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Problem

Many developmental psychologists are concerned about how parents' child-rearing practices influence adolescents' self-esteem, for self-esteem provides one of the foundations for the development of personality. Is it possible that parents' child-rearing practices contribute to the development of a low self-esteem which in turn influences behavior? This study was conducted to determine the relationship of self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents to the perceived degree of their parents' child-rearing practices.
Method

The study involved 132 delinquent male adolescents who matriculated during the fall semester of 1979 at Starr Commonwealth, Albion, Michigan. The males ranged from 12 to 18 years of age, with 82 whites, 34 blacks, 4 American Indians, 3 Spanish Americans, and 4 others. One hundred six males came from two-parent homes.

Two instruments were used to collect data on the self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' child-rearing practices. The Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (SEI) was employed to assess the self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents. The Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire (PCR) was used to investigate the perceived degree of their parents' child-rearing practices.

It was hypothesized that a significant correlation exists between self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' child-rearing practices.

It was also hypothesized that significant multiple correlations exist between ten parent-child relations variables and each of four self-esteem variables.

Zero-order correlations and multiple regression analysis were used to analyze the data.

Results

Among the 132 delinquent male adolescents 95 percent of their fathers were employed while 75 percent of their mothers were homemakers.

Low self-esteem was found among these delinquent male adolescents. They perceived their fathers' child-rearing practices
as demanding, casual, loving, and tending to give symbolic-love rewards.

They perceived their mothers' child-rearing practices to be demanding, loving, and giving of symbolic-love rewards.

A significant correlation exists between social self-esteem of these delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their father's demanding child-rearing practices.

A significant correlation exists between general self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of symbolic-love rewards given by their mothers. A significant correlation exists between school self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of symbolic-love punishment given by their mothers. A significant correlation exists between social self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their mothers' casual child-rearing practices.

A significant multiple correlation exists between ten parent-child relations (mothers') variables and school self-esteem. Greater self-esteem tends to be related to delinquent male adolescents' perceptions of less demanding, greater symbolic-love reward and symbolic-love punishment child-rearing practices on the part of their mothers.

No significant correlations exist between general self-esteem, school self-esteem, social self-esteem, and home self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' protective, rejecting, neglecting, loving, direct-object reward, and direct-object punishment child-rearing practices. No significant multiple correlations exist between ten parent-child relations variables and general, social, and home self-esteem.
Conclusion

In conclusion, delinquent male adolescents have a lower self-esteem in relation to the perceived degree of their parents' child-rearing practices. The low self-esteem of these delinquent adolescents are related to a pattern of varied child-rearing practices as perceived by these youth of their fathers and mothers: demanding fathers, and casual mothers, fathers whose child-rearing practices are both demanding and casual, and casual and loving.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Interests in Self-Esteem

In recent years the fields of psychology, psychiatry, and sociology have all experienced an upsurge of interest in the nature of the self-esteem. The fact that these three fields should come to share an interest in this aspect of personality bespeaks the power of this concept to intrude itself upon established ways of thought and procedure. Though each field bears with it the inert weight of its distinctive tradition, all have found the idea of self-esteem relevant to their concerns.

Clinical and experimental studies have provided valuable insights into the nature of self-esteem (particularly its pathological manifestations), but still very little is known about the nature and distribution of self-esteem, self-values, and self-perceptions in the broader society. The present study investigated the self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents in relation to the perceived degree of their parents' child-rearing practices.

Concepts of Child-rearing Practices

Since the turn of the century, behavioral scientists have shown an increasing interest in child-rearing practices. However, theoretical formulations from one period to the next have been in sharp
contradiction. The early experiences of infancy and childhood are given a central role in Freudian theories of personality development (Freud, 1930, 1949). Psychoanalytically-oriented anthropological writing has viewed the infant-and child-care practices as keys in explaining the "character structure" and the institutions of different cultures (Kardiner, 1939). Sociologists have marked child-rearing practices as sensitively differentiating attributes of social classes (Clausen & Williams, 1963; Kohn, 1963).

Although, in the earlier history of American psychology, child rearing was generally accepted or regarded as a descriptive, non-theoretical field of investigation with "practical purposes," such as parent education. Child rearing gained a prominent role in theoretical psychology, beginning in the 1950s with the upsurge of interest in developmental processes. Since then, conditions of early child-rearing practices have received steady attention in both child and animal research (Bandura & Walters, 1963; Becker, 1964).

**Two Conceptual Frameworks**

Two conceptual frameworks, namely Psychoanalytic and behavioral, in some respects quite divergent and in others quite consonant with one another, have served to provide the theoretical underpinnings for a great portion of the psychological research on the influences of child rearing. These two orientations by no means set forth the same views of social learning; nevertheless they have led to research in investigations that have many shared interests. Both have typically viewed the process of socialization as one in which stimulus events provided by the caretaker are important determinants of child behavior.
In both orientations the complex effects of rewards and punishments, and the nature of their effects in combination, have been emphasized in behavioristic formulations (Boe, 1966; Hoffman, 1963).

In psychoanalytic theory an identification process is viewed as an important determinant in personality development. Characteristics of the parent-child relationship, such as warmth and rejection, have been posited as contributors to socialization (Sears, Rau, & Albert, 1965).

The theoretical positions adopted by those working in this area are by no means identical, and such different positions do make a difference. Yet, from a broad perspective, it is reasonable to state that the wide-ranging interests and positions in this field converge with an almost single purpose and, in some respects, a single point of view that the caretaker's role in the process of socialization is an important determinant of child behavior.

Statement of the Problem

Many child and developmental psychologists are concerned about how parents' child-rearing practices can influence a child's self-esteem, as self-esteem provides one of the foundations for the development of the child's personality. The way the child is brought up will usually affect the child for life.

In research done on the effects of parents' child-rearing practices on self-esteem, Rosenberg's (1965) findings indicated that "when an adolescent perceived his parents as being positively concerned about him, he tended to have higher self-esteem" (p. 146). Conversely, the adolescent who showed lower self-esteem usually had maladjusted
relationships with his parents. Nikelly (1967) reported that the adolescents' maladjusted self-esteem is developed as a result of the neglect shown by their mothers.

A review of the literature (Andry, 1960; Bandura, 1959; 1969, 1973; Iacovetta, 1975; Jensen, 1972; Kagan, 1956; Kaplan, 1958; Livson, 1966; Medinnus, 1965; Nikelly, 1967; Rosenberg, 1963, 1965; and Rutter, Graham, Chadwick, & Yule, 1976) and the studies done so far on the parent-child interaction has brought several questions into focus:

Could there be a possible significant correlation between self-esteem and parents' child-rearing practices? If this is possible, then in what ways and to what degree do parents' child-rearing practices affect the development of either a high or low self-esteem in adolescents? How do delinquent male adolescents perceive their parents' child-rearing practices?

The present study was done to investigate the relationship between the self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' child-rearing practices.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between the self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' child-rearing practices, as measured by the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory and the Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire. The specific purposes were:

1. To determine the relationship between the self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' protective child-rearing practices.
2. To determine the relationship between the self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' demanding child-rearing practices.

3. To determine the relationship between the self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' rejecting child-rearing practices.

4. To determine the relationship between the self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' neglecting child-rearing practices.

5. To determine the relationship between the self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' casual child-rearing practices.

6. To determine the relationship between the self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' loving child-rearing practices.

7. To determine the relationship between the self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of symbolic-love rewards given by their parents.

8. To determine the relationship between the self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of direct-object rewards given by their parents.

9. To determine the relationship between the self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of symbolic-love punishment given by their parents.

10. To determine the relationship between the self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of direct-object
punishment given by their parents.

**Importance of the Study**

Studies on self-esteem of adolescents' and parental child-rearing practices have been receiving attention in recent years (Ausubel, Balthazar, Rosenthal, Blackman, Schpoont, & Wilkowitz, 1954; Coopersmith, 1967; Duncan, 1978; Medinnus, 1964; and Robinson, 1978). The rate of juvenile delinquency is increasing rapidly throughout the nation. Educators, sociologists, government officials, child psychologists, criminologists, religious leaders, counselors, and concerned parents are constantly searching for solutions to this elusive problem.

It is hoped that the present study sheds some light on delinquent male adolescents' self-esteem in relation to the perceived degree of their parents' child-rearing practices. This study should contribute to the knowledge and understanding of what kinds of child-rearing practices are more suitable or preferable for the development of positive self-esteem in the adolescent.

The review of literature has failed to reveal investigations into the relationship between the self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' child-rearing practices. Of the studies on child-rearing practices the majority are based on parental reports, observations of parent-child interactions, and interviews with the parents. The parental reports "tend to be more biased and too often less complete measurement of the actual child-rearing practices" (Roe & Siegelman, 1963, p. 14). Direct reports by the adolescents themselves should be able to provide a more accurate picture of what they perceive as being more desirable child-rearing
practices. Therefore this study makes the following contributions:

1. It contributes to knowledge by investigating the self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' child-rearing practices.

2. It explores the effects of parental child-rearing practices on the self-esteem of adolescents.

3. It provides useful information for the planning and development of training programs in parenting and child-rearing.

4. It provides the Starr Commonwealth (which provided the population for this study) with the important feedback concerning the self-esteem of their residents in relation to the perceived degree of their parents' child-rearing practices.

Rationale for the Hypotheses

Many child psychologists and sociologists are concerned about how parents' child-rearing practices influence a child's self-esteem. Several studies like those done by Andry (1960), Glueck and Glueck (1950), Hirschi (1969), Nye (1956), and Tait and Hodges (1962) indicate the consequences of parental discipline and child-rearing practices on adolescents and that rejecting, permissive, and neglectful child-rearing practices appear to contribute to low self-esteem in adolescents—even more so, if the adolescents are delinquents.

At the same time, protective, demanding, and loving child-rearing practices appear to contribute to high self-esteem in adolescents. Although other factors, aside from parent-child interactions, may have some influences on the adolescents' self-esteem, one would be led to the understanding that there is a predominant relationship
between self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' child-rearing practices.

Statement of Hypotheses

The underlying hypothesis states that the self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents is correlated with the perceived degree of their parents' child-rearing practices. This major hypothesis is further stated by forty-four research hypotheses. The first forty are zero-order correlation hypotheses, and the last four are multiple-correlation hypotheses.

1. There is a significant correlation between the general self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' protective child-rearing practices.

2. There is a significant correlation between the general self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' demanding child-rearing practices.

3. There is a significant correlation between the general self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' rejecting child-rearing practices.

4. There is a significant correlation between the general self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' neglecting child-rearing practices.

5. There is a significant correlation between the general self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' casual child-rearing practices.

6. There is a significant correlation between the general self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their
parents' loving child-rearing practices.

7. There is a significant correlation between the general self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of symbolic-love rewards given by their parents.

8. There is a significant correlation between the general self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of direct-object rewards given by their parents.

9. There is a significant correlation between the general self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of symbolic-love punishment given by their parents.

10. There is a significant correlation between the general self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of direct-object punishment given by their parents.

11. There is a significant correlation between the school self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' protective child-rearing practices.

12. There is a significant correlation between the school self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' demanding child-rearing practices.

13. There is a significant correlation between the school self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' rejecting child-rearing practices.

14. There is a significant correlation between the school self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' neglecting child-rearing practices.

15. There is a significant correlation between the school self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' disengaging child-rearing practices.
self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' casual child-rearing practices.

16. There is a significant correlation between the school self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' loving child-rearing practice.

17. There is a significant correlation between the school self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of symbolic-love rewards given by their parents.

18. There is a significant correlation between the school self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of direct-object rewards given by their parents.

19. There is a significant correlation between the school self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of symbolic-love punishment given by their parents.

20. There is a significant correlation between the school self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of direct-object punishment given by their parents.

21. There is a significant correlation between the social self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' protective child-rearing practices.

22. There is a significant correlation between the social self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' demanding child-rearing practices.

23. There is a significant correlation between the social self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' rejecting child-rearing practices.
24. There is a significant correlation between the social self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' neglecting child-rearing practices.

25. There is a significant correlation between the social self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' casual child-rearing practices.

26. There is a significant correlation between the social self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' loving child-rearing practices.

27. There is a significant correlation between the social self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of symbolic-love rewards given by their parents.

28. There is a significant correlation between the social self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of direct-object rewards given by their parents.

29. There is a significant correlation between the social self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of symbolic-love punishment given by their parents.

30. There is a significant correlation between the social self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of direct-object punishment given by their parents.

31. There is a significant correlation between the home self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' protective child-rearing practices.

32. There is a significant correlation between the home self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree
of their parents' demanding child-rearing practices.

33. There is a significant correlation between the home self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' rejecting child-rearing practices.

34. There is a significant correlation between the home self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' neglecting child-rearing practices.

35. There is a significant correlation between the home self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' casual child-rearing practices.

36. There is a significant correlation between the home self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' loving child-rearing practices.

37. There is a significant correlation between the home self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of symbolic-love rewards given by their parents.

38. There is a significant correlation between the home self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of direct-object rewards given by their parents.

39. There is a significant correlation between the home self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of symbolic-love punishment given by their parents.

40. There is a significant correlation between the home self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of direct-object punishment given by their parents.

41. There is a significant multiple correlation between the
ten parent-child-relations variables and the general self-esteem.

42. There is a significant multiple correlation between the ten parent-child-relations variables and the school self-esteem.

43. There is a significant multiple correlation between the ten parent-child-relations variables and the social self-esteem.

44. There is a significant multiple correlation between the ten parent-child-relations variables and the home self-esteem.

**Definition of Terms**

The following is a description of the terms as they are understood in the context of the present study.

**Self-Esteem.** In this study, self-esteem refers to the evaluation which the individual makes and customarily maintains with regard to himself. It expresses an attitude of approval or disapproval and indicates the extent to which the individual believes himself to be capable, significant, successful, and worthy. Chaplin (1973) defines self-esteem as the "individual's evaluation of himself" (p. 444).

**High-High Self-Esteem.** Persons with high-high self-esteem are classified as those socially and academically successful persons who appear to be relatively content with their situations (Coopersmith, 1967, p. 13).

**High-Low Self-Esteem.** Persons referred to as having high-low self-esteem are defensive individuals who maintain a favorable self-regard despite low ratings given by their teachers, getting limited acceptance from their peers, and obtaining relatively poor academic performance (Coopersmith, 1967, p. 13).

**Medium-Medium Self-Esteem.** Individuals classified as having
medium-medium self-esteem are usually average persons who are stable, relatively contented, and of moderate capacities and achievements (Coopersmith, 1967, p. 14).

**Low-High Self-Esteem.** Individuals who are classified as having a low-high self-esteem are persons notable for their extremely low self-evaluation in the face of marked academic and social success (Coopersmith, 1967, p. 14).

**Low-Low Self-Esteem.** The characteristic of low-low self-esteem refers to the socially and academically unsuccessful adolescents who have accepted the reality of their inferiority (Coopersmith, 1967, p. 14).

**Adolescence.** Adolescence is the stage of growth that lies between childhood and adulthood. It is a period of physical, emotional, and social change (Garrison, 1955, p. 2).

**Delinquent.** Sanders (1976) classifies a delinquent as:

... any person under the age of 18 years who persistently or habitually refuses to obey the reasonable and proper orders or directions of his parents, guardian, custodian, or school authorities, or who is beyond the control of such persons; or any person who is a truant from school within the meaning of any law of the State; or who from any cause is in danger of leading an idle, dissolute, lewd, or immoral life, is within the jurisdiction of the juvenile court, which may adjudge such person to be a ward of the court. This also includes the boy who is an incorrigible runaway (pp. 4-5).

**Parents** means fathers and mothers as measured independently. The Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire does not measure these adolescents' perceptions of their parents together, but measures each parent separately.

**Child-rearing Practices.** The patterns of disciplining or rearing of children is termed child-rearing practices.
Parental Child-rearing Variables used in this study, as classified by Roe and Siegelman (1963), are as follows:

1. Protective practice refers to the practice of parents who give the child's interests first priority. They are indulgent, provide special privileges, are demonstratively affectionate, possibly gushing. They select friends carefully but rarely let their child visit other homes without them. They protect the child from other children, from experiences in which the child may suffer disappointment, discomfort, or injury. They are highly intrusive and expect to know all about what the child is thinking and experiencing. They reward according to how well their youngsters perform according to their wishes (p. 357).

2. Demanding practice refers to the practice of parents who set high standards of accomplishment in particular areas—manners, school, and extracurricular activities. They impose strict regulations and demand unquestioning obedience to them, and they do not make exceptions. They expect the child to be busy at all times at some useful activity. They have high punitiveness. They restrict friendships in accord with these standards. They do not try to find out what a child is thinking or feeling, they tell him what to think or feel (p. 357).

3. Rejecting practice refers to the practice of parents who follow the extreme patterns of the preceding group. Behavior becomes rejecting when the attitude is rejection of the childishness of the child. Parents may also reject the child as an individual. They are cold and hostile, derogate the child, and make fun of him and his inadequacies and problems. They may frequently leave the child alone and often not permit other children in the house. They have no regard for
the child's point of view. The regulations they establish are not for the sake of training the child but for protecting themselves from the child's intrusions (p. 357).

4. **Neglecting** practice refers to the practice of parents who pay little attention to the child, give him a minimum of physical care, and show no affection. They forget promises made to him, forget things for him. They are cold, but not derogatory nor hostile. They leave him alone, but do not go out of their way to avoid him (p. 357).

5. **Casual** practice refers to the practice of parents who pay more attention to the child than the neglecting parent and are mildly affectionate. They are responsive to him if they are not busy about something else. They do not think about him nor plan for him very much, but take him as a part of the general situation. They do not worry much about the child and make little definite effort to train him. They are easy-going, have few rules, and do not make much effort to enforce those they already have (p. 357).

6. **Loving** practice refers to the practice of parents who give the child warm and loving attention. They try to help him with his projects that are important to him, but are not intrusive. They are more likely to reason with the child than to punish him, but they will punish him when it is necessary. They give him praise, but not indiscriminately. They try specifically to help him through problems in the way best for him. The child feels that he is able to confide in them and to ask them for help. They invite his friends to the house and try to make things attractive for them. They encourage independence and are willing to let the child take chances in order to grow towards
independence. Distinction between loving and casual categories can be difficult. A basic differentiating factor is the amount of thought given to the child's problems (p. 357).

7. **Symbolic-Love Reward** refers to the kinds of rewards which are given by parents, such as praises for approved behavior, special attention, and demonstrated affection (p. 357).

8. **Direct-Object Reward** refers to the tangible rewards such as gifts of money or toys, or relief from chores given to children as rewards for good behavior (p. 357).

9. **Symbolic-Love Punishment** refers to such punishments as shaming the child before his siblings or peers, isolating him, and withdrawing love from the child (p. 357).

10. **Direct-Object Punishment** refers to physical punishment, taking away playthings, reducing allowance, and denying promised trips to the child (p. 357).

**Limitations**

This study relates the self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents to the perceived degree of their parents' child-rearing practices. Possible cause and effect relationships between the self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' child-rearing practices may not be direct and discrete, but are perceived by delinquent male adolescents as strong factors which influence their behavior patterns.

The study is limited geographically to the population of one hundred forty-eight male adolescents residing in Starr Commonwealth, located at Albion, Michigan. Starr Commonwealth is a nonprofit,
licensed, residential group-care agency governed by a voluntary board of community leaders. It serves one hundred forty-eight boys, ranging from ten to eighteen years old, having social and behavioral difficulties. It is supported primarily by purchase of service funds from referral agencies and contributions from individuals and foundations. This organization was founded by Floyd Starr in 1913. The founder's motto is: "There is no such thing as a bad boy." The Albion campus consists of only male residents; however, there are two other campuses located at Van Wert and Columbus, Ohio, consisting of both male and female residents. The study is limited to the residents who were matriculating during the fall semester of 1979.

**Organization of the Study**

Chapter I states the problem, nature, and purpose of the study and provides a rationale for the hypotheses stated in the investigation of the relationship between the self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' child-rearing practices. Included in the chapter are forty-four research hypotheses, definitions of terms, and limitations of the study.

Chapter II contains a review of literature concerning the self-esteem and parental child-rearing practices. Specifically, this chapter includes a discussion on self-esteem, concepts of self-esteem, theories and development of child-rearing practices, the influences of parental child-rearing practices, the approaches and instruments used in the study of child-rearing practices, historical trends of child-rearing practices, theories of delinquency, and the delinquent home.

In chapter III the research design describes the selection and
characteristics of subjects, the variables, the instruments and methods of scoring, pilot study, the administration of instruments and collection of data. The statement of null hypotheses, and the statistical-analysis methods utilized in the study are presented.

Chapter IV includes the data and presentation of findings on the self-esteem and the perceived degree of their parents' child-rearing practices, inter-correlations between two sets of variables, and multiple regression analysis.

Chapter V presents discussions on self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' child-rearing practices. The chapter also contains the summary, conclusions, and implications for further research.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter contains a review of literature concerning self-esteem and parents' child-rearing practices. It also includes a definition of self-esteem, conceptual analysis of self, concepts of self-esteem, views by various theorists on self-esteem, theories and development of child-rearing practices, historical trends in child-rearing practices, and the influences of parental-child-rearing practices. It also includes a brief discussion on juvenile delinquency.

Definitions of Self-Esteem

It seems apparent that self-esteem provides an important foundation for the development of a child's personality. Yarrow (1960) defines "self-esteem" in terms of the "readiness to act--an individual's orientation toward aspects of his personal and impersonal environment and toward himself" (p. 5).

Many studies emphasize self-esteem as a basis for integrating personality and self-concept. For instance, Garlow, Butler, and Guthrie (1963) view self-esteem as a "major determinant of the behavior and perceptions" (p. 15), and Douvan and Gold (1966) indicate that...
self-esteem is "the total configuration of self" (p. 515). It is stated that "self-esteem is a personal judgment of worthiness that is expressed in the attitudes the individual holds toward himself" (Coopersmith, 1967, pp. 4-5). In that context, the individual makes the evaluation regarding himself according to his abilities and personal values as he is aware of them. However, these self-attitudes may be conscious or unconscious and be responded to favorably or unfavorably, according to Coopersmith (p. 5).

The Significance of Self-Esteem

The major basis for this study is the widely held belief that self-esteem is significantly associated with personal satisfaction and effective functioning. The achievement of a high self-esteem has been regarded as important by a number of personality theorists—Rogers, Murphy, Horney, and Adler—but few have made direct studies of its effects. This belief in the importance of self-esteem is also shared by many clinicians and social psychologists. Since, however, consensus does not constitute proof, this widely held belief is suggestive rather than definitive. In addition, most statements concerning the importance of self-esteem tend to be relatively general in nature. They rarely indicate the specific behaviors to which self-esteem is related or in what way it is an effective, contributing determinant of personality.

Wylie's (1961) insightful and scholarly monograph reveals that persons who seek psychological help frequently acknowledge that they suffer from feelings of inadequacy and unworthiness. These people see themselves as helpless and inferior, incapable of improving
their situations or of tolerating or reducing the anxiety readily aroused by everyday events and stress (Rogers & Dymond, 1954).

Clinical psychologists observe that persons who are plagued by doubts of their worthiness can neither give nor receive love, apparently fearing that the exposure that comes with intimacy will reveal their inadequacies and cause them to be rejected (Fromm, 1939). They thus avoid closeness in their relationships and feel isolated as a result. Other studies also reveal that persons whose performance does not match their personal ambitions evaluate themselves as inferior, no matter how high their attainments may be. These persons are likely to report feelings of guilt, shame, or depression and to conclude that their actual accomplishments are of little significance. Unless and until they can attain their desired goals, they regard themselves as unsuccessful and unworthy. Clinical studies repeatedly demonstrate that failures and other conditions that threaten to expose personal inadequacies are probably the major cause of anxiety. Anxiety and self-esteem are closely related (Gendlin, 1962; Hartman, 1958; and McClelland, Atkinson, Clark, & Lowell, 1953).

Many laboratory and field studies tend to support and extend the clinical psychologist's impressions of the significance of self-esteem in personal experience and interpersonal behavior. Although the evidence is often merely an inference derived from the study of other topics, these research studies often conclude that self-esteem is a major contributing variable. Motivational research strongly suggests that the striving after social status and social approval stems, in good part, from the desire to maintain a favorable self-evaluation.
Experimental studies indicate that a person with low self-esteem is less capable of resisting pressures to conform and is less able to perceive threatening stimuli than a person with high self-esteem (Janis, 1954). They further indicate that a person with a high self-esteem maintains a fairly constant image of his capabilities and of his distinctness as a person. Studies of creative persons show that creative persons rank quite high in self-esteem (Gendlin, 1962; Jacobson, 1954; Stephenson, 1953).

Of even greater importance and meaning to the present study are the indirect indications that in children domination, rejection, and severe punishment result in lower self-esteem. Under such conditions the children have fewer experiences of love and success and tend to become generally submissive and withdrawn (although occasionally veering to the opposite extreme of aggression and domination). Children reared under such crippling environments are unlikely to be realistic and effective in their daily functioning and are more likely to exhibit anti-social behavior patterns (Baumrind, 1966; Coopersmith, 1967; Solomon, 1964; Walters, Parke, & Cane, 1965).

**Conceptual Analysis of Self**

During his early years, the child develops a concept that the parts of his body, the responses of others to him, and the objects he receives have a common point of reference. With more experience he arrives at an abstraction of what these attributes and events have in common. He develops meanings that he associates with and which become generalized perceptions that govern his behavior and personality.
This abstraction is the "object" to which he refers when he considers his reactions to himself and the reactions of others to him. It is an abstraction that is formed and elaborated in social interactions, private reactions to himself, mastery in solving developmental tasks, and competence in dealing with life situations (Horowitz, 1935).

Inasmuch as young children have little experience and only limited capacity to abstract, they tend to form relatively vague, simple, haphazard abstractions of themselves. Their idea of themselves as an object is sketchy and is likely to be associated with highly localized and specific parts of the body (Horowitz, 1935; Natsoulas & Dubanoski, 1964). With additional experience and information that give perspective upon the reference of events, and with an increased capacity to abstract, the child's symbolic representation becomes more precise and complex.

The concept "self" comes to cover more attributes and experiences, while at the same time it becomes more selective as to which distinctive characteristics of these experiences are assumed to be self-referring. As with any abstraction, selectivity results in certain characteristics being excluded and others being over-emphasized. The "self" is the object a person regards himself to be. It is thus selectively weighted according to the individual's abstraction of the common features of his personal experiences. Although the idea of the self is open to change and alteration, it appears to be relatively resistant to such changes. Once established, it apparently provides a sense of personal continuity over space and time and is defended against change, reduction, and insult (Coopersmith,
The concept of self as an object is inevitably a complex concept. It is formed out of a variety of experiences, includes varied and numerous extensions, is exhibited in external objects (the body) as well as internal ones, and is based upon different levels and types of competence in coping with the environment. The concept of self is thus multidimensional, with different dimensions reflecting both the diversity of experience, characteristics, abilities, and different emphases in the process of abstraction (Wylie, 1961). Rather than study this multidimensional pattern of concepts in its entirety, this research focuses on self-evaluation. This study is specifically concerned with the evaluative attitude which the individual holds toward himself as an "object." In these terms, the present study represents an examination of the conditions that produce high and low self-esteem.

**Views on Self-Esteem by Major Theorists**

There are several theories of personality that include self-esteem as a significant variable, but only one (Adler) in which it plays a major role. The neo-Freudians--particularly Sullivan, Horney, and Fromm--are highly attentive to the significance of self-esteem, but they treat it as a separate topic rather than one central to their own theories. Adler clearly perceived the importance of self-esteem but was more concerned with its implications for therapy than with explanations. The work of such ego psychologists as Erikson (1963), Hartman (1958), and Jacobson (1954) is clearly related to self-esteem, but the relationship is indirect and carries a heavy superstructure...
of unrelated assumptions. Self-psychologists like Rogers, and the phenomenologists, in general, have been interested in self-esteem but have been more concerned with the general nature of subjective experience and the individual's acceptance of his experiences. These studies have provided an increased understanding of the subjective basis of human behavior and have contributed a number of procedural innovations and refinements which facilitate the study of self-esteem (Gendlin, 1962; Rogers, 1954; Stephenson, 1953). However, in their acceptance of experience per se, and its importance in the therapeutic process, they have largely bypassed the issues of defensiveness and external validation.

Earlier psychologists and sociologists such as William James, George H. Mead, and Charles Cooley provided major insights and guidelines for the study of self-esteem. Their principles remain among the most convincing on the topic, particularly their discussions of the sources of high and low self-esteem. These psychologists were more likely to be very concerned with the origin and the nature of the self, and the continuity, consistency, and quality of subjective experience. They also appreciated the significance of self-esteem but did not propose a specific theoretical framework within which that subject could be discussed and investigated. Therefore, one can conclude that there is no single theoretical context in which self-esteem can be considered without accepting a number of vague and often unrelated assumptions. It is therefore necessary to develop a context from more specific, topical treatments and to integrate these concepts into a coherent and testable theory.
William James' analysis, as revealed in *Principles of Psychology* (1890), provides three possible influences upon self-esteem. In the course of analyzing subjective experience and the significance of self, James concludes that human ambitions and values play an essential role in determining whether one regards himself favorably or not. One's achievements are measured against one's ambitions for any given area of behavior. If achievement approaches or meets expectations in a valued area, the result is high self-esteem. However, if there is a wide divergence, then one can regard one's self poorly.

Our self-feeling in this world depends entirely on what we back ourselves to be and do. It is determined by the ratio of our actualities to our purposed potentialities; a fraction of which our pretensions are the denominator, and the numerator our success; thus self-esteem = success
pretensions
(James, 1890, p. 310).

James concludes that achievement is measured against ambition with valued areas assuming particular importance, but he also believes that man achieves a sense of his general worth by employing communal standards of success and status (p. 210).

According to James, "self-esteem" is the sum total of all that man can call his. It is not only his body and his psychic process, but his clothes, his house, his wife, and his children, his ancestors and his friends, his reputation and occupation, his lands and horses, his yacht, and bank accounts (p. 291). All these things give him the same emotions. In addition to the material constituents of the self, James proposes a "social self" which is the recognition he gets from
his peers. The enhancement of a man's extended self, be it his body, race, father, or reputation, is expected to raise his self-esteem, and derogation is expected to have the opposite effect (pp. 308-309).

George H. Mead's Concept of Self-Esteem

As a sociologist, Mead is concerned with the process by which the individual becomes a compatible and integrated member of the social group. He concludes that in the course of this process the individual internalizes the ideas and attitudes, adopting them and expressing them in his own way. This holds true for attitudes and actions expressed toward himself as well as toward external objects. He comes to respond to himself and develops self-attitudes consistent with those expressed by the significant others in this world. Internalizing their posture toward him, he values himself, as others regard and value him and demeans himself to the extent that they reject, ignore, or demean him. He thus learns how he appears to specific others, "assumes the attitude or uses the gesture which another individual will use, and responds to it himself, or tends to so respond. . . . He gradually becomes a social being in his own experience and acts toward others" (Mead, 1934, p. 145). The end of regarding and speaking to and of himself as others have spoken is that he assumes the properties of a social object. When this occurs he tends to conceive of himself as having the characteristics and value that others attribute to him.

To Mead, self-esteem is largely derived from the reflected appraisal of others. According to Mead, the man is an island in his
self-evaluation. No matter how isolated and independent one may believe himself to be, one carries within himself the reflecting mirror of his social group. If one places high values on one's self, there have been key persons in one's life who have treated him with concern and respect; if one holds one's self lowly, significant others have treated him as an inferior object. The views of the generalized (or significant) others as expressed in their manner of treatment are Mead's key to the formation of self-esteem (pp. 154-58).

Harry S. Sullivan's Concept of Self-Esteem

Harry S. Sullivan accepts Mead's interpretation of the social origins of personality and then proceeds to a more extended analysis of the interpersonal processes involved. He believes that the awareness of other people is virtually omnipresent and has a large evaluative component. The individual is continually guarding himself against a loss of self-esteem, for it is this loss that produces the feelings of anxiety. "Anxiety" is an interpersonal phenomenon that occurs when an individual expects to be or is indeed rejected or demeaned by himself or others (Mullahy, 1967, pp. 10-12).

Sullivan also raised the issue of how the individual learns to diminish or to thwart threats to his self-esteem. Individuals learned to cope with such threats in differing styles and to different degrees. The ability to minimize or avoid loss of self-esteem is important in maintaining a relatively high, acceptable level of esteem. His focus on the interpersonal bases of self-esteem, the particular importance of parents and siblings, and the importance of procedures to minimize

Karen Horney's Concept of Self-Esteem

Karen Horney (1945, 1950) focuses on the interpersonal processes and on ways of warding off self-destructing feelings. She lists a wide range of adverse factors that may produce feelings of helplessness and isolation. She believes that these feelings are major sources of unhappiness and reduced personal effectiveness. The conditions that produce anxiety include domination, indifference, lack of respect, disparagement. She also indicates that the main cause for all these conditions is a disturbance in the parent-child relationship generally associated with parental egocentricity (1950, pp. 110-75).

Morris Rosenberg's Concept of Self-Esteem

The major empirical study of Morris Rosenberg represents a significant step in explaining many of the social conditions associated with enhanced and diminished self-esteem. Information on these conditions and the subjective experiences of esteem were obtained from an attitude survey administered to over five thousand high-school students. The study indicates that social class is only weakly related, and ethnic-group affiliation is unrelated to self-esteem. However, this study underscores that the amount of paternal attention and concern, which differs by social class, religion, and ethnic group, is significantly related to self-esteem. Adolescents who have close relationships with their fathers are higher in self-esteem.
than are those with more distant, impersonal relationships (pp. 129-46).

Carl Rogers' Concept of Self-Esteem

Carl Rogers (1952) proposes that all persons develop a self-image which serves to guide and maintain their adjustment to the external world. Since this image develops out of interaction with the environment, it reflects the judgments, preferences, and shortcomings of the particular familial and social setting. Rogers indicates the pernicious effects of self-judgments that the individual as an entity, or in selected components of behavior, is bad. Such harsh, reflecting judgments prevent the individual from accepting himself and therefore cause him severe suffering. Even though they may be ignored or denied expression, these harsh, reflecting judgments continue to have a destructive effect by producing underlying doubts of worthiness and competence (pp. 481-533).

Rogers (1951) also argues that a permissive atmosphere which permits the free expression of ideas and feelings and does not resort to harsh or frequent evaluation enables the individual to know and accept himself. Conflicts can be averted if parents and significant others accept the views and values of the child, although they need not necessarily agree with him. In this way, the adolescent comes to respect himself, gains assurance in deriving his own values, and learns to trust himself as a locus of experience. This requires parents who are willing to accept differences and are able and ready to trust their child (pp. 5-158).
Alfred Adler's Concept of Self-Esteem

Alfred Adler (1927, 1955) places greater stress on the importance of actual weakness and maladies in producing low self-esteem than the other theorists do. In his early work, Adler proposes that feeling of inferiority may develop around certain organs or patterns of behavior in which the individual is indeed inferior. Actual injuries as a withered arm or blindness or bodily weakness in breathing or muscular dystrophy may produce feelings of insufficiency and incompetency (1927, pp. 1-142).

Adler (1956) terms such insufficiencies and disabilities as "organ inferiorities" as distinct from the more socially or individually defined bases of inferiority feelings (pp. 24-25). He proposes that feelings of inferiority are an inevitable occurrence of the childhood experiences of every individual. The comparison between relative strengths and sizes that children invariably make leads them to conclude that they are, in fact, weak and incomplete. The result is a feeling of inferiority and insufficiency that motivates and stimulates the child to achieve greater size and competence (pp. 22-30).

Adler notes three distinct conditions that may have bad consequences on the development of self-esteem. The first are the organ inferiorities and differences in size and strength. These conditions are to a great extent unpreventable and, since they do have motivating effects, their presence can also result in a positive outcome. Whether or not a positive outcome develops depends in good part upon the acceptance, support, and encouragement of the parents and immediate friends. These experiences represent the second major...
condition. With acceptance and support, children with inferiorities can compensate for these weaknesses and turn them into strengths; without such support they become hopeless and embittered. Whereas Adler believes in the importance of support and acceptance, he warns against the destructive effects of pampering, which is the third condition. He believes that overindulged children develop an unrealistically inflated value of their worth. They become egocentric and demanding and are not willing or prepared to engage in mature, reciprocal social relationships with others (1956, pp. 118-419).

**Historical Trends in Child Rearing**

**Colonial America (1640-1850)**

Children, particularly those living on the frontier, were raised almost exclusively in the context of isolated nuclear families under conditions in which the birth and death rates were quite high. All members of the family were needed for its work as a productive unit. Independence and marriage at an early age were expected. A stern Puritan Christianity strongly influenced parents' conceptions of human nature.

Children were considered by nature as obdurate, and inclined to do the work of the devil; they had to be broken like a horse in order to be fit for society. They were to be seen and not heard. They were to defer formally to their parents in all matters including, frequently, their marriage, and they were expected above all to be industrious. (Christensen, 1964, p. 403)

**Industrialization Era (1850-1900)**

During the period of industrialization which began after the Civil War, the character of society changed drastically and the
demands upon the family were thus quite varied. The locality of work for more and more families shifted to the city. The family changed from a unit of production to one chiefly of consumption as income-producing work was more and more carried on outside of the home in the factory. Children were in great demand as laborers and many of them were forced to work twelve to fourteen hours a day (Kenkel, 1973, p. 246).

Twenty-five percent of the boys between the ages of ten and fifteen years old were employed in the factories as late as 1890 (Kenkel, 1973, p. 246). As a result of the awakened moral indignation at the exploitation of child labor, the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children was founded and at a later date the child-labor legislation was enacted.

The ideal adult personality of the early industrialized society can be described as having such distinct characteristics as: self-control, self-denial, self-sufficiency, a strong motivation to get ahead, and a willingness to take risks. Parents during this period of industrialization stressed rewarding individualism, independence, self-denial, and competitiveness in child-rearing practices (Kenkel, 1973, p. 246).

As the industrial efforts became more successful, the factories did not need every available hand at work. First, the very young and later the very old, were released from work. Then as technology became more advanced, fewer unskilled workers were needed and more skilled and managerial workers were needed. Industrial success and technological advancement made it possible for children to be in
schools rather than working in the factories. Thus the emphasis in child-rearing practices was radically changing to another perspective (Kenkel, 1973, p. 244).

Emergent Mass Society (1900-1945)

With the turn of the century the era of scientific child-rearing began first in the more mobile middle-class families. Shorn of advice from friends and kin on how to rear children and more deprived by the demands of industry of sufficient intimate contact with neighbors to learn by imitation, young middle-class families began to turn to the experts for advice. Kenkel (1973) sees the period since World War I as the period of emergence of the mass society and proposes that the child-rearing norms appropriate to the development of an ideal adult personality for a bureaucratized mass society must emphasize accommodation, getting along, and conformity (pp. 247-49).

Accordingly, the slogan for the day is no longer "get ahead" but "get along." This change in emphasis from "getting ahead" to "getting along" has, of course, been noted by other child-rearing experts. In Lonely Crowd, Riesman, Glazer, and Denney (1950) discussed the change from "inner-directed" to "other-directed" personalities. The "inner-directed" person regulates his behavior in accordance with strong precepts internalized in early life from the direction of his parents and elders. The "other-directed" person, by contrast, takes his cue from his contemporaries and then looks to them for a source of direction for his behavior. Riesman seems to feel that various forces in the modern society tend to produce increasingly more "other-directed"
people (Reisman, 1950, p. 148).

Miller and Swanson (1953) found that the entrepreneurial middle-class mothers seem to be training their children to exercise greater self-control, to be more self-reliant, and to take a more active and manipulative stance toward society. The child-rearing practices of bureaucratic middle-class mothers seem to encourage the child to adopt an accommodating and adjusting approach to life.

Modern Child-rearing Era
(1945-Present)

Modern child-rearing practices seem to concentrate on how to produce happy, contented children and mothers and fathers who enjoy parenthood. Spock (1957) proposes the permissive approach to child-rearing. Bronfenbrenner concludes that in 1958 the major changes in child-rearing practices are:

1. Mothers of all social classes have become more flexible with regard to feeding and weaning over the past quarter of the century. The trend is toward demand-feeding and late-weaning from the bottle.

2. Class variations in feeding, weaning, and toilet-training are perceivable.

3. Middle-class mothers since World War II are more permissive across the board with their young children than are working-class mothers, especially in such areas as oral behavior, toilet accidents, dependency, sex, aggressiveness, and freedom of movement outside the home. (Bronfenbrenner, 1958, p. 424)

Within this context the middle-class has shifted away from emotional control toward freer expression of affection.

In the 1980s popular magazine articles are shifting away from permissiveness and reintroducing the idea of restrictiveness and teaching a child that there are limits beyond which he cannot go.
Theories of Child-rearing Practices

The Puritan Theory

It is useful to think of any society's regimen of child-rearing as involving--implicitly--three basic conceptions: (1) of original nature, (2) of the ideal adult member of that society, and (3) of the procedures to mold the raw material into the finished product. Because the colonial Puritans offer a rather obvious and easily understood example, it is instructive to consider their views or theories (Kenkel, 1973, pp. 162-64).

The Puritan theory of child-rearing seems to borrow heavily from the Old Testament theory of child-rearing. Children were thought to be depraved at birth. If left to their own designs, it was thought that they would grow up to be pleasure-seeking adults. The approved adult was industrious, pious, and, above all, self-denying. Therefore, it seemed to follow that the child-rearing regimen should be one of sternness, work, and denial of the flesh. The theory of depravity of child nature, which was reflected in Puritan methods of training and disciplining children, is seen in Cotton Mather's account of an interview with his daughter which occurred some thirty years before his death:

I took my little daughter Katy (age four) into my study and there told my child that I am to die shortly and she must, when I am dead, remember everything I now said unto her. I set before her the sinful condition of her nature and charged her to pray in secret places every day. That God for the sake of Jesus Christ would give her a new heart. . . . I gave her to understand that when I am taken from her, she must look to meet with more humbling afflictions than she does now that she has a tender father to provide for her. (Calhoun, 1945, pp. 75-76)
The concept of original sin was interpreted by the Puritans to mean that a child was innately base and sinful. His or her "natural tendencies," therefore, would be toward evil, and only by diligent training and rigid discipline could the "Old Adam" be kept in reasonable submission. Parents and other adults were in agreement that "beating" was the best way to control the children's sinful inclinations. The entry in Judge Sewall's diary on the beating of his son gives some of the religious flavor that accompanied the punishment:

1862, November 6, Joseph threw a knob of brass, and hit his sister Betty upon the forehead so as to make it bleed; upon which, and for his playing at Prayer-time, and eating when Return Thanks I whip'd him pretty smartly. When I first went in, call'd by his Grandmother, he sought to shadow and hide himself from me behind the head of the Cradle, which he gave me the sorrowful remembrance of Adam's carriage. (Earle, 1889, p. 208)

The use and threat of strong disciplinary measures, perhaps needless to say, did not produce a generation of little Puritan saints. Boys proved to be particularly troublesome, and time and again instances of "incorrigible" and "wicked" youths were recorded.

It was noted that Puritan parents were not to love their children "too intensely." A couple, having lost two children by drowning, interpreted the tragedy as God's retribution for their having been too indulgent with the children (Winthrop, 1853, p. 411). The first concept of child-rearing practices is the Calvinist-Puritan view implied in the hell-fire and brimstone sermons of the more fundamentalist preachers.

A second view is that the infant, rather than being originally evil, is originally innocent. This Rousseaurian concept of original
goodness carries the idea that the world, as contrasted with the child, is full of vice and wickedness, sorrow and tragedy. Since purity is desirable, it follows that the child should be sheltered from the world of evil and sorrow. It is this conception of original nature that Margaret Mead has in mind when she asserts that American parents believe they should present themselves to their children as considerably more, morally, than they actually are (Mead, 1943, p. 127).

The third concept of original nature may be seen as a variant of the second; that the infant is not only originally innocent but also rich in potentiality while at the same time being very fragile and responsive to both good and bad treatment. According to this third concept, a favorable environment during the first few months and years of life, especially a favorable experience with a warm, nurturing mother, enables the many potentialities born in the infant to develop so that the resulting adult is spontaneous, creative, warm, kind, friendly, and secure. Conversely, it is believed that an unfavorable experience in infancy and childhood, again especially in the maternal relationship, produces the opposite kind of adult—rigid, cruel, and insecure (Earle, 1889, p. 238).

The Directional Theory

From the standpoint of immediate parent-child interactions a very important dimension is that of directiveness versus permissiveness, or, as the child psychologists phrase it, the directional theory involves ordering and forbidding procedures; it involves being directive with the child. It focuses on the assumption that the child is less wise than his or her parents, and that the parents should
make many decisions for their child.

Judging from the directional theory, an obedient and reserved child reflects credit on his parents.

The Developmental Theory

The developmental theory implies a relatively permissive atmosphere, the idea that the child should be allowed to evolve from his own potentialities, to make his own mistakes, to develop into a unique and creative person. From the research of Stendler and Wolfenstein, it seems clear that, over a period of perhaps twenty-five years or so and beginning in the middle thirties, the direction of advice to parents has been toward the developmental, permissive, indulgent point of view. Escalona (1949) has thus summarized this philosophy of child-rearing:

To select a few representative items: It is now thought that it is up to us as adults to meet the needs of the younger child, rather than to expect early adoption from him. To wit, self-demand schedules and all that goes with them. Among the needs of the young child we recognize the need for affection and for an intimate relationship with the mother as of very great importance, tending to evaluate it as more crucial than the need for good physical care. We prize self-expressions, sincerity of feeling, and spontaneous interest above good manners, self-restraint, or intellectual accomplishments. (P. 160)

It is clear that this approach places much more emphasis on the welfare of the child and much less on the pleasure and convenience of the parents. Escalona has offered the interesting hypothesis that parents have been taking up the indulgent-developmental technique of child-rearing not only because of the considerable promotion it has received from psychoanalysts, psychologists, and others, but also because many parents feel a load of unconscious guilt about the failure
of the parental generation to provide an acceptable world for their children to live in. Escalona (1949) also points out that the pampering method of child rearing with demand feeding and related characteristics can be very hectic for the parents.

The Autocratic Theory

To the extent that one can read the current signs of the times, the change prefigured in the recent journals is currently taking place. The pendulum in child-rearing practices seems to be moving away from the indulgent-permissive end toward a more autocratic form or pattern of child-disciplinary measures. It has been discovered that firmness and strictness on the part of the parents is good for the children: it adds to the sense of security. Here are some examples given by other psychologists in support of the autocratic theory:

... love alone ... cannot and should not be expected to counteract the effects of all the temptations and frustrations that surround so many children today. (Barclay, 1956, p. 48)

The magnificent promise of progressive education has been dimmed by those who incorporated a rebellion against and hatred of their own society into their plans for freeing children to learn more spontaneously. Pediatricians who share the cultural belief in the need to teach self-control have twisted the invention of a self-regulatory schedule ... to a method of spoiling the baby by giving it its own way. (Mead, 1955, pp. 453-54)

Many teachers ... have ... exemplified a specious egalitarianism child and adult. The child ... wants the adult's help in controlling his impulses ... he needs to feel that the adult has achieved a more sure mastery of impulses ... egalitarian tendencies of adults to express a one-sided perception of children's feelings toward authority. (Wolfenstein, 1955, p. 446)
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Along with the conceptual convergence between different theoretical formulations, there is a similar correspondence in the research methods that have been used in investigating child-rearing influences on personality development. Both psychoanalytically oriented research and research from a social-learning framework (as well as atheoretical studies) have by and large used similar procedures to obtain data on rearing experiences and on child behavior. There has been heavy reliance on verbal reports of untrained introspectionists, parents, or children. These reports generally have been the bases of indices of mother-child interactions that are interpreted as modal or usual sequences of interplay (Eron, Banton, Walder, & Laulight, 1961, pp. 457-72; Smith, 1958, pp. 278-82).

The dimensions of parental behavior that have been studied are specified as mainly the kinds of rewarding or punishing attentions from parents, and the warmth or hostility of parental interactions with the child. The behavioral outcomes investigated cover the gamut of personality dimensions, depending on the nature of the subjects: infant responsiveness, toddler dependency, delinquent adolescent hostility, and adult psychopathology (Bandura & Walters, 1963; Becker, 1964; Sears, Maccoby, & Levin, 1957; Sears, Rau, & Alpert, 1965). In the investigation of rearing antecedents of offspring behavior and adolescent behavior, experimentation or direct observations of histories of interaction have been used less extensively. Such use is illustrated in animal research in the work of Harlow and Harlow (1962), in infant studies by Rheingold (1960), in clinical...
studies of pathological family interaction (Wynne, Rycoff, Day, & Hirsch, 1958), and in miniature short-term "histories" of interaction in experimental work with children by Bishop (1951) and by Bandura and Walters (1963). However, verbal reports to date constitute the principal evidence upon which the theory and prescriptions of child-rearing practices rest.

In a study which evaluates the Bronfenbrenner Parent-Behavior Questionnaire, Siegelman (1956) recommends using a research technique for measuring children's perceptions of how they were treated by their father or mother. Therefore, it seems to be reasonable to assume that a scale which measures a child's perceptions of child-rearing practices or patterns of both parents should be more complete than a scale which uses parental reports of either the mother or the father. That is why Roe and Siegelman's Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire was utilized in this study to measure the adolescents' perceptions of their parents' child-rearing practices. The questionnaire is described in greater detail in the chapter on research design.

**Influences of Parents' Child-rearing Practices**

Douvan and Gold (1966) introduce Rosenberg's findings (1965) that when an adolescent perceived his parents as positively concerned about him, he tended to have a higher self-esteem, and that adolescents who showed lower self-esteem had maladjusted relationships with friends.

Medinnus (1965) found that adolescents who were high in self-acceptance and adjustment perceived their parents as more accepting
of them than did adolescents with low self-esteem or self-acceptance. In addition, Medinnus (1965) found that adolescents high in self-acceptance identified more closely with their mothers' than with their fathers' child-rearing practices.

The fact that parental loving attitude is positively related to high self-esteem was found in another study by Rosenberg (1963). Rosenberg found that parental interest in children ("parents' knowing of the child's performance in school, the parents' responses to the child's friends, and family interactions during mealtime," p. 7) was associated with high adolescent self-esteem, while parental "extreme indifference" was associated with low adolescent self-esteem (pp. 136-46).

A long-term study of attitudes toward self is reported by Coopersmith (1957). He studied the self-esteem of normal middle-class boys in pre-adolescence. He concentrated on the effect of parental treatment and concluded that persons who were reared with "acceptance," "respect," and "clearly defined rules" were competent and independent individuals with positive self-esteem, and that persons reared under a condition of rejection had negative self-esteem, resulting in a tendency to withdraw and become submissive (pp. 165-80).

The above studies show that an individual's self-attitude is related to peers' evaluations or interests in him or her, parental behaviors directed toward him, and the degree of success in his doings. This might imply that adolescents' attitudes toward self and others' influences--especially parental influences--are highly related.

Morris and Tseng's study (1957) of children's attitudes toward parents indicated that, for both sexes, attitudes toward mothers...
were more favorable than toward fathers.

Livson (1966) explored the relationships between three aspects of parental behavior (authority, affection, and emotional investment) and their children's involvement with each parent. The aspects of parental behaviors are based upon clinical evaluations of yearly interviews with the mother. Livson found that the children were highly involved with mothers who were highly affectionate toward them (pp. 173-94).

An early study by Watson (1934), referred to in his later study (1957), reports that adolescents with strict parents had unfavorable interactions with peers and hostility to their parents. Douvan & Gold (1966) indicate that dependent and/or rebellious adolescents, who had parents who expected their children to obey and respect their authority, showed hostility toward their parents on the projective tests.

In the studies regarding parents' child-rearing behaviors toward their children, most data have been obtained by questionnaires to parents, interviews with parents, and by observations of parental behavior (Coopersmith, 1967; Livson, 1966; Sears, Maccoby, & Levin, 1957). However, the importance of the child's perception of his parents has been recognized early for understanding his personality development (Ausubel, Balthazar, Rosenthal, Blackman, Schpoont, & Welkowitz, 1954). Parents' behaviors "affect the child's ego development only to the extent and in the form in which he perceives it" (Ausubel, et al., 1954, p. 173). Therefore, it seems that research should focus on the children's perceptions of child-rearing practices.
or child-rearing attitudes of parents rather than on parental reports alone.

Furthermore, studies (Livson, 1966; Sears, Maccoby, & Levin, 1957) regarding parental behavior as indicated by parental reports have emphasized maternal rearing patterns, while the father's role has been neglected. However, it seems that the father's child-rearing techniques as well as the mother's child-rearing techniques should be considered in studies on parental behaviors.

**Delinquency**

**Causation Theories and Approaches**

Are not some of the causes of delinquency well known? What kinds of theories and approaches have been investigated? How were these theories and generalizations developed?

Causal thinking is surely not foreign to the layman. Few citizens are totally puzzled by the course of events and believe that "things just happen by chance." Instead, most occurrences in the physical and social world are presumed to be caused by something—that events which preceded it somehow produced it. Consider the illustration of lung cancer. Cigarettes cause cancer because their ingredients lead to physical changes in lung tissue. Or, stated in another way, cigarettes cause cancer because a person who smokes them for an extended period of time is very likely to develop cancerous lungs.

Causal thinking in science bears some similarity to etiological reasoning on the part of the layman. In both cases, relationships are identified; one phenomenon, event, or form of behavior is linked
to another event which presumably led to it. In addition, a time sequence is usually implied such that the cause of something rests in a factor which preceded it. In short, both the layman and the scientist deal with causal statements taking an "If X occurs, then Y will probably follow" form. In the case of delinquency, an illustrative etiological claim would be: "If children are reared in family circumstances characterized by parental rejection and neglect, most of them will develop into aggressive and antisocial persons." Although scientific and lay ideas of causation show some points of similarity, they are not by any means identical.

Tappan (1949) expresses the orientation to causation: "Cause is the exertion by multiple factors, occurring in varied but specific configurations, of a determining influence upon the deviant behavior that ensues" (pp. 64-65).

In general, three major theories have guided delinquency analysts: biogenic, psychogenic, and sociogenic approaches. Each of these declares that the genesis of juvenile misconduct is to be found in factors of a particular kind. However, other psychologists have chosen to use the eclectic approach to analyze the genesis of delinquency such as the following: biogenic-psychogenic, biogenic-sociogenic, psychogenic-sociogenic, and biogenic-psychogenic-sociogenic.

Biogenic answers to etiological questions view the lawbreaker as a person whose misconduct is the result of faulty biology. The offender is hereditarily defective; he suffers from endocrine imbalance or brain damage; his bodily structure and temperament pattern have pushed him toward delinquency.
Psychogenic approaches are quite varied in character, but they all indicate that the offender behaves as he does in response to psychological pathology of some kind. In most of these theories, the maladjusted delinquent is judged to be the product of intimate social experiences in the family or the environment.

Sociogenic arguments explain variations in delinquency rates by conditions of social structure. More specifically, they account for individual offenders by referring to normal learning processes which go on in gangs or other situations that stigmatize contacts with social-control agencies, and to other variables of that kind.

Biogenic Theory of Delinquency

One of the most recent biological investigations concerned the presence of mesomorphic bodily structure among delinquents. Glueck and Glueck (1956) found that mesomorphic boys were more frequent among the offenders they studied than among the non-offenders. Mesomorphic structure characterized 60.1 percent of the lawbreakers, but only 30.7 percent of the nondelinquents. These findings were the result of careful measurement, thus there is little question as to their accuracy.

Coartes and Gotti (1972) conducted a detailed, careful investigation of the links between biological, psychological, and social factors and delinquency. They report that mesomorphic bodily structure, temperament patterns, and delinquency are related. They also present a complex bio-psychosocial theory of juvenile delinquency (p. 40).
Psychoanalytic Theory of Delinquency

The theme guiding psychogenic investigation is that critical causal factors in delinquency are personality problems to which juvenile misbehavior is presumed to be a response. Aichhorn (1955), a pioneering figure in the development of this argument, asserted that "there must be something in the child himself which the environment brings out in the form of delinquency" (p. 30). Delinquents behave as they do because they are in some way "sick," "maladjusted," or "pathological." Aichhorn's statement also indicates a second assumption of psychogenic perspectives: that the environment may function as a precipitating force, but never as a primary force in causation (pp. 31-35).

Although the proponents of psychogenic theory by no means speak with one voice about delinquency, three general positions can be discerned in the writings of psychiatrists, psychologists, and others of psychogenic persuasion. The psychoanalytic position extends to crime and delinquency the psychoanalytic theory developed by Freud. In addition, Healy and Bonner, Hewitt and Jenkins, Glueck and Glueck, and others propose the personality theory in relation to delinquency. A third argument links delinquency to a particular form of personality structure, psychopathy, or sociopathy.

Emotional Problems and Delinquency

Since 1900, psychiatrists and others have written much about personality problems, emotional imbalances and delinquency, independent of Freudian psychoanalytic theory. The emotional dynamics that
have been identified have been of many kinds, and the origins of these problems have been alleged to involve a large variety of background experiences, with particular emphasis upon parent-child tensions and distorted primary group relations. Grossbard (1962) provides one example of this view. He avers that most offenders show inefficient or underdeveloped ego mechanisms and tend to act out mental conflicts instead of handling them by rational means or symptom formation.

Burt's (1938) study, which claims that 85 percent of the offenders he studied prior to 1938 were emotionally impaired, stands as an early example of the general personality problem view. In a study on delinquency and emotional problems, Healy and Bronner (1936) compared 105 delinquents with 105 of their nondelinquent siblings in New Haven, Boston, and Detroit. After examining those youngsters, these investigators concluded that no less than 91 percent of the delinquents were unhappy or discontented in their life circumstances or extremely disturbed because of emotion-provoking situations or experiences (Healy & Bronner, 1936, p. 122).

Proponents of psychogenic arguments must also contend with the findings of Schuessler and Cressey (1950) who reviewed many studies of personality characteristics of delinquents and criminals. They concluded:

... of 113 such comparisons, 42 percent showed differences in favor of the noncriminal, while the remainder were indeterminate. The doubtful validity of many of the obtained differences, as well as the lack of consistency in the combined results, makes it impossible to conclude from these data that criminality and personality elements are associated. (Schuessler & Cressey, 1950, pp. 476-84)

Waldo and Dinitz (1967) examined a large number of studies
conducted between 1950 and 1955. After carefully assessing the results of these inquiries, the conclusion was that no marked relationships between personality elements and delinquency were reflected in them. However, these studies conducted by Schuessler and Cressey (1950) and Waldo and Dinitz (1967) were dealing with heterogeneous samples of offenders and nondelinquents. No effort was made in any of these to discover personality dimensions among offender types with the delinquents.

Kvaraceus (1959) discovered that the extent to which emotional adjustment is a factor in misbehavior depends upon the offender's social background, as indicated in table 1.

**TABLE 1**

**DISTRIBUTION OF DELINQUENT INDIVIDUALS AND EMOTIONAL DISTURBANCE**

(In Percentage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Status</th>
<th>Demonstrable Emotional Disturbance</th>
<th>Little or No Serious Emotional Disturbance</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle/Upper classes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower class</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Fifteen percent of the delinquents in the group, studied by Kvaraceus, Miller, and Baron (1959) came from the upper class, but two-thirds of the 15 percent or one tenth of the entire group of delinquents...
were emotionally disturbed. That is, if a delinquent comes from an upper class home, he is twice as likely to be emotionally disturbed as he is to be normal in his emotional reactions. The "good" home provides a basic standard of conduct that most of the children follow willingly and such a home protects its youth from some of the more damaging ideas that are current in poorer homes. Therefore, if a boy from a good home misbehaves, he is presumably led into trouble by his maladjustments, not by external circumstances.

Of the delinquents from the lower class--who made up 85 percent of the total--70 percent of the total showed no emotional maladjustment. Only 15 percent (from the lower class) of the total sample showed emotional disturbances (Kvaraceus, Miller & Barron, 1959, p. 54). Therefore presumably the delinquency reflected a more normal adjustment from the lower class.

Robins' study (1966) traced the adult adjustments of 324 child-guidance-clinic patients in St. Louis, Missouri, thirty years after they had appeared in the clinic. A comparison group of 100 normal school children were similarly subjected to a follow-up study. Most of the guidance-clinic juveniles had been sent to the clinic by the juvenile court. Of these, over 70 percent had been referred for "antisocial conduct," that is, "runaway behavior," "truancy," and "theft." Robins defines "sociopaths" as persons who tend to exhibit a "gross, repetitive failure to conform to societal norms in many areas of life, life, in the absence of thought disturbance suggesting psychoses" (p. 79).
Sociogenic Theory of Delinquency

Merton's study (1957) contends that delinquency is a response to the unavailability of conventional or socially approved routes to success and is characteristic of lower-class persons (pp. 131-94). Barron (1955) attributes delinquency to the clash of values in a pluralistic society, to the impersonality, individualism, disrespect for law and order, exploitiveness, and other ingredients central to the American way of life (pp. 93-112).

Reckless' social-containment theory (1973) offers an overarching perspective for the explanation of criminality and delinquency. The central thesis is that individuals are restrained from lawbreaking partly by outer containment such as social ties to others, and consistency of evaluations of the person made by others. Inner containment in the form of a prosocial self-concept is of major significance in keeping persons from wandering into lawbreaking (pp. 55-65).

The Delinquent Home

The homes of the delinquent and nondelinquent boys in the Glueck and Glueck study (1950) were of much the same external type—overcrowded tenements with poor sanitation and poor furnishings, but those of the nondelinquents were cleaner and fewer of the families were on welfare.

The family stock of the two groups was definitely poorer for the delinquents. Among both the immediate ancestors and the living relatives there are more who were defective in character, emotionally disturbed, drunkards, or criminals. The parents and siblings of the
delinquents showed an excess of the same traits. The percentage differences in regard to the characteristics between the two groups ran from 6 to 39 percent; and in all categories the delinquents show the higher percentage of negative traits (Shulman, 1949).

The broken home also plays its part, although its role is not as significant as was once thought. In general, the earlier the break, the more extensive is the effect on the children. One important long-time effect upon the boys in the family is their deprivation of the customary father-image, which usually acts as a model for their own development. If a boy has only a mother or only a mother and sisters, he has to live in a feminine atmosphere, which may nudge him into delinquency in his revolt against too many women and his desire to be a man (Monahan, 1960, pp. 387-97).

Shulman (1949) feels that the fundamental causes of delinquency are to be found in the treatment accorded a child by his parents, especially during his preschool years. For various reasons, the basic theme is one of rejection on the part of the parents (pp. 21-31). Nearly twice as many delinquents as nondelinquents came from broken homes, and nearly four times as many were living with people who were substituting for their own parents (Wattenberg, 1950, pp. 6-9).

**Summary**

Studies like those of Garlow, Butler, and Guthrie (1963) and Douvan and Gold (1966) have indicated that "self-esteem" is a major determinant of the behavior and a "total configuration of self" (Douvan & Gold, 1966, p. 521).

Self-esteem is significantly associated with one's personal
satisfaction and effective functioning. Theorists like William James, George Mead, Harry S. Sullivan, Karen Horney, Morris Rosenberg, Carl Rogers, and Alfred Adler dealt with the various concepts of self-esteem. William James concludes that achievement is measured against ambition with valued areas assuming particular importance, but he also believes that men achieve a sense of their general self-esteem by employing communal standards of success and position in society.

As a sociologist, Mead is more concerned with self-esteem in relation to socialization. Sullivan believes in the interpersonal processes and on ways of preventing self-destructing feelings. Rosenberg deals with the parental influences on the development of self-esteem. Rogers proposes a permissive atmosphere for the development of a positive self-image. Adler places greater stress on the importance of actual weakness and maladies in producing low self-esteem.

The trends of child-rearing practices reflect the needs of each particular historical period. During the colonial period, the children were to be seen and not heard. During the industrialization era, the children were forced to work in the factories for twelve to fourteen hours a day. The emphasis on child-rearing practices during this period were: development of self-control, self-denial, self-sufficiency, a strong motivation to get ahead, and a willingness to take risks. The emergent mass society emphasized accommodation, getting along, and conformity in child-rearing practices, while the modern era vacillates between permissiveness and restrictiveness, or between laissez-faire and autocratic patterns of child-rearing.
The Puritan theory of child-rearing involves three basic concepts of: (1) original nature, (2) ideal adult member of the society, and (3) the procedures to mold the raw material into the finished product. The Puritans emphasize that a child is innately base and sinful. The directional theory involves ordering and forbidding procedures. The developmental theory proposes the indulgent, permissive atmosphere in child-rearing. The autocratic theory reintroduces the strict, restrictive pattern of child-rearing.

Both psychoanalytically oriented research and social-learning research have relied heavily on verbal reports to obtain their data. In the investigation of child-rearing practices, experimentation or direct observations of histories of interactions have been used less extensively.

Studies like that of Rosenberg (1965) find that the adolescent who perceived his parents as positively concerned about him tended to have more self-acceptance. Medinnus (1965) find that adolescents with higher self-acceptance perceived their parents as more accepting. Bandura and Walters (1960) emphasize the influence of child-rearing practices of parents on the self-esteem of their adolescents.

Biogenic, psychogenic, and sociogenic factors are proposed as causes for delinquency by various psychiatrists, psychologists, and researchers. Monahan (1960) indicates that broken homes play an important part or contributory role in the causality of delinquency. Shulman (1949) notes the basic theme in the delinquents' home as one of rejection by their parents. Wattenberg (1950) indicates that
nondelinquents have the affection, interest, and support of their parents, which the delinquents do not have.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

Introduction

This correlational study was conducted with the purpose of investigating the self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and their perceived degree of their parents' child-rearing practices to ascertain if a relationship exists between them.

Selection of Subjects

For the purpose of this study the subjects were selected from Starr Commonwealth population in Albion, Michigan. The group consisted of delinquent male adolescents who were matriculating during the fall semester of 1979 at Starr Commonwealth. This population consisted of 148 male adolescents. Of this group, sixteen were disqualified. Ten of the sixteen were underaged, and the other six followed instructions incorrectly. Thus 132 were utilized for the study.

This sample population selected from Starr Commonwealth was an intact sample. These delinquent male adolescents were not necessarily reflecting a typical population of delinquents.

Characteristics of the Population

The subjects consisted of delinquent or troubled male adolescents who had been referred to Starr Commonwealth by the courts,
juvenile detention centers, concerned parents, mental health agencies, and child psychiatrists in the state of Michigan. Many of these residents had traumatic childhood backgrounds, and some were already leading a criminal way of life.

Tables 2 through 4 give a composite picture of the population of this study. Table 2 presents the racial composition of the population and indicates that the majority of the population for this study were whites (65.9 percent). Blacks constituted 25.8 percent of the population, while a very small minority, approximately 8 percent of the population, consisted of American Indians, Spanish Americans, and others.

Table 3 presents the age composition of the total population of 132 delinquent male adolescents. This table shows that the majority of the population ranged from sixteen to seventeen years old.

Table 4 presents the parental composition of the population of this study. The majority (63.6 percent) of the population had both

TABLE 2
RACIAL COMPOSITION OF POPULATION
\(\text{(N = 132)}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Races</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>65.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3
AGE COMPOSITION OF POPULATION (N = 132)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (in Years)</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 4
PARENTAL COMPOSITION OF POPULATION (N = 132)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural father and mother</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural mother and stepfather</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single parent only</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster father and mother</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
natural father and natural mother. Twenty-two delinquent male adolescents or 16.7 percent of the total population had a natural mother and a stepfather. Fifteen or 11.4 percent of the total population did not have fathers, but mothers only. Eleven or 8.3 percent of the population did not have any parents but were brought up by their foster or adoptive parents. Some of these delinquent male adolescents had lost their parents through death, had been abandoned by their parents, or were declared wards of the courts because of abuse and neglect by their parents.

Some of the exhibited distinct characteristics of behavior as provided by Starr Commonwealth are:

1. Habitual truants
2. Knowingly associated with thieves and vicious and/or immoral persons
3. Incorrigible
4. Acting beyond the control of their parents or guardians
5. Growing up in idleness or crime
6. Absenting self from home without consent
7. Habitually using repulsive, obscene, or vulgar language in public places
8. Conducting self imorally or indecently
9. Smoking cigarettes
10. Using intoxicating liquor and illegal drugs
11. Loitering and engaging in illegal occupations.

See appendix C for specific charges listed as reasons for assignments to Starr Commonwealth.
The Starr Commonwealth was founded by Floyd Starr in 1913 in Albion, Michigan, as a home for troubled boys. His motto is: "There is no such thing as a bad boy." Starr Commonwealth carries on the positive approach to the development of troubled children into happy healthy individuals. It serves about 160 troubled boys with social and behavioral difficulties.

**Variables**

There are two sets of variables—dependent and independent—in this study. The dependent variables consist of the scores of the subjects, classified according to the Self-Esteem Inventory (SEI). They are the General Self-Esteem, School Self-Esteem, Social Self-Esteem, and Home Self-Esteem measures obtained with respect to the adolescents. The independent variables classified by Roe and Siegelman's (1963) Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire (PCR) consist of Protective, Demanding, Rejecting, Neglecting, Casual, Loving, Symbolic-Love Reward, Direct-Object Reward, Symbolic-Love Punishment and Direct-Object Punishment measures obtained with respect to the parents as perceived by delinquent male adolescents.

**Instrumentation**

Two instruments were used for the study, namely, the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (SEI) and the Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire (PCR).

**Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory**

To measure the self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents, the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory was used. This instrument
consists of four subscales: General Self-Esteem, School Self-Esteem, Social Self-Esteem, and Home Self-Esteem. The original pool of items was drawn from Rogers and Dyno (1954) and Coopersmith's original research. Five psychologists classified these items as indicative of high or low self-esteem. Several factor analyses have revealed that the scale is multidimensional in nature. This instrument has shown considerable construct validity in a series of studies conducted by Coopersmith, establishing theoretically consistent relationships with creativity, anxiety, parental treatment, level of aspiration and other variables. The test-retest reliability after five weeks was .88, according to Coopersmith (1967).

Fullerton (1972) who has used the Self-Esteem Inventory for his study reported a reliability of .87, while Taylor and Reitz (1968), utilizing the same instrument, reported a .90 split-half reliability. Crandall (1973) found correlations of .59 and .60 between the Self-Esteem Inventory Scale and the Rosenberg scale. For validity of the instrument Getsinger, Kunce, Miller, and Weinberg (1972) reported a correlation of .60 between a derived picture test and the Self-Esteem Inventory Scale. Taylor and Reitz (1968) reported a correlation of .45 between the CPI self-acceptance scale and the Coopersmith scale. The same researchers also found correlations of .75 and .44 between the Coopersmith scale and the Edwards and Marlowe-Crowne social desirability scales.

The Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (SEI) has been administered to over 40,000 children and adults over a period from 1962 to 1967. The respondents included both adults and children ranging
across the entire socioeconomic range and members of many ethnic and subcultural groups (for example, Blacks, Chicanos, American Indians, and Puerto Ricans).

Scoring Method for SEI

There are five subscales which cycle in sequence the length of the SEI. These subscales are as follows:

General Self-Esteem Item Nos.: 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 10, 15, 16, 17, 22, 23, 24, 29, 30, 31, 36, 37, 38, 43, 44, 45, 50, 51, 52, 57, 58.

School Self-Esteem Item Nos.: 7, 14, 21, 28, 35, 42, 49.

Social Self-Esteem Item Nos.: 4, 11, 18, 25, 32, 39, 46, 53.

Home Self-Esteem Item Nos.: 5, 12, 19, 26, 33, 40, 47, 54.

Lie Scale Item Nos.: 6, 13, 20, 27, 34, 41, 48, 55.

The scores are reported as follows:

1. Total number of positive responses on all scales excluding the Lie Scale is the maximum score of 50. That is one point for every positive answer on the four subscales—general self-esteem, school self-esteem, social self-esteem, and home self-esteem. Whether or not a respondent has answered a certain test item positively is determined according to the scoring key given by Coopersmith, the author of the instrument. The higher the number of positive answers, the higher is the self-esteem of the respondent, and vice versa.

2. A separate score with a maximum score of eight points is given for the Lie Scale. This study did not utilize these scores.

3. In the general self-esteem subscale, Coopersmith's
classification of the scores and levels is as follows:

Each respondent who scores between 1.0 and 5.2 is classified as having a low-low self-esteem. He is socially and academically unsuccessful and has accepted the unhappy reality of his inferiority.

Each respondent with a score between 5.3 and 10.4 is classified as having a low-high self-esteem. He has an extremely low self-evaluation despite marked academic and social success. He judges himself in terms of some absolute personal criteria.

Each respondent with a score between 10.5 and 15.6 is classified as having a medium-medium self-esteem. He is stable, relatively content, and is of moderate capacities and achievements.

The respondent who has a score between 15.7 and 20.8 is classified as having a high-low self-esteem. He maintains a favorable self-regard, although he gets low ratings from his teachers and limited acceptance from his peers. At the same time, he is relatively content with his situation.

Each respondent who scores between 20.9 and 26.0 is classified as having a high-high self-esteem. He is socially and academically successful and is totally satisfied with himself.

For the other three subscales—school self-esteem, social self-esteem, and home self-esteem—the corresponding ranges and levels of the scores are as follows:

1.0-1.6 Low-Low Self-Esteem
1.7-3.2 Low-High Self-Esteem
3.3-4.8 Medium-Medium Self-Esteem
4.9-6.4 High-Low Self-Esteem
6.5-8.0 High-High Self-Esteem
Basically there are three categories of self-esteem, namely, low self-esteem, medium self-esteem, and high self-esteem. In the category of low self-esteem, the low-high self-esteem occupies the highest level of low self-esteem, while the low-low self-esteem occupies the lowest level of the low self-esteem category. In the category of high self-esteem, the high-high self-esteem signifies the highest level of the high self-esteem, while the high-low self-esteem signifies the lowest level of self-esteem in that category.

Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire

The Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire (PCR) was devised by Roe and Siegelman in 1963 to measure the behavior of parents toward their children as perceived by their children. It was originally constructed for use with adults who recalled how their parents treated them while they were growing up, especially before the age of twelve.

There are ten subtests: six contain fifteen items each, namely, protective, demanding, rejecting, neglecting, casual, and loving. Four contain ten items each for symbolic-love reward, direct-object reward, symbolic-love punishment, and direct-object punishment.

The reliability of the PCR scales has been well established (Goldin, 1969; Green & Parker, 1965; Roe & Siegelman, 1963; and Siegelman, 1965). Green and Parker (1965) administered the PCR to seventh grade boys and girls and reported reliabilities ranging from .50 to .88. In their study, these same researchers reported
Spearman-Brown split-half reliabilities ranging from .68 to .94. Tyron (1957) found that the reliabilities for the PCR ranged from .63 to .97 for all samples.

The concurrent validity of the PCR was supported by the work of Cox (1970), and the construct validity of the PCR was suggested by the findings of Siegelman (1965, 1973).

**Scoring Method for the PCR**

When taking the Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire (PCR), respondents were instructed to try to remember how things were before they were eleven years old and how their parents behaved toward them in a variety of situations. These parent-child relations were recorded on a five-point Likert-type scale. A typical PCR item would be:

*My mother objected when I was late for meals.*

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

A score of "5" is given for an answer of "Very True" and a value of "1" is given for "Very Untrue." A neutral reaction could be checked in the center of the five-point continuum and is awarded a value of "3."

There are ten subscales which cycle in sequence the length of the PCR. These subscales are the following:

- **Protective** Item Nos.: 1, 11, 21, 31, 41, 51, 61, 71, 81, 91, 101, 107, 113, 119, 125.
- **Demanding** Item Nos.: 6, 16, 26, 36, 46, 56, 66, 76, 86, 96, 105, 111, 117, 123, 129.
- **Rejecting** Item Nos.: 3, 13, 23, 33, 43, 53, 63, 73, 83, 93, 102, 103, 114, 120, 126.
Neglecting  Item Nos.:  9, 19, 29, 39, 49, 59, 69, 79,  
89, 99, 106, 112, 118, 124,  
130.

Casual  Item Nos.:  4, 14, 24, 34, 44, 54, 64, 74,  
84, 94, 103, 109, 115, 121,  
127.

Loving  Item Nos.:  8, 18, 28, 38, 48, 58, 68, 78,  
88, 98, 104, 110, 116, 122, 128.

Symbolic-Love Reward  Item Nos.:  5, 15, 25, 35, 45, 55, 65, 75,  
85, 95.

Direct-Object Reward  Item Nos.:  10, 20, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70,  
80, 90, 100.

Symbolic-Love Punishment  Item Nos.:  2, 12, 22, 32, 42, 52, 62, 72,  
82, 93.

Direct-Object Punishment  Item Nos.:  7, 17, 27, 37, 47, 57, 67, 77,  
87, 97.

In every case, a high score indicates high protectiveness, 
demanding, rejecting, neglecting, casual, loving, symbolic-love reward, direct-object reward, symbolic-love punishment, or direct-object punishment.

For the following subscales--protective, demanding, rejecting, neglecting, casual, and loving--the results are scored as follows:

1-15 = Very Low (VL)  
16-30 = Quite Low (QL)  
31-45 = Neutral or Undecided (N)  
46-60 = Quite High (QH)  
61-75 = Very High (VH)
For the following subscales: symbolic-love reward, direct-object reward, symbolic-love punishment, and direct-object punishment, the results are scored as follows:

1-10 = Very Low (VL)
11-20 = Quite Low (QL)
21-30 = Neutral or Undecided (N)
31-40 = Quite High (QH)
41-50 = Very High (VH)

Pilot Study

A pilot study, using the Self-Esteem Inventory (SEI) and the Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire (PCR) was undertaken using thirty-two adolescents in a juvenile home (name withheld by request) in southwest Michigan, on October 19, 1979. Twenty-four males and eight females with ages ranging from twelve to seventeen years and with reading levels of grade three to eleven participated in this study.

The pilot study was done to explore the efficiency of the instruments, the length of time necessary for the completion of tests by the participants, and the readability of the test items.

The results of the study were as follows: (1) 90 percent of the subjects easily understood the instruments and directions for the two instruments; (2) time needed to complete the Self-Esteem Inventory ranged from three minutes to eight minutes, with the average being five minutes. Time needed to complete the Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire ranged from twenty-five minutes to forty-four minutes; (3) 90 percent of the thirty-two adolescents found little
difficulty in understanding the test items for these two instruments administered; (4) 10 percent of these adolescents found five words for which they asked further clarification, these being "concessions," "consequences," "considerations," "disapproved," and "ridiculed."

Procedures

Administration of the Instruments

On October 30, 1979, the investigator met with the president of Starr Commonwealth and his director of research and presented to them the details of the study and requested the use of their residents as subjects for the study to be conducted during the fall semester of 1979. After the investigator's presentation, the president of Starr Commonwealth and his director of research approved the request for this study to be done on the Albion, Michigan Campus of Starr Commonwealth. The president noted that the investigator was the first doctoral student ever given permission to do a research study on this campus.

For more than two weeks following the first meeting the investigator met frequently with the president, the director of research and her staff, and the directors and resource teachers of the three residential villages of Starr Commonwealth, namely, Cedar, Lakeview, and Maple, to iron out the final details for the administration of the two instruments--SEI and PCR.

At the conclusion of the series of meetings with the staff of Starr Commonwealth, guidelines were suggested for the administration of the two instruments. The investigator also conducted an inservice seminar for the resource teachers and residential directors of the villages.
concerning the procedures of administration of these two instruments.

Collection of Data

The SEI and PCR were administered to the residents of the three residential villages in three settings at different times. In one village, the subjects had the instruments administered to them in their residential village auditorium on the morning of November 28, 1979. The residents of the other two villages met in their respective classrooms on the morning and afternoon of December 5, 1979. A resource teacher from each residential village was selected to administer the instruments; however, the investigator was present at all times during the administration of these instruments.

The resource teacher was requested to read each question twice before the subject responded by filling out the appropriate blank. The reasons for the procedure were: (1) to insure accuracy in spite of the low reading level of some of the respondents; (2) to minimize any chance of error or random answering by the respondents; (3) to create a more conducive atmosphere for testing by using the resource teacher who is familiar with the subjects; and (4) to prevent the investigator's foreign accept from interfering with understanding of the items on the two instruments. Difficult words in the items had been clarified with the authors of the PCR instrument prior to administration.

After the first instrument was administered, the subjects were then given a six-minute break. After the first 130 items of the PCR had been completed, the subjects were given a two-minute break. In order to insure the the privacy of the subjects' identities, they were
not required to sign their names.

Due to errors in filling out the questionnaires and some subjects' ages being under the study's stipulated age group, the responses of 132 subjects were used for this study. Altogether, the subjects responded to 318 test items on the SEI and the PCR. The completed response sheets were transcribed by the investigator on Computer OpScan response sheets. The test items were scored and totaled by the Andrews University Computer Center. New files consisting of the subtest scores for each respondent were built in order to analyze the data collected.

**Statement of Hypotheses**

The underlying hypothesis is that there is a correlation between the self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' child-rearing practices. Forty-four hypotheses were set forth in the null form for testing. The first forty hypotheses were zero-order correlation hypotheses, while the last four were multiple regression hypotheses.

1. There is no significant correlation between the general self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' protective child-rearing practices.

2. There is no significant correlation between the general self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' demanding child-rearing practices.

3. There is no significant correlation between the general self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' rejecting child-rearing practices.
4. There is no significant correlation between the general self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' neglecting child-rearing practices.

5. There is no significant correlation between the general self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' casual child-rearing practices.

6. There is no significant correlation between the general self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' loving child-rearing practices.

7. There is no significant correlation between the general self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of symbolic-love rewards given by their parents.

8. There is no significant correlation between the general self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of direct-object rewards given by their parents.

9. There is no significant correlation between the general self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of symbolic-love punishment given by their parents.

10. There is no significant correlation between the general self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of direct-object punishment given by their parents.

11. There is no significant correlation between the school self-concept of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' protective child-rearing practices.

12. There is no significant correlation between the school self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree
of their parents' demanding child-rearing practices.

13. There is no significant correlation between the school self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' rejecting child-rearing practices.

14. There is no significant correlation between the school self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' neglecting child-rearing practices.

15. There is no significant correlation between the school self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' casual child-rearing practices.

16. There is no significant correlation between the school self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' loving child-rearing practices.

17. There is no significant correlation between the school self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of symbolic-love rewards given by their parents.

18. There is no significant correlation between the school self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of direct-object rewards given by their parents.

19. There is no significant correlation between the school self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of symbolic-love punishment given by their parents.

20. There is no significant correlation between the school self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of direct-object punishment given by their parents.

21. There is no significant correlation between the social
self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' protective child-rearing practices.

22. There is no significant correlation between the social self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' demanding child-rearing practices.

23. There is no significant correlation between the social self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' rejecting child-rearing practices.

24. There is no significant correlation between the social self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' neglecting child-rearing practices.

25. There is no significant correlation between the social self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' casual child-rearing practices.

26. There is no significant correlation between the social self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' loving child-rearing practices.

27. There is no significant correlation between the social self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of symbolic-love rewards given by their parents.

28. There is no significant correlation between the social self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of direct-object rewards given by their parents.

29. There is no significant correlation between the social self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of symbolic-love punishment given by their parents.
30. There is no significant correlation between the social self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of direct-object punishment given by their parents.

31. There is no significant correlation between the home self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' protective child-rearing practices.

32. There is no significant correlation between the home self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' demanding child-rearing practices.

33. There is no significant correlation between the home self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' rejecting child-rearing practices.

34. There is no significant correlation between the home self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' neglecting child-rearing practices.

35. There is no significant correlation between the home self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' casual child-rearing practices.

36. There is no significant correlation between the home self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' loving child-rearing practices.

37. There is no significant correlation between the home self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of symbolic-love rewards given by their parents.

38. There is no significant correlation between the home self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree
of direct-object rewards given by their parents.

39. There is no significant correlation between the home self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of symbolic-love punishment given by their parents.

40. There is no significant correlation between the home self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of direct-object punishment given by their parents.

41. There is no significant multiple correlation between the ten parent-child relations variables and the general self-esteem.

42. There is no significant multiple correlation between the ten parent-child relations variables and the school self-esteem.

43. There is no significant multiple correlation between the ten parent-child relations variables and the social self-esteem.

44. There is no significant multiple correlation between the ten parent-child relations variables and the home self-esteem.

**Statistical Analysis**

The major statistical methods for examining the data were zero-order correlations and multiple regression analysis. First, to test hypotheses 1 to 40, an inter-correlation matrix was set up, allowing the examination of the coefficients of correlation between all pairs of variables in the study. This makes clear all correlations between the dependent variables and also reveals any inter-correlations between the dependent and independent variables.

Secondly, hypotheses 41 to 44 were tested by multiple linear regression analysis, with the ten PCR subscores as independent variables and the relevant SEI subscore as dependent variable.
The level of α for testing all hypotheses was set at .05.

Summary

Chapter III has presented the research design and procedures of a study of the self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' child-rearing practices. The selection procedure and the characteristics of the population were discussed. The variables, construction, and validation of the two instruments—Self-Esteem inventory and Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire, scoring method for each of the two instruments, pilot study, administration of the instruments and the collection of data, the statement of hypotheses, and the method for performing the statistical analysis were explained.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA AND PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

Introduction

The first three chapters have described the rationale and the methodology for a research study on the subject of delinquent male adolescents' self-esteem and their perceptions of their parents' child-rearing practices. This chapter presents the findings of the research.

The population selected for the study consisted of the residents at the Albion, Michigan, campus of Starr Commonwealth. Responses from 132 subjects qualified for inclusion in this study. Data were collected from each of the 132 residents and were analyzed to determine the findings.

The major hypothesis upon which the research is based is that delinquent male adolescents' self-esteem is related to their perceived degree of their parents' child-rearing practices. From this broad major hypothesis, forty-four null hypotheses were set forth for testing.

The Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory and the Roe and Siegelman's Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire were utilized to collect the data required to test the various hypotheses. The two instruments consist of 318 items divided among fourteen subscales.
The responses of the 132 delinquent male adolescents to the SEI yielded some interesting information. These findings are presented in table 5.

**TABLE 5**

**CENTRAL VALUE AND VARIABILITY OF SEI SUBSCALE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Possible Range</th>
<th>Actual Range</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General self</td>
<td>1-26</td>
<td>6-15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School self</td>
<td>1-8</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social self</td>
<td>1-8</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home self</td>
<td>1-8</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total self</td>
<td>4-50</td>
<td>14-28</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On any one item for the *Self-Esteem Inventory* every positive answer is equivalent to one point, whereas every negative answer is equivalent to zero. At the same time, the higher the score, the higher is the self-esteem, and the lower the score, the lower is the self-esteem.

Looking at the actual ranges reported in table 5, it is noted that three of the five scales occupy almost the full range of scores possible. This means that, in these cases, there is at least one subject who has a score of one point for the school self-esteem, social self-esteem, and home self-esteem, and at least one subject who received a score of seven points for school self-esteem and social
self-esteem, where the maximum possible was eight.

In the general self-esteem subscale, Coopersmith's classification of the scores and levels is as follows:

1.0-5.2 Low-Low Self-Esteem
5.3-10.4 Low-High Self-Esteem
10.5-15.6 Medium-Medium Self-Esteem
15.7-20.8 High-Low Self-Esteem
20.9-26.0 High-High Self-Esteem

For the other three subscales--school self-esteem, social self-esteem, and home self-esteem, the corresponding ranges and levels of the scores are as follows:

1.0-1.6 Low-Low Self-Esteem
1.7-3.2 Low-High Self-Esteem
3.3-4.8 Medium-Medium Self-Esteem
4.9-6.4 High-Low Self-Esteem
6.5-8.0 High-High Self-Esteem

The interpretation of the meanings of the scores for the subscales is given on p. 65.

The mean is 10.1 for the general self-esteem. This indicates that on the average, the subjects have a low-high general self-esteem.

One reason for the low standard deviation for the scales may be that these subjects have special parents different from the general population. These boys were at Starr Commonwealth, a private high class institution. There was some homogeneity among the group: (1) all are males, (2) all are adolescents, (3) all are delinquents, (4) the majority
come from lower socioeconomic backgrounds (68.2 percent), (5) the majority come from two-parent families (80.3 percent), and (6) the majority are whites (65.2 percent).

There is a very minimal chance of inappropriate or random answering of the items by the subjects because the researcher and his assistants were present to assist the resource teacher and to supervise these delinquent male adolescents. The researcher did not see any random marking of the SEI or the PCR questionnaire.

Table 6 shows the means and standard deviations of the distribution of self-esteem scores for the sample of the present study in comparison to the statistics from Coopersmith's and Donaldson's samples.

**TABLE 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chong</th>
<th>Coopersmith</th>
<th>Donaldson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From table 6 it is clear that the mean score of the current sample is considerably lower than for the other two samples (about 65 percent). An even greater disparity is evidenced in the standard deviation, scarcely 20 percent of that for the other samples. This seems to confirm the effect of a great homogeneity of this sample--white delinquent males, as compared to nondelinquents, males and females, blacks and whites in the other two samples. This homogeneity
suggests that a "classical" reliability estimate for the scales, requiring a large standard deviation, is scarcely a trustworthy statistic for the present study.

**Distributional Analysis of the Various Levels of the Self-Esteem**

Table 7 shows the frequency of total self-esteem scores in the various ranges. It reveals that 43 (32.6 percent) of the 132 subjects have low-high self-esteem, while 89 (67.4 percent) of the 132 subjects have medium-medium self-esteem.

**TABLE 7**

**DISTRIBUTION OF TOTAL SELF-ESTEEM SCORES BY LEVEL**

\[(N = 132)\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total SEI</td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>L - L</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>L - H</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>M - M</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>H - L</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>H - H</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 21.6

Standard Deviation 2.7

Further inspection of the total scores on the general self-esteem scale reveals that 78 (59.1 percent) of the 132 subjects have low-high self-esteem; whereas, 54 (40.9 percent) of the 132 subjects...
have medium-medium self-esteem, as shown in table 8.

**TABLE 8**

**DISTRIBUTION OF GENERAL SELF-ESTEEM SCORES BY LEVEL**

(N = 132)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Self</td>
<td>1.0-5.2</td>
<td>L - L</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3-10.4</td>
<td>L - H</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.5-15.6</td>
<td>M - M</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.7-20.8</td>
<td>H - L</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.9-26.0</td>
<td>H - H</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 reveals that 45 (34.1 percent) of the 132 subjects scored a low-high self-esteem on the school self-esteem scale; while the majority 73 (55.3 percent) of the 132 subjects have medium-medium self-esteem.

Table 10 indicates that on the social self-esteem scale, 74 (56.1 percent) of the 132 subjects have a medium-medium social self-esteem; while almost equal numbers of subjects have a low-high social self-esteem and a high-low social self-esteem (26 and 23, respectively).

Table 11 shows that a large number or a majority of the delinquent male adolescents (90 subjects or 68.2 percent) have a low-high home self-esteem; while only a very small minority--2 subjects
### TABLE 9
**DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL SELF-ESTEEM SCORES BY LEVEL (N = 132)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School self</td>
<td>1.0-1.6</td>
<td>L - L</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.7-3.2</td>
<td>L - H</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3-4.8</td>
<td>M - M</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.9-6.4</td>
<td>H - L</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.5-8.0</td>
<td>H - H</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Deviation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 10
**DISTRIBUTION OF SOCIAL SELF-ESTEEM SCORES BY LEVEL (N = 132)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Self</td>
<td>1.0-1.6</td>
<td>L - L</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.7-3.2</td>
<td>L - H</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3-4.8</td>
<td>M - M</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.9-6.4</td>
<td>H - L</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.5-8.0</td>
<td>H - H</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Deviation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TABLE 11
DISTRIBUTION OF HOME SELF-ESTEEM
SCORES BY LEVEL (N = 132)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home self</td>
<td>1.0-1.6</td>
<td>L - L</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.7-3.2</td>
<td>L - H</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3-4.8</td>
<td>M - M</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.9-6.4</td>
<td>H - L</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.5-8.0</td>
<td>H - H</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 3.0
Standard Deviation 1.0

(1.5 percent of the total population)--have a high-high home self-esteem.

Summary Data on the Responses to
PCR Questionnaire

Table 12 presents the summary data on the responses to the PCR questionnaire for the perceived degree of the delinquent male adolescents' child-rearing practices utilized by their fathers.

On any one item for the PCR for the perceived degree of the delinquent male adolescents' fathers' child-rearing practices, a subject's score could range from a number equal to the number of items in the scale to a number five times the number of items in the scale.

It can be seen from the actual ranges reported in table 12 that in three of the ten subscales the possible maximum score is
TABLE 12

SUMMARY DATA ON THE RESPONSES TO PARENT-CHILD RELATIONS QUESTIONNAIRE (FATHERS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Poss. Range</th>
<th>Actual Range</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
<th>Level*</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-Protective</td>
<td>15-75</td>
<td>30-73</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-Demanding</td>
<td>15-75</td>
<td>18-68</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>QH</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-Rejecting</td>
<td>15-75</td>
<td>23-73</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Neglecting</td>
<td>15-75</td>
<td>29-75</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Casual</td>
<td>15-75</td>
<td>30-68</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>QH</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-Loving</td>
<td>15-75</td>
<td>17-71</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>QH</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-S-L Reward</td>
<td>10-50</td>
<td>10-50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>QH</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-D-O Reward</td>
<td>10-50</td>
<td>11-50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-S-L Punishment</td>
<td>10-50</td>
<td>11-49</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-D-O Punishment</td>
<td>10-50</td>
<td>15-50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See pages 68 and 69.

utilized. This means that in these cases at least one subject had all fives. Since the items were stated in both high and low directions, the subject described checked both ones and fives, but the scoring system converted all of his responses to the high extremes.

The questionnaire seems to have identified a wide spread of perceived degree of the delinquent male adolescents' fathers' child-rearing practices. In order to correctly interpret the scores, it is necessary to know to which end of the perception continuum a high score refers.

A high score on the individual subscales indicates high.
protective, demanding, rejecting, neglecting, casual, loving, symbolic-love reward, direct-object reward, symbolic-love punishment, or direct-object punishment. A low score reveals low protective, demanding, rejecting, neglecting, casual, loving symbolic-love reward, direct-object reward, symbolic-love punishment, or direct-object punishment. Thus on subscale A, the subject with the score of seventy-three points perceives his father's child-rearing practices as being very protective, while the subject with the score of thirty points perceives his father's child-rearing practices as not being very protective.

A subject scoring eighteen points perceives his father as being quite low in demanding, whereas a subject with a score of sixty-eight points perceives his father's child-rearing practices as being quite high-demanding. That is, his father is perceived to have the tendency of setting high standards of accomplishment in particular areas—manners, schoolwork, etc. The father imposes strict regulations, demands understanding obedience to the regulations, and does not make any exceptions. He expects the child to be busy at all times at some useful activity. He has high punitiveness. He restricts friendships in accord with these standards. He does not try to find out what his child is thinking or feeling, but tells the child what to think or feel.

The results as shown in table 12 indicate that on the average, the delinquent male adolescents perceive their fathers' child-rearing practices as highly demanding, casual, and loving, and have the tendencies of giving symbolic-love rewards to their children. On the basis of the means these adolescents did not perceive their fathers'
child-rearing practices to be either protective, rejecting, or neglecting, and neither did their fathers give any direct-object rewards, symbolic-love punishment, nor direct-object punishment.

Table 13 presents the summary data on the responses of the 132 subjects to the PCR for the perceived degree of the delinquent male adolescents' mothers' child-rearing practices.

**TABLE 13**

**SUMMARY DATA ON THE RESPONSES TO PARENT-CHILD-RELATIONS QUESTIONNAIRE (MOTHERS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Poss. Range</th>
<th>Actual Range</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-Protective</td>
<td>15-75</td>
<td>33-70</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-Demanding</td>
<td>15-75</td>
<td>18-75</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>QH</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-Rejecting</td>
<td>15-75</td>
<td>18-75</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Neglecting</td>
<td>15-75</td>
<td>27-75</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>QL</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Casual</td>
<td>15-75</td>
<td>28-72</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-Loving</td>
<td>15-75</td>
<td>15-70</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>QH</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-S-L Reward</td>
<td>10-50</td>
<td>10-50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>QH</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-D-O Reward</td>
<td>10-50</td>
<td>10-50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-S-L Punishment</td>
<td>10-50</td>
<td>11-49</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-D-O Punishment</td>
<td>10-50</td>
<td>10-50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See pages 68 and 69.

The findings in table 13 reveal that on the average, delinquent male adolescents perceive their mothers' child-rearing practices
as highly demanding and loving and have the tendency of giving their adolescents symbolic-love rewards. On the basis of the means these delinquent male adolescents perceived their mothers' child-rearing practices as neither protective, rejecting, neglecting, nor casual. They also did not perceive their mothers to give any direct-object rewards, symbolic-love punishment, or direct-object punishment. This same group perceived their mothers' child-rearing practices as low-neglecting.

**Inter-correlations among Parents' Child-rearing Variables**

So far this chapter has been occupied with general data gathered from the scales. Table 14 presents the correlations between all pairs of variables of the Parent-Child Relations questionnaire.

Above the diagonal space is the inter-correlation matrix for the perception by delinquent male adolescents of their fathers' child-rearing practice variables, and below the diagonal space is the inter-correlation matrix for the perceptions by delinquent male adolescents of their mothers' child-rearing variables.

Any correlation among the independent variables which is higher than .30 is not considered to be meaningful for this study. However, the correlations which are lower than .30 are discussed in this section.

It is interesting to note that there is only one correlation below .30 for delinquent male adolescents' perceptions of their father's child-rearing practices. The low correlation of .28 is between rejecting and loving child-rearing variables. High
TABLE 14
INTER-CORRELATION MATRIX OF CHILD-REARING VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-Protecting</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>-.84</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-Demanding</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.64</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-Rejecting</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Neglecting</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Casual</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.61</td>
<td>-.63</td>
<td>-.72</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-Loving</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-.68</td>
<td>-.62</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-S-L Reward</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-D-O Reward</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>-.57</td>
<td>-.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-S-L Punishment</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-D-O Punishment</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
correlations are found between all the other variables in the delinquent male adolescents' perceptions of their fathers' child-rearing practices.

**Correlations between Independent and Dependent Variables**

In order to test the hypotheses it must be determined which of the correlations between general self-esteem, school self-esteem, social self-esteem, and home self-esteem and the independent variables--the child-rearing variables are statistically significant. In other words, how likely is it that the correlations observed in the sample of 132 subjects reflect the correlations significantly different from non-delinquent adolescents in this country.

Every correlative is tested for significance at the .05 level--two-tailed test. The critical value of $t$ is obtained as:

$$t = r \sqrt{\frac{N - 2}{1 - r^2}}$$

$$1.97 = r \sqrt{\frac{130}{1 - r^2}}$$

$$3.8809 (1 - r^2) = 130r^2$$

$$\frac{1.97^2}{r^2} = \frac{130}{1 - r^2}$$

$$r = \frac{3.8809}{\sqrt{133.8809}} = \pm .170.$$  

Therefore $r > .170$ is significant at the .05 level in the positive tail, and $r < -.170$ is significant at the .05 level in the negative tail.
For any one of the correlations, it is necessary to determine the statistical significance.

**Testing of the Hypotheses**

Tables 15 and 16 present the correlations between the Self-Esteem scales and the Parent-Child-Relations scales for the delinquent male adolescents' perceived degree of both their fathers' and mothers' child-rearing practices. These correlations are utilized for the testing of the forty research hypotheses.

**TABLE 15**

**CORRELATIONS BETWEEN SELF-ESTEEM AND PCR (FATHERS')**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PCR Scales</th>
<th>General Self</th>
<th>School Self</th>
<th>Social Self</th>
<th>Home Self</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-Protective</td>
<td>.0556</td>
<td>-.0101</td>
<td>-.1213</td>
<td>.1514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-Demanding</td>
<td>.0439</td>
<td>-.0368</td>
<td>.1736*</td>
<td>.1063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-Rejecting</td>
<td>-.0141</td>
<td>.0152</td>
<td>.0830</td>
<td>-.1373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Neglecting</td>
<td>.0454</td>
<td>.0585</td>
<td>.0495</td>
<td>-.1228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Casual</td>
<td>-.0259</td>
<td>-.0188</td>
<td>.1285</td>
<td>-.1022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-Loving</td>
<td>.0413</td>
<td>.0183</td>
<td>-.0999</td>
<td>.1130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-S-L Reward</td>
<td>.0582</td>
<td>.0658</td>
<td>-.1229</td>
<td>.1151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-D-O Reward</td>
<td>.0639</td>
<td>.0200</td>
<td>-.1443</td>
<td>.0822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-S-L Punishment</td>
<td>-.0578</td>
<td>-.0547</td>
<td>.1457</td>
<td>.1478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-D-O Punishment</td>
<td>-.0488</td>
<td>.0309</td>
<td>.1149</td>
<td>.1514</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$r^* > .170$ significant at the .05 level in the positive tail, $r^* < -.170$ significant at the .05 level in the negative tail
TABLE 16
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN SELF-ESTEEM AND PCR (MOTHERS')

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PCR Scales</th>
<th>General Self</th>
<th>School Self</th>
<th>Social Self</th>
<th>Home Self</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-Protective</td>
<td>.0642</td>
<td>-.1165</td>
<td>-.0504</td>
<td>-.0206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-Demanding</td>
<td>.0899</td>
<td>-.0965</td>
<td>-.0412</td>
<td>-.0070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-Rejecting</td>
<td>.1086</td>
<td>-.0648</td>
<td>-.0339</td>
<td>.1324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Neglecting</td>
<td>.1100</td>
<td>-.0512</td>
<td>-.0123</td>
<td>.1531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Casual</td>
<td>-.0473</td>
<td>-.0694</td>
<td>.2217*</td>
<td>.0857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-Loving</td>
<td>.0131</td>
<td>-.0225</td>
<td>-.1010</td>
<td>-.0946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-S-L Reward</td>
<td>.1838*</td>
<td>.1438</td>
<td>-.1328</td>
<td>-.0020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-D-O Reward</td>
<td>-.0829</td>
<td>-.0769</td>
<td>-.1163</td>
<td>-.0433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-S-L Punishment</td>
<td>-.0091</td>
<td>.1858*</td>
<td>-.1052</td>
<td>-.0911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-D-O Punishment</td>
<td>-.0402</td>
<td>-.0799</td>
<td>.0161</td>
<td>.0092</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*\(r > .170\) significant at the .05 level in the positive tail, *\(r < -.170\) significant at the .05 level in the negative tail.

Hypothesis 1

There is no significant correlation between the general self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' protective child-rearing practices.

The correlation of the general self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents with the perceived degree of their parents' protective child-rearing practices \((r = .055\) and \(.064\)\) is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis is retained.
Hypothesis 2

There is no significant correlation between the general self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' demanding child-rearing practices.

The correlation of the general self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents with the perceived degree of their parents' demanding child-rearing practices ($r = .044$ and $.089$) is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis is retained.

Hypothesis 3

There is no significant correlation between the general self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' rejecting child-rearing practices.

The correlation of the general self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents with the perceived degree of their parents' rejecting child-rearing practices ($r = -.014$ and $.109$) is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis is retained.

Hypothesis 4

There is no significant correlation between the general self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' neglecting child-rearing practices.

The correlation between the general self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' neglecting child-rearing practices ($r = .045$ and $.110$) is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis is retained.
Hypothesis 5

There is no significant correlation between the general self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' casual child-rearing practices.

The correlation between the general self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' casual child-rearing practices (r = -.026 and -.047) is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis is retained.

Hypothesis 6

There is no significant correlation between the general self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' loving child-rearing practices.

The correlation of the general self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents with the perceived degree of their parents' loving child-rearing practices (r = .041 and .013) is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis is retained.

Hypothesis 7

There is no significant correlation between the general self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of symbolic-love rewards given by their parents.

The correlation between the general self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of symbolic-love rewards given by their fathers is not significant (r = .058), but is significant for the mothers (r = .184) at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis is retained with respect to the fathers but rejected with respect to the mothers.
Hypothesis 8

There is no significant correlation between the general self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of direct-object rewards given by their parents.

The correlation of the general self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents with the perceived degree of direct-object rewards given by their parents ($r = .064$ and $-.083$) is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis is retained.

Hypothesis 9

There is no significant correlation between the general self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of symbolic-love punishment given by their parents.

The correlation of the general self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents with the perceived degree of symbolic-love punishment given by their parents ($r = -.056$ and $-.009$) is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis is retained.

Hypothesis 10

There is no significant correlation between the general self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of direct-object punishment given by their parents.

The correlation of the general self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents with the perceived degree of direct-object punishment given by their parents ($r = -.049$ and $-.040$) is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis is retained.

Hypothesis 11

There is no significant correlation between the school self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of
their parents' protective child-rearing practices.

The correlation of the school self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents with the perceived degree of their parents' protective child-rearing practices (\( r = -0.010 \) and \(-0.117\)) is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis is retained.

Hypothesis 12

There is no significant correlation between the school self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' demanding child-rearing practices.

The correlation of the school self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents with the perceived degree of their parents' demanding child-rearing practices (\( r = -0.037 \) and \(-0.097\)) is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis is retained.

Hypothesis 13

There is no significant correlation between the school self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' rejecting child-rearing practices.

The correlation of the school self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents with the perceived degree of their parents' rejecting child-rearing practices (\( r = 0.015 \) and \(-0.065\)) is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis is retained.

Hypothesis 14

There is no significant correlation between the school self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' neglecting child-rearing practices.
The correlation between the school self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' neglecting child-rearing practices \((r = .059 \text{ and } -.051)\) is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis is retained.

Hypothesis 15

There is no significant correlation between the school self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' casual child-rearing practices.

The correlation of the school self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents with the perceived degree of their parents' casual child-rearing practices \((r = -.019 \text{ and } -.069)\) is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis is retained.

Hypothesis 16

There is no significant correlation between the school self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' loving child-rearing practices.

The correlation of the school self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents with the perceived degree of their parents' loving child-rearing practices \((r = .018 \text{ and } -.023)\) is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis is retained.

Hypothesis 17

There is no significant correlation between the school self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of symbolic-love rewards given by their parents.

The correlation of the school self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents with the perceived degree of symbolic-love rewards given by their parents is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis is retained.
adolescents with the perceived degree of symbolic-love rewards given by their parents is not significant for the fathers ($r = .066$), is not significant for the mothers ($r = .144$) at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis is retained.

Hypothesis 18

There is no significant correlation between the school self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of direct-object rewards given by their parents. The correlation of the school self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents with the perceived degree of direct-object rewards given by their parents ($r = .020$ and $-.077$) is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis is retained.

Hypothesis 19

There is no significant correlation between the school self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of symbolic-love punishment given by their parents. The correlation of the school self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents with the perceived degree of symbolic-love punishment given by their parents is not significant for the fathers ($r = -.055$), but is significant for the mothers ($r = .186$) at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis is retained with respect to the fathers, but is rejected with respect to the mothers.

Hypothesis 20

There is no significant correlation between the school self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of
The correlation of the school self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents with the perceived degree of direct-object punishment given by their parents (r = .031 and -.078) is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis is retained.

Hypothesis 21

There is no significant correlation between the social self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' protective child-rearing practices.

The correlation between the social self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' protective child-rearing practices (r = -.121 and -.050) is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis is retained.

Hypothesis 22

There is no significant correlation between the social esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' demanding child-rearing practices.

The correlation of the social self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents with the perceived degree of their parents' demanding child-rearing practices is significant for the fathers (r = .174), but is not significant for the mothers (r = -.041) at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis is rejected with respect to the fathers, but retained with respect to the mothers.
Hypothesis 23

There is no significant correlation between the social self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' rejecting child-rearing practices.

The correlation of the social self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents with the perceived degree of their parents' rejecting child-rearing practices ($r = .083$ and $-.034$) is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis is retained.

Hypothesis 24

There is no significant correlation between the social self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' neglecting child-rearing practices.

The correlation between the social self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' neglecting child-rearing practices ($r = .049$ and $-.012$) is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis is retained.

Hypothesis 25

There is no significant correlation between the social self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' casual child-rearing practices.

The correlation of the social self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents with the perceived degree of their parents' casual child-rearing practices is not significant for the fathers ($r = .129$), but is significant for the mothers ($r = .222$) at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis is retained with respect to the fathers, but is
rejected with respect to the mothers.

Hypothesis 26

There is no significant correlation between the social self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' loving child-rearing practices.

The correlation of the social self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents with the perceived degree of their parents' loving child-rearing practices ($r = -0.099$ and $-0.101$) is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis is retained.

Hypothesis 27

There is no significant correlation between the social self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of symbolic-love rewards given by their parents.

The correlation of the social self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents with the perceived degree of symbolic-love rewards given by their parents ($r = -0.123$ and $-0.133$) is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis is retained.

Hypothesis 28

There is no significant correlation between the social self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of direct-object rewards given by their parents.

The correlation of the social self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents with the perceived degree of direct-object rewards given by their parents ($r = -0.144$ and $-0.116$) is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis is retained.
Hypothesis 29

There is no significant correlation between the social self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of symbolic-love punishment given by their parents.

The correlation of the social self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents with the perceived degree of symbolic-love punishment given by their parents ($r = .146$ and $-.105$) is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis is retained.

Hypothesis 30

There is no significant correlation between the social self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of direct-object punishment given by their parents.

The correlation of the social self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents with the perceived degree of direct-object punishment given by their parents ($r = .115$ and $0.016$) is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis is retained.

Hypothesis 31

There is no significant correlation between the home self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' protective child-rearing practices.

The correlation of the home self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents with the perceived degree of their parents' protective child-rearing practices ($r = .151$ and $-.021$) is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis is retained.
Hypothesis 32

There is not significant correlation between the home self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' demanding child-rearing practices.

The correlation of the home self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents with the perceived degree of their parents' demanding child-rearing practices ($r = .106$ and $-.007$) is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis is retained.

Hypothesis 33

There is no significant correlation between the home self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' rejecting child-rearing practices.

The correlation of the home self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents with the perceived degree of their parents' rejecting child-rearing practices ($r = -.137$ and $1.32$) is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis is retained.

Hypothesis 34

There is no significant correlation between the home self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' neglecting child-rearing practices.

The correlation between the home self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' neglecting child-rearing practices ($r = -.123$ and $1.53$) is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis is retained.
Hypothesis 35

There is no significant correlation between the home self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' casual child-rearing practices.

The correlation between the home self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' casual child-rearing practices ($r = -0.102$ and $0.086$) is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis is retained.

Hypothesis 36

There is no significant correlation between the home self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' loving child-rearing practices.

The correlation of the home self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents with the perceived degree of their parents' loving child-rearing practices ($r = 0.113$ and $-0.095$) is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis is retained.

Hypothesis 37

There is no significant correlation between the home self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of symbolic-love rewards given by their parents.

The correlation of the home self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents with the perceived degree of symbolic-love rewards given by their parents ($r = 0.115$ and $-0.002$) is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis is retained.
Hypothesis 38

There is no significant correlation between the home self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of direct-object rewards given by their parents.

The correlation between the home self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of direct-object rewards given by their parents ($r = .082$ and $-.043$) is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis is retained.

Hypothesis 39

There is no significant correlation between the home self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of symbolic-love punishment given by their parents.

The correlation of the home self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents with the perceived degree of symbolic-love punishment given by their parents ($r = .148$ and $-.091$) is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis is retained.

Hypothesis 40

There is no significant correlation between the home self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of direct-object punishment given by their parents.

The correlation of the home self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents with the perceived degree of direct-object punishment given by their parents ($r = .151$ and $.009$) is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis is retained.
Hypothesis 41

There is no significant multiple correlation between the ten parent-child relations variables and the general self-esteem.

The critical $F$ value with 10 and 21 degrees of freedom is 1.91. Table 17 presents the analysis of variance for regression--general self-esteem and fathers' child-relations variables.

**TABLE 17**

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR REGRESSION
GENERAL SELF-ESTEEM AND FATHERS'
CHILD-RELATIONS VARIABLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>$F$ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Due to Regression</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.2931</td>
<td>2.5293</td>
<td>0.6540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation about Regression</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>467.9500</td>
<td>3.8674</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>493.2431</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the fathers' child-relations variables, as shown in table 17, the $F$ value is 0.6540 with 10 and 121 degrees of freedom which is not a significant value with $\alpha = .05$.

Therefore the null hypothesis with respect to the fathers is upheld. The obtained multiple correlation of 0.2264 is not significant.

Table 18 presents the analysis of variance for regression--general self-esteem and mothers' child-relations variables. For the mothers' child-relations variables the $F$ value is 0.5817 with 10 and 121 degrees of freedom which is not a significant value with $\alpha = .05$.

Therefore the null hypothesis with respect to the mothers is upheld. The obtained multiple correlation of 0.2142 is not significant.
TABLE 18

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR REGRESSION
GENERAL SELF-ESTEEM AND MOTHERS' CHILD-RELATIONS VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Due to Regression</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.6240</td>
<td>2.2624</td>
<td>0.5817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation about Regression</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>470.6185</td>
<td>3.8894</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>493.2425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 42

There is no significant multiple correlation between the ten parent-child relations variables and the school self-esteem. The critical F value with 10 and 121 degrees of freedom is 1.91. Table 19 presents the analysis of variance for regression--school self-esteem and fathers' child-relations variables.

TABLE 19

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR REGRESSION
SCHOOL SELF-ESTEEM AND FATHERS' CHILD-RELATIONS VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Due to Regression</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.2418</td>
<td>1.3242</td>
<td>0.9984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation about Regression</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>160.4855</td>
<td>1.3263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>173.7273</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the fathers' child-relations variables as shown in table 19, the F value is 0.9984 with 10 and 121 degrees of freedom which is not a significant value with $\alpha = .05$.

Therefore the null hypothesis with respect to the fathers' child-relations variables and the school self-esteem is upheld. The obtained multiple correlation of 0.2761 is not significant.

Table 20 shows the ANOVA for the mothers' child-relations variables and school self-esteem.

**TABLE 20**

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR REGRESSION SCHOOL SELF-ESTEEM AND MOTHERS' CHILD-RELATIONS VARIABLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Due to Regression</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24.3219</td>
<td>2.4322</td>
<td>1.9700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation about Regression</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>149.4054</td>
<td>1.2348</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>173.7273</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The value of F is 1.97, which is statistically significant with $\alpha = .05$.

Therefore the null hypothesis with respect to the mothers' child-relations variables and the school self-esteem is rejected. There is a significant multiple correlation coefficient of 0.3742 between school self-esteem and mothers' child-relations variables.

Table 21 presents the regression coefficients and t values for the ten independent variables.
TABLE 21

COEFFICIENTS AND VALUES: SCHOOL SELF-ESTEEM
AND MOTHERS' CHILD-RELATIONS VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PCR Variables</th>
<th>Regression Coefficients</th>
<th>t Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-Protective</td>
<td>.0183</td>
<td>1.0483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-Demanding</td>
<td>-.0567</td>
<td>-3.0304*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-Rejecting</td>
<td>-.0108</td>
<td>-0.4926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Neglecting</td>
<td>.0134</td>
<td>-0.6823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Casual</td>
<td>-.0170</td>
<td>-1.0686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-Loving</td>
<td>.0140</td>
<td>0.8217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-S-L Reward</td>
<td>.0466</td>
<td>2.0504*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-D-O Reward</td>
<td>-.0037</td>
<td>-0.2535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-S-L Punishment</td>
<td>.0413</td>
<td>2.2028*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-D-O Punishment</td>
<td>.0099</td>
<td>0.5819</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple Correlation Coefficient 0.3742

The significant t values are for variables B, I, G, in that order of importance. The coefficient for variable B is negative, and those for variables I and G are positive. Hence greater self-esteem tends to be related to delinquent male adolescents' perceptions of less demanding, greater symbolic-love reward and symbolic-love punishment child-rearing practices on the part of the mothers.
Hypothesis 43

There is no significant multiple correlation between the ten parent-child relations variables and the social self-esteem.

The critical $F$ value with 10 and 121 degrees of freedom is 1.91. Table 22 presents the analysis of variance for regression--social self-esteem and fathers's child-relations variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>$F$ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Due to Regression</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.0169</td>
<td>2.1017</td>
<td>1.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation about Regression</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>209.6119</td>
<td>1.7323</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>230.6288</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the fathers' child-relations variables, as shown in table 22, the $F$ value is 1.213 with 10 and 121 degrees of freedom which is not a significant value with $\alpha = .05$.

Therefore the null hypothesis with respect to the fathers is upheld. The obtained multiple correlation of 0.3019 is not significant.

Table 23 presents the analysis of variance for regression--social self-esteem and mothers' child-relations variables. For the mothers' child-relations variables, the $F$ value is 1.261 with 10 and 121 degrees of freedom which is not a significant value with $\alpha = .05$.

Therefore the null hypothesis with respect to the mothers' child-relations variables is upheld. The obtained multiple correlation of 0.3072 is not significant.
TABLE 23
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR REGRESSION
SOCIAL SELF-ESTEEM AND MOTHERS' CHILD-RELATIONS VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Due to Regression</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.7634</td>
<td>2.1763</td>
<td>1.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation about Regression</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>208.8653</td>
<td>1.7262</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>230.6287</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus in general there is no significant multiple correlation between the ten parent-child relations variables and the social self-esteem.

Hypothesis 44

There is no significant multiple correlation between the ten parent-child relations variables and the home self-esteem.

Table 24 presents the analysis of variance for regression--home self-esteem and fathers' child-relations variables.

TABLE 24
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR REGRESSION
HOME SELF-ESTEEM AND FATHERS' CHILD-RELATIONS VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Due to Regression</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.4504</td>
<td>0.6450</td>
<td>0.5934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation about Regression</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>131.5193</td>
<td>1.0869</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>137.9697</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the fathers' child-relations variables, as shown in table 24, the F value is 0.5934 with 10 and 121 degrees of freedom which is not a significant value with $\alpha = .05$.

Therefore the null hypothesis with respect to the fathers is upheld. The obtained multiple correlation of 0.2162 is not significant.

Table 25 presents the analysis of variance for regression--home self-esteem and mothers' child-relations variables.

**TABLE 25**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Due to Regression</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.8474</td>
<td>0.8848</td>
<td>0.8291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation about Regression</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>129.1222</td>
<td>1.0671</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>137.9696</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the mothers' child-relations variables, as shown in table 25, the F value is 0.8291 with $\alpha = .05$.

Therefore the null hypothesis with respect to the mothers is upheld. The obtained multiple correlation of 0.2533 is not significant.

Thus there is no significant multiple correlation between the ten parent-child relations variables and the home self-esteem.

**Summary**

Chapter IV has presented the findings of a study on the self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their
parents' child-rearing practices. The general information on the responses by the subjects to the self-esteem inventory has been reported. Distributions of levels of the self-esteem have been analyzed. The responses to the Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire were also summarized and discussed. Inter-correlations among the ten parent-child relations variables were examined.

Thirty-nine out of the forty-four null hypotheses have been retained, while five null hypotheses were rejected.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS
AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of the Problem

This study is concerned with the self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' child-rearing practices. That some child-rearing practices contribute to the development of self-esteem during adolescence should be considered a crucial concern for parents, child psychologists, child psychiatrists, criminologists, sociologists, family counselors, educators, and spiritual leaders.

The research was conducted to discover if there is a relationship between self-esteem and certain other child-rearing variables. The variables were selected on the basis of an understanding of influences on the self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents. After a careful review of relevant literature, it was assumed that self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents is related to the perceived degree of their parents' child-rearing practices.

Forty-four null hypotheses were set forth for testing in this study.
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Summary of the Research Design

The population for this study is all delinquent male adolescents residing in Starr Commonwealth-Albion campus. The subjects were selected only from adolescent males with ages ranging from twelve to eighteen years. These adolescents--132 in all--constitute the population for the study.

To collect the needed data the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory and Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire were utilized. The Self-Esteem Inventory consists of fifty-eight items divided into a number of "Like Me" and "Unlike Me" scales. The Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire for the adolescents' perceptions of their fathers' and mothers' child-rearing practices consists of 260 items divided into a number of Likert-type attitude scales. Responses were made on the original forms and were then transferred by the investigator by hand to the OpScan answer sheets.

Four scales were used to measure the various aspects of the self-esteem of the delinquent male adolescents: (1) General Self, (2) School Self, (3) Social Self, and (4) Home Self.

Ten scales were used to measure the adolescents' perceptions of their parents' child-rearing practices. They were: (1) Protective, (2) Demanding, (3) Rejecting, (4) Neglecting, (5) Casual, (6) Loving, (7) Symbolic-Love Reward, (8) Direct-Object Reward, (9) Symbolic-Love Punishment, and (10) Direct-Object Punishment.

The PCR also includes the following demographic information: (1) wage, (2) race, (3) parental number--two parents or single parent, and (4) parental occupations.
The data were collected over a period of three weeks during November and December of 1979. The resource teacher of each residential village in the Starr Commonwealth proctored the administration of these instruments; the investigator was present at all sittings to assist wherever possible. Complete anonymity was guaranteed the subjects in their responses.

The collected data were analyzed at the Andrews University Computing Center. The statistical methods used were zero-order correlations and multiple regression analysis. Correlations between the self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' child-rearing practices were examined from several perspectives.

Summary and Conclusion of the Findings

A conservative interpretation of the Self-Esteem Inventory scores suggests that the delinquent male adolescents residing in the Starr Commonwealth have an extremely low self-esteem (21.6) in comparison with the norms (25.0) given by Coopersmith, the author of the instrument. One important finding of this study is that delinquent male adolescents have a lower self-esteem than non-delinquent male adolescents.

The low correlations between the delinquent male adolescents' self-esteem and their perceptions of parents' child-rearing practices are attributed to the low standard deviations. These, in turn, have been attributed to the homogeneity of the subjects. The following factors contributed to the homogeneity of the subjects: (1) same sex, (2) same age group, (3) same parental number, (4) same socioeconomic
background, (5) same parental occupational category, and (6) same anti-social behaviors, and (7) all placed at Starr Commonwealth.

The results indicate that 67.4 percent of the 132 delinquent male adolescents have medium-medium total self-esteem; 40.9 percent of the 132 subjects have medium-medium general self-esteem; and 55.3 percent of the 132 subjects have medium-medium school self-esteem. Another 56.1 percent of the 132 subjects have medium-medium social self-esteem, while only 19.7 percent of the 132 subjects have medium-medium home self-esteem.

The findings also indicate that 59.1 percent and 68.2 percent of the 132 subjects have low-high general self-esteem and home self-esteem, respectively.

Delinquent male adolescents perceived their fathers' child-rearing practices as being high in demanding, casual, and loving. Their fathers were also perceived to give them a lot of symbolic-love rewards.

The findings reveal that on the average, delinquent male adolescents perceived their mothers' child-rearing practices as high in demanding, loving, and giving of symbolic-love rewards, and low in neglecting.

Low correlations were found between all positive and negative child-rearing variables. For instance, an adolescent who perceived his father to be loving does not perceive him as rejecting.

A significant positive correlation was found between social self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' demanding child-rearing practices with respect to the fathers.
The following comparisons between the self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their mothers' child-rearing practices were found.

1. A significant positive correlation exists between the general self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of symbolic-love rewards given by their mothers.

2. A significant positive correlation exists between the school self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of symbolic-love punishment given by their mothers.

3. A significant positive correlation exists between the social self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their mothers' casual child-rearing practices.

4. A significant positive multiple correlation exists between the ten parent-child relations (mothers') variables and the school self-esteem. Significant t values are indicated for variables demanding, symbolic-love punishment, and symbolic-love reward, in that order of importance. The coefficient for variable demanding is negative, and those for variables symbolic-love punishment and symbolic-love reward are positive. Greater self-esteem tends to be related to delinquent male adolescents' perception of less demanding, greater symbolic-love reward and symbolic-love punishment child-rearing practices on the part of the mothers.

**Discussion of the Findings**

It is interesting to note from the findings that although 132 delinquent male adolescents perceived that their parents--both fathers' and mothers'--child-rearing practices were demanding, casual, and
loving, their self-esteem is found to be extremely low in comparison with the self-esteem of non-delinquents.

This finding is contrary to Coopersmith's (1957), Douvan and Gold's (1966), Nikelly's (1967), and Rosenberg's (1963) studies who found that adolescents have higher self-esteem when they perceived their parents as being loving, accepting, affectionate, and protective.

The present study indicates that these delinquent male adolescents who perceived their parents as loving, casual, and demanding have low self-esteem in comparison with the norm population.

A commonly held psychiatric view is that virtually all delinquency is an indication of early parental neglect or rejection.

In this study the majority of delinquent male adolescents did not perceive their parents to be protective, rejecting, or neglecting. These results were not in agreement with findings by other researchers that parental child-rearing practices such as neglect, indifference, hostility, and rejection have sometimes been closely associated with delinquent behavior.

By every measure of family relationship used in comparative statistical studies, a large percentage of delinquents—often almost half—have good parental relationships. Conversely, at least a minority of non-delinquents come from homes with unfavorable emotional relationships.

Self-Esteem of Delinquent Male Adolescents

The majority (59.1 percent) of delinquent male adolescents have developed a low-high general self-esteem. These adolescents have
extremely low general self-evaluation in spite of their academic and social success.

The majority of delinquent male adolescents (55.3 percent) are found to have a medium-medium school self-esteem. These adolescents are usually typical persons, who are stable, relatively contented, and are of moderate capacities and achievements in relation to their academic performance.

The majority of delinquent male adolescents (56.1 percent) are found to have a medium-medium social self-esteem. They were relatively contented and have made moderate achievements in their social relationships.

The majority of delinquent male adolescents (68.2 percent) have developed a low-high home self-esteem. Their self-esteem in relation to their home environmental and parental attitudes and treatment is extremely low.

Responses to PCR Questionnaire

Findings indicate that delinquent male adolescents perceived their fathers' child-rearing practices as highly demanding, casual, loving, and that their fathers tend to give a lot of symbolic-love rewards. The results of the study gave a very unique portrait of the fathers' child-rearing practices of delinquent male adolescents who have developed a low-high self-esteem.

Their fathers were perceived to have set high standards of accomplishment in etiquette, school and extracurricular activities for their adolescents. They have high punitiveness. They will be responsive to their adolescents only if they are not busy about something
else. Although they are demanding, these fathers encourage independence and are willing to take chances in order to allow their adolescents to grow towards independence. These fathers are also perceived to give rewards for good behavior such as praises, special attention and demonstrated affection.

Findings indicate that delinquent male adolescents perceived their mothers' child-rearing practices as highly demanding, loving, giving of symbolic-love rewards and low neglecting.

Their portrait of their mothers' child-rearing practices are as follows: their mothers have the tendency of setting high standards of accomplishments for these adolescents in manners, academic work, and extracurricular activities. They impose strict regulations and demand unquestioning obedience to the rules. They are demanding but yet loving. These mothers gave their adolescents warm and loving attention. They tried specifically to help their adolescents through problems in the way best for them. They were more likely to reason with their adolescents than to punish them, but they would use punitive measures when they are necessary. These mothers were also perceived to give symbolic-love rewards for appropriate behavior. These rewards are praises, special attention, and demonstrated affection.

Less contradictory perceptions of mothers' child-rearing practices seemed to come out of this study. The delinquent male adolescents seem to have conflicting perceptions of their fathers' child-rearing practices. Their fathers were perceived as both demanding and casual; casual and loving.
Relationship between Self-Esteem and the Perceived Degree of Parental Child-rearing Practices

General Self-Esteem

According to the findings, no significant relationships were found between the general self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' protective, rejecting, demanding, neglecting, loving, casual, direct-object reward, symbolic-love punishment, and direct-object punishment child-rearing practices.

The above mentioned perceptions of parents' child-rearing practices did not have a significant relationship to the self-esteem in these delinquent male adolescents.

However, from the perceptions of these delinquent male adolescents, their mothers' giving of symbolic-love reward is significantly related to their general self-esteem.

School Self-Esteem

The findings indicate that no significant relationships exist between the school self-esteem of these delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' protective, demanding, rejecting, neglecting, casual, loving, symbolic-love reward, direct-object reward, and direct-object punishment child-rearing practices.

The above-mentioned parents' child-rearing practices as perceived by delinquent male adolescents are not significantly related to the school self-esteem of these adolescents, except that the perceived degree of mothers' symbolic-love punishment is significantly related to the school self-esteem of these delinquent male adolescents.
Social Self-Esteem

According to the results of the study, no significant relationship exists between the social self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' protective, rejecting, neglecting, loving, symbolic-love reward, direct-object reward, symbolic-love punishment, and direct-object punishment child-rearing practices.

These above-mentioned perceptions of parents' child-rearing practices did not have a significant relationship to the self-esteem of these delinquent male adolescents, except that the perceived degree of fathers' demanding and mothers' casual child-rearing practices are significantly related to the self-esteem of these delinquent male adolescents.

Home Self-Esteem

No significant relationship exists between the home self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' protective, demanding, rejecting, neglecting, casual, loving, symbolic-love reward, direct-object reward, symbolic-love punishment and direct-object punishment child-rearing practices.

None of the parental child-rearing practices mentioned above, as perceived by these delinquent adolescents, were significantly related to their home self-esteem.

It is interesting to note that fathers' demanding and mothers' casual child-rearing practices as perceived by this group of adolescents are related to the social self-esteem of these adolescents.

Further studies are needed to determine the inconsistent
child-rearing practices of parents and their effects on adolescents.

Andry (1960) concludes that delinquents tended to have inconsistent parents—strict fathers and lax mothers.

McCord, McCord and Zola (1959) report that boys thought to have had very strict or erratic discipline from their parents were significantly more delinquent-prone than those who had experienced more consistent patterns adopted by both parents. Glueck and Glueck (1950) find that their delinquents were much more likely than their non-delinquents to have had lax, overstrict or erratic discipline from both parents.

No significant multiple correlation exists between the ten parent-child relations variables and the general, social, and home self-esteem. This means that the ten parent-child-rearing practices in combination as reported perceived by this population were not significantly related to the various types of self-esteem. The only relationship that these ten parent-child variables of the mothers as perceived by their sons made was on the school self-esteem.

Time and again, the results seemed to point to the significant relationships between mothers' child-rearing practices as perceived by their sons and their self-esteem. Demographic information given about the 132 delinquent male adolescents indicates that the majority (95 percent) of the fathers were employed, while 75 percent of the mothers were housewives in this population.

Are these results indicating the important role of the mother in the development of self-esteem in these adolescents? Why is the father not playing an important role too? Is there a possibility that
because their fathers spent less contact time in the home with these male adolescents due to their occupational responsibilities, that is why these adolescents perceived their mothers' child-rearing practices to be significantly related to their self-esteem?

In conclusion, low self-esteem in delinquent male adolescents in this population appeared to be related to the following factors as perceived by them:


2. Conflicting perceptions of their fathers' role in the family: both demanding and casual, demanding and loving, casual and loving.

This study reveals the perceptions of a specific group of delinquent boys enrolled at Starr Commonwealth, Albion, Michigan. These delinquents do not appear to come from homes typical of delinquents, for 95 percent of their fathers are employed and 75 percent of their mothers are housewives.

Implications for Further Research

The present study investigated the relationship between the self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' child-rearing practices. The findings of this study provide insights into the adolescents' perception of their parents' child-rearing practices that are related to a low self-esteem in adolescents.

Differences were found in correlations between positive and
negative child-rearing practices. The findings also noted that more significant correlations were found between perceived degree of mothers' child-rearing practices and the self-esteem of delinquent male adolescents than between the perceived degree of fathers' child-rearing practices and the self-esteem of these delinquents.

It is evident that the findings of the present study raise a number of questions related to the self-esteem of adolescents and the perceived degree of their parents' child-rearing practices. Finding answers to these questions would necessitate further studies. It is recommended:

1. That sampling of delinquent male adolescents' behavior be drawn from different settings to see whether there was a selective element in the adolescents in Starr Commonwealth different from delinquents in general.

2. That studies be conducted among delinquent female adolescents to ascertain whether similar findings with reference to self-esteem and parents' child-rearing practices will result.

3. That a study be conducted that compares delinquent and non-delinquent population to determine if there are any major differences between the two groups in regard to self-esteem and parents' child-rearing practices.

4. That a study be conducted that will compare religiously-oriented and non-religiously-oriented adolescents in regard to their self-esteem and their perceptions of their parents' child-rearing practices.

5. That further investigations be undertaken to determine
whether there are any correlations between the adolescents' personality and their perceptions of parents' child-rearing practices by using Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire II.

6. That a comparative study be conducted among a sizable number of families to determine the attitudes of parents toward child-rearing and their children's perceptions of their child-rearing practices.

7. That a study be undertaken to ascertain whether there is any correlation between the adolescents' self-esteem and parental disciplinary measures--autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire.
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APPENDIX C

Reasons for Placement of 1979 Sample
MOST SERIOUS CHARGE OR MOST SIGNIFICANT REASON FOR PLACEMENT OF 1979 SAMPLE  
\( N = 132 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason or Charge</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forcible Rape</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assaults</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny Theft</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle Theft</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgery and Counterfeiting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen Property Possessing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons: Carrying, Possessing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Offenses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcotic Drug Law</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runaway</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truancy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ungovernable Behavior</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

Number and Percent of Referrals by Type of
Referral Source for 1979 Sample
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Agency or Parent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Court</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Social Services/DPW</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Department</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. A. 150</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>132</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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