked to answer these questions as they thought their particular child would answer them. The children, but not the parents, were also requested to fill in the interests and activities part of the questionnaire.

When parent and child interviews were completed, two teachers for each of sixteen of the children interviewed were asked to respond to the questions of the test as they thought each particular child would respond. These cases for teacher judgments were chosen in the

following manner: the eight children having scores closest to parent judgment scores became the "close" group and the eight children whose scores varied the most from scores of parent estimation became the "divergent" group.

Raw scores for child responses and for parent estimates of those responses were computed from the test blanks. Tabulation was made as to the number of mothers and the number of fathers overestimating or underestimating child scores for each of the twelve subtests and for each of the two main parts of the test. Pearson product-moment coefficients of correlation were computed between parent and child scores for the subtests and main divisions of the test in order that specific areas of parent-child agreement or disagreement might be observed.

Teacher estimates for the small groups were handled in the same manner except that comparisons were also made between parent and teacher estimates. Individual case studies for these sixteen children were made and considered.

When data were analyzed several conclusions became evident:

1. Parents were likely to underestimate child feelings concerning self adjustment. In ranking the accuracy of parent estimates from high to low

the father-son relationship was the closest with mother-son, mother-daughter, and father-daughter following in the order named.

2. Data indicated that when the child's feelings concerning his social adjustment were considered his parents were likely to overestimate those feelings. The ranking as to the accuracy of parent estimates of feelings in this category was from high to low as follows: father-son, mother-son, mother-daughter, and father-daughter.

3. Parent estimates of child responses were more accurate when the questions involved social adjustment than when feelings regarding self adjustment were considered.

4. When close and divergent groups as concerned parent estimates and child scores were considered, relationship trends were the same for the close group as for the group of forty children as a whole. Parents in the divergent group, however, seemed likely to underestimate children more than most parents on sub-tests dealing with self adjustment and to underestimate rather than to overestimate when social adjustment was considered.

5. The two teachers interviewed were likely to overestimate child responses in areas of both

self adjustment and social adjustment. When close and divergent groups as defined above were compared, teacher overestimation for the divergent group was greater in social adjustment than in self adjustment.