

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Maryam B. Quednow for the Master of Science
(name of student) (degree)

in Clinical Psychology presented in August 1986
(major) (date)

Title: Investigation into the Relationship Between Family Relationships
and Self-Concept: A Preliminary Study

Abstract approved: David S. Daugherty

The present study was designed to investigate the relationship between family self-concept and family functioning. The subjects consisted of 60 Introduction to Psychology students at Emporia State University. All subjects were administered two tests, the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS) and the Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scale III (FACES). The TSCS yielded one score measuring family self-concept and the FACES yielded two scores measuring family cohesion (emotional bonding) and family adaptability (change).

The results indicate that family self-concept is significantly affected by family cohesion. No significance was obtained, however, between family self-concept and family adaptability. Correlations between family cohesion and family adaptability also proved to be nonsignificant. Types of emotional bonding among family members may be a determinant in the development of self-concept.

INVESTIGATION INTO THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS AND SELF-CONCEPT:
A PRELIMINARY STUDY

A Thesis
Presented to
the Division of Psychology and Special Education
EMPORIA STATE UNIVERSITY

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science

by
Maryam B. Quednow

Stephen F. Hawes

Approved for the Major Department

James F. Lovell

Approved for the Graduate Council

455861 DP MAR 31 '87

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iii
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. METHOD	15
Subjects	15
Instruments	15
Procedure	17
3. RESULTS	18
4. DISCUSSION	21
REFERENCES	24
APPENDIXES	29

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
TABLE	
1. Correlations Between the Three Self-Report Measures	19

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The family system plays a major role in the development of an individual's self-concept. Family therapists believe that the dominant forces in the personality development are located externally in current interactions in the family system. The fundamental premise is that people are products of their social context and any attempt to understand them must include an appreciation of their families (Nichols, 1984). Intensive research has been conducted on the relationship between a child's self-concept and his family functioning. Information relating to how family functioning affects a young adult and how family influence is carried over into young adulthood is not as extensively researched. Consequently, the present study will focus on perceived family functioning and its effects on a young adult's self-concept.

The measurement of a child's perception of himself is important in the study of family relationships since self-concept develops as a product of interactions with others (Rathus & Siegal, 1976). It has been shown that the child who experience success during his early years as well as parental warmth, respect, and encouragement will attain a positive self-image (Coopersmith, 1967). Although other factors such as school, work, and peer relationships affect an individual's self-concept, the influence of the family is an increasingly researched area. According to Bell and Bell (1983), individual behavior is conceptualized as constrained by and nestled in ongoing systems of relationships of which the family is the primary representative.

The family system perspective views each family member's behavior as both contributing to, and constrained by, an ongoing family pattern. Family interactions involve close relationships in which personal resources of one member, such as self-esteem and competence, affect other family members' attitudes and perceptions which in turn affect interpersonal behavior. The family is a primary interpersonal environment in that the styles of perceiving and relating to others throughout life can be patterned here (Bell & Bell, 1983).

Coopersmith (1967) through interviews with mothers and children, determined that the psychological bases of esteem are more dependent on close, personal relationships and the immediate environment than upon material benefits or prestige rankings in the community at large. Because level of self-esteem is often associated with success, Coopersmith (1967) used variables such as religion and social class to discover some relationship between social class and self-esteem; however, the relationship is less patterned and weaker than might have been expected on the basis of differences in status (p. 215). The findings for religion indicate that members of more numerous or dominant religious groups do not rate higher in self-esteem. These findings suggest that the definition of success is a matter of personal interpretation rather than a direct and immediate consequence of one's social status and affiliation, and that it is the experiences within one's own social reference group that determine one's social definition of success--not the broader social context (p. 86).

Coopersmith's (1967) study provided information which supports the theory that although other environmental factors affect an individual's

self-concept, the main influence is the individual's social reference group which includes the family.

Studies investigating the relationship of family influence on children have gathered data which support the theory that the family plays a role in the development of a child's self-concept. Coopersmith (1967) found data that supported the hypothesis that conflict and tension between parents is associated with at least one important index of poor adjustment in children; low self-esteem. The Coopersmith (1967) study relied on parental reports of the parental relationship. In studies which have relied on children's reports of the parental relationship, children who report a high incidence of parental or family conflict are more likely to show poor adjustment and low self-esteem, even when the conflict occurred several years earlier (Raschke & Raschke, 1979). Rosenberg (1965) noted that conflict between parents and their children, rather than conflict between parents, may increase a child's feelings of worthlessness; i.e., lower self-esteem. Presumably, any of these events could affect a child's self-esteem adversely, especially if they are interpreted to mean rejection by at least one parent.

Cooper, Holman, and Braithwaite (1983) researched the relationship between a child's self-esteem and his perception of family cohesion. Using the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory, The Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale, and The Child and Family Questionnaire which incorporated the Family Cohesion Index, they tested 476 fifth- and sixth-grade children. Results indicated that children from different family types experienced varying degrees of closeness and support. Furthermore, those children reporting little family support tended to score low levels on self-esteem. This research indicates that family cohesion, when

measured through the child's perceptions of family relationships, has an important influence on the development of self-concept in children.

The relationship among socio-economic status, sibling variables, social-psychological home environment, parent involvement in intervention programs, and child self-concept and achievement were empirically investigated to determine the importance and kind of parent participation most closely related to children's cognitive and affective development. A sample of 321 second grade children was used and data were collected through interviews. Active parent involvement was related to increases in the academic performance and, to a lesser degree, the self-concept of the participating children. The social psychological environment of the family, defined from a social learning perspective, was strongly related to the achievement and self-concept of children (Revicki, 1981).

According to Bowes (1983), interaction patterns within the family also seem to affect a child's self-concept. The study which concluded that the family system, which consists of the interaction patterns or means of communicating which family members develop within the family as a working whole, is directly related to the way a developing child learns to perceive himself.

The family is an especially important source of attachment and support for children since children may not have the extra-familial support systems that many adults have. According to Nelson (1984), for middle school students (those in grades seven and eight) two particularly important environmental settings are the classroom and the family while two important domains for their adaptations are affect (feelings of satisfaction and confidence within the family, peers, and schoolwork) and school achievement. His results indicate, all facets of students'

self-concepts (peer, scholastic, and general) and satisfaction with family tended to be related to family climates characterized as high in cohesion, expressiveness, and organization and low in conflict and control. These results support the evidence that although there are many outside factors which may influence a child's self-concept, the family remains as one of the most important influences.

Much support has been gathered which shows the influence of the family on younger children. This influence, however, is also carried over into adolescence. Adolescence is a stressful time in an individual's growth and development. Influences that affect self-concept may affect the adolescent into adulthood. As a consequence of both their physical and cognitive development and of changing social expectations, adolescents begin to reevaluate and reorganize the skills and identifications of childhood into a new framework that provides the adolescent with a "subjective sense of invigorating sameness and continuity" (Erikson, 1968, p. 19). Identity formation necessitates the use of social cognitive and social comparison processes. These processes require one to look critically at oneself and at society simultaneously --in other words, to engage in a multiple perspective taking (Hill, 1979). Adolescence, then, is a critical period for self-concept formation.

By examining interaction patterns in typical families, Cooper, Grotevant, and Condon (1983) hoped to develop an account of the processes through which interaction within the family could enhance the adolescent's development in domains beyond the family. The results of their investigation indicate a relation between patterns of communication in the family and adolescent psychosocial development. Findings suggest

that the leaving process is facilitated by individual family relationships and characterized by separateness. Separateness gives the adolescent permission to develop his or her own point of view in the context of connectedness which provides a secure base from which the adolescent can explore worlds outside the family.

The family's contribution to the adolescent's developing sense of identity must be considered in the context of the family's culture and child-rearing goals. Although most adolescents do not achieve a sense of consolidation of identity until later adolescence, research and clinical evidence suggest that the family's ability to adapt to the changing needs of its early adolescent has implications for the process of identity formation (Grotevant, 1983).

Self-esteem is an important resource for the young adolescent who is beginning to explore possibilities for a sense of identity.

Adolescents high in self-esteem are more likely to have the confidence and competence to be open to new information they encounter, and to take some of the risks involved inherent in identity exploration.

Coopersmith (1967) investigated the relationship between child-rearing practices in a sample of subjects. He found that parents of high self-esteem boys encouraged their children to express their opinions, permitted their children to disagree with them, provided clear limits for the children's behavior, frequently showed them affection, and generally took an interest in their children's lives.

Grotevant (1983) concluded that both connectedness (as indicated by support, cohesiveness and acceptance) and individuality (as indicated by disagreements) in family interaction are related to identity formation in late adolescence. The family context most likely to facilitate the

adolescent's developing sense of identity is the one that maneuvers within the dynamic tension between individuality and connectedness. Individuality facilitates the developing sense of self as distinctive and unique; connectedness provides the security and self-esteem which permits the adolescent to venture out and explore.

The adolescent's self-concept affects his daily living patterns as well as influences his future. Dinitz and Pfau-Vincent (1982) examined the effects of family relationships on the self-concept of sixth grade boys who lived in high delinquency areas of Columbus, Ohio. Potential delinquents reported that they were more often severely punished. Their mothers stated that the family situation was usually characterized by conflict, and that there was not much family participation in leisure and other family activities.

Reports by the boys and their mothers strongly suggest that one of the preconditions of law abiding or delinquent conduct is to be found in the concept of self and interaction patterns that one has acquired in one's primary group relationships. Furthermore, these positive or negative concepts represent the differential responses to various environments and confrontation patterns. Concept of self and others reflects the impact of life on a person as he or she has internalized various experiences. Dinitz and Pfau-Vincent (1982) found that the level of self-concept may be an underlying component in delinquent or nondelinquent conduct.

Song In-Sub and Mattie (1983) investigated the relationship between home environment, self-concept, and academic achievement of Korean adolescents. They discovered that self-concept is a mediating variable between home environment and academic achievement. According to their

study, family psychological characteristics have substantially direct impact on self-concept constructs. Beyond their direct effects on self-concept, these results seem to indicate that family psychological characteristics have indirect influences on academic achievement via their direct influence on the self-concept constructs.

In order to investigate the self-concept of different types of adolescents, Himes-Chapman and Hanson (1983) sought out adolescents from youth homes, mental institutions, and normal homes. Solvberg and Blaker (1975) reported that socially appropriate adjustment is accompanied by intimate and confidential relationships with parents. Disturbed adolescents have greater difficulty in understanding their parent's expectations of them. Families of these adolescents experience a combination of parental conflict and parent-child coalitions. In the Himes-Chapman and Hanson (1983) study the Family Environment Scale, Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire, and the Tennessee Self Concept Scale were used to assess family relationships and self-concept. Adolescents in the normal group reported significantly higher levels of cohesion, moral-religious organizations, achievement orientations, intellectual-cultural focus, and lower conflict than the other two family types. This describes a functional family environment as having clear communication between its members, high cohesion, low conflicts, a sense of morality and ethics, realistic expectations for achievement, a clear structure of family responsibilities, and involvement in activities which expands interests and abilities.

The family environment and parent-child relationship appears to contribute to a strong positive self-concept of the adolescent. The normal group adolescents were significantly higher in all areas of

self-concept. The youth home and mental institute adolescents had a less healthy family and they had deficient parent child relationships. The adolescents in these groups perceived little cohesion and unity among family members. The self-concepts of the other two groups of adolescents were significantly lower in all areas than the normal adolescents. Evidence suggests that family environment influences the adolescent's self-concept as well as mental health and types of behavior patterns (Himes-Chapman & Hanson, 1983).

Related to the adolescent's self-concept, Newman and Murray (1983) focused on the concept of identity and family relations. They defined identity as the integration of past identifications, contemporary competencies, and future aspirations. The identity formation of the adolescent appears to be influenced by several factors--individual characteristics, reciprocal relationship with each parent, the family system itself, and the cultural milieu. According to Newman and Murray (1983), in early adolescence not only do parental and family patterns of power and decision making have an impact on the adolescent's efforts to express individuality, but that process of individuation influences authority relations and structure. The areas of family sex role definitions, orientation towards work, and socio-ethical values are the major domains which will influence the process as well as the content of identity formation.

Included within the family context is the area of sibling relations. Influences of the siblings in the family have an effect on an individual's self-concept.

Sibling death during adolescence very likely has an enduring effect upon a surviving child (Silver & Waitmon, 1980). Balk (1983) designed a

study to investigate the grief reaction and self-concept perceptions of teenagers whose siblings had died. Using the Offer Self-Image Questionnaire (OSIQ), Balk (1983) discovered that the participants' values development had been influenced positively according to the scores on the OSIQ moral values scale, attitudes toward religion, and lessons learned from the death. Accordingly, family coherency differences among the participants were also noted. Distinctions found between greater and lesser family coherency are related to a family's role in facilitating or inhibiting healthy bereavement outcomes. A tradition of greater family coherency assists the teenager to work through problems using the family as a resource. Thus, the influence of the family can be tied into the development of an adolescent's self-concept as related to sibling death.

Tesser (1980) developed a self-esteem maintenance model used to make predictions about sibling identification and sibling friction. His main preface concludes that a family is made up of individuals, each of whom is trying to enhance, or at least maintain his or her own self-esteem, and that self-esteem is strongly influenced by one's relationships to other people in the family. His model suggests that persons operate on closeness, performance, and relevance to adjust their self-esteem. According to the self-esteem model, individuals can gain better self-esteem by basking in the reflected glory of others who are close and who perform well, or they can lose in self-esteem by comparison with those who are close and who perform well. The relative importance of reflection and comparison processes is determined by the relevance of the other's performance to one's own self definition. Sibling relationships have a direct influence on an individual and his self-esteem according to the Tesser model.

Many psychological theories point to the importance of siblings for personality development. The basic rationale of these theories is that during childhood the presence of siblings provides children with interpersonal experiences which help form the child's overall personality. Falbo (1980) paid undergraduates of the University of Texas to complete a series of personality measures and a background questionnaire. Sibling status was defined in terms of four groups: only, first, middle, and last borns. In terms of interpersonal orientation, he obtained sibling status effects in locus of control, self-esteem, and self-centeredness indicating sibling effect on self-esteem.

The effects of family influence on an individual's self-esteem begin in childhood and continue throughout adolescence. Many of these studies have indicated that type of family environment is a factor influencing self-concept.

Perry (1983) studied the parental characteristics in abusing and nonabusing families. The parent variables assessed included whether the parent was abused as a child, self-esteem, anxiety, life stress, perceived family environment and expectations for their children's development. A control group (parents from nonabusing families) and a sample population of clients from a local mental health center (parents from abusive families) were used and significant differences were found on a number of measures. A greater percentage of clients had a history of abuse than did the control group. They reported lower self-esteem and higher anxiety. The clients reported greater conflict, less cohesion, and less expression than the controls. Results indicate that children from abusive homes are likely to have lower self-esteem and become abusers themselves.

The self-image of abused adolescents was researched by Hjorth (1982). Physically abused adolescents show lower self-esteem in a number of areas when compared to nonabused adolescents. These areas include family relations, emotional stability, psychopathology, impulse control, coping skills, as well as poorer overall self-image.

Future effects of family environmental influences have been found to occur in children from families with divorced parents. Slater (1983) using the Tennessee Self Concept Scale to measure the self-concept of high school students, examined the possible effects of separation and divorce on the adolescents' self-esteem. Although males from disrupted homes have better self-concepts and perceptions of their family environment, the opposite tended to be true for females. Conflict in the family environment was negatively correlated with all of the subscores of self-esteem on the Tennessee Self Concept Scale. Hence, the interaction demonstrating lower self-esteem for females from disrupted homes could be related to the increased amount of conflict they reported.

The amount of conflict in the home rather than the divorce itself also is a factor influencing self-esteem. Slater (1984) showed a main effect of high conflict in the home to be associated with lower self-esteem. Ongoing conflict in intact or divorced homes produces lower self-esteem.

While much research has been conducted on family influence and its effects on the child or adolescent, little research has been conducted using college students or adults. Adult clients who were seeking treatment at a University of Missouri counseling center were evaluated on self-esteem using the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) (Anderson, 1985). Over half of the clients who reported low

self-esteem also reported they had problems with their families. Anderson (1985) concluded that the emphasis on control may well be consistent within the family situation. The parents were often seen as demanding and rigid, but at the same time unpredictable in terms of their behavior. Many of the parents of these individuals were reported as violence prone or emotionally explosive. These parental characteristics affected the self-esteem of these individuals into adulthood.

In a study conducted with undergraduate students, Parish (1981) found that college students' self-concepts varied significantly according to perceived family happiness. A possible explanation could be offered by Heider's (1985) Attribution Theory. According to the theory, individuals generally attempt to identify who is responsible for the prevailing circumstances they find themselves in. Compared to those from happy families, those from unhappy families may have attributed their less than optimal circumstances to themselves, resulting in a lower self-concept.

A Filipino study supports the findings of Parish (1981). College freshmen from the University of San Carlos in the Phillipines were the subjects for a study conducted by Watkins and Astilla (1980). They measured self-esteem and the amount of family acceptance of the subjects. The high self-esteem group reported a superior level of family inter-relationships as compared to the low self-esteem group.

Although much emphasis has been placed on how the family affects a child's self-concept, little research has been conducted examining familial influence on the self-concept of young adults. This would suggest that further research should be conducted to investigate the

possibility that family influences on an individual's self-concept continue beyond childhood and adolescence.

The present study was designed to investigate the relationship between a college student's self-concept and his/her perceived level of family functioning. More specifically, college Introduction to Psychology students were compared on two measures. The first measure was one of that individual's family self-concept and the second measure was of that individual's perceived level of family functioning.

CHAPTER 2

METHOD

Subjects

The subjects were 60 students enrolled in Introduction to Psychology at Emporia State University. The data were gathered during the 1986 Spring semester at the University.

Instruments

Family self-concept was measured with the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS). This instrument is a Likert-type scale consisting of 100 self-descriptive statements which the subject uses to portray his own picture of himself. The scores contribute to a 3×5 self-concept classification system. The results yield scores for three internal and five external dimensions of self-concept as well as a total score for self-esteem. The internal reference is subdivided into three areas: (1) identity (the individual's perception of his basic identity), (2) self satisfaction (individual's perception about how he feels about the self he perceives), (3) behavior (individual's perception of his own behavior). The external reference is subdivided into five areas: (1) physical self, (2) moral-ethical self, (3) personal self, (4) family self, and (5) social self. The external frame is a measure of how the individual utilizes outside resources to describe himself (Pound, Manses & Putnam, 1977). The family self-concept is the area focused upon in the present study.

Regarding the reliability and validity of the TSCS, reliability is found in the remarkable similarity of profile patterns found through

test-retest techniques with the same individuals over long periods of time. Through various profile analysis the author, William Fitts (1965), has demonstrated that the distinctive features of the individual profiles are still present for most persons a year or so later.

TSCS content validity was determined by seven clinical psychologists who acted as judges. If the seven unanimously agreed on an item, then that item was accepted to be classified correctly (Fitts, 1965).

The Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scale III (FACES III) was the second testing instrument. This scale consists of ten cohesion items and ten adaptability items. The respondent is asked to read statements and decide for each, on a Likert type scale, how frequently the described behavior occurs in his/her own family (Olson, McCubbin, Barnes, Larsen, Muxen, & Wilson, 1982).

Family cohesion assesses the degree to which family members are separated from or connected to their families. Family cohesion is the emotional bonding that family members have toward one another (Olson et al., 1982).

Family adaptability (change) includes the extent to which the family system is flexible and able to change. Family adaptability is the ability of a marital or family system to change its power structure, role relationships, and relationship rules in response to situational and developmental stress (Olson et al., 1982).

Both family adaptability and cohesion, as measured by FACES III provide an overall picture of how the individual perceives his/her family functioning. Also, this provides information on how the individual perceives him/herself within the family.

Construct validity on FACES III includes the high correlation of the items within each scale with the total scale. From the results of factor analysis, the ten cohesion items all correlated highly with the total score on cohesion, and the ten adaptability items all correlated highly with the total adaptability score (Olson et al., 1982).

The reliability of FACES III was tested using Cronbach Alpha for each scale (cohesion and adaptability). The internal consistency reliability is adequate for both cohesion and adaptability and the reliability was replicated across two independent samples (Olson et al., 1982).

Procedure

Both the TSCS and FACES III were administered to Introduction to Psychology students during the spring semester at Emporia State University. The students were asked to sign a consent form explaining the testing procedures as per human subjects committee policy (see Appendix A).

The TSCS and the FACES III were administered during class time. Confidentiality was ensured in that students did not have to write their names on either test.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

Analysis of the data was based on a final sample of 60 subjects from Introduction to Psychology classes at Emporia State University.

1. The Tennessee Self Concept Scale (Family Self-Concept) overall mean was 67.70 with a standard deviation of 10.22;
2. the Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scale overall cohesion mean was 34.80 with a standard deviation of 6.802; and
3. the Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scale overall adaptability mean was 25.50 with a standard deviation of 7.425 (see Appendix B).

Pearson Product Moment Correlations were computed to determine the relationship between the measures: (1) Family Self-Concept, as measured by the TSCS; (2) Family Cohesion, as measured by the FACES; and (3) Family Adaptability, as measured by the FACES.

As can be seen from Table 1 the TSCS family self-concept scores and the FACES cohesion scores were significantly related. The other measures, TSCS/Adaptability and Adaptability/Cohesion, when correlated, did not prove to be significantly related.

Insert Table 1 about here

Therefore, an individual's emotional bonding to his family is significantly related to that individual's family self-concept. Family self-concept and family adaptability (change) did not appear to be

Table 1

Correlations Between the Three Self-Report Measures

	TSCS	Adaptability	Cohesion
TSCS	----	.2305	.7908*
Adaptability	----	-----	.1705
Cohesion	----	-----	-----

* Significant relationship

significantly related. Furthermore, the family cohesion and family adaptability correlations indicate no significance between the measures of family closeness and the ability of the family to adapt to change.

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

Conclusions drawn from the body of literature indicate a relationship between the type of family from which an individual comes and that particular individual's family self-concept. It has been hypothesized that other external forces such as school, work, and peer relationships affect self-concept formation. Although these areas are important in the development of self-concept, the family functioning of that individual influences the other aspects as well. If an individual does not have a supportive, nurturing, family environment the other areas of his life may be affected.

The present study was designed to discover and to reinforce past research in regards to the relationship between an individual's family self-concept and perceived family functioning. Hypothesized results (i.e., that family functioning would have a significant affect on self-concept formation) were shown only to be significant on one area of measure. Results indicated that family cohesion and family self-concept were significantly related. The degree to which family members are separated from or connected to their families was shown to have a significant affect on family self-concept.

The results did not support the hypothesis that there would be a significant relationship between family adaptability and family self-concept. Family adaptability is the extent to which a family system is flexible and able to change. Although family adaptability may influence an individual's family self-concept, it did not prove to be a

significant factor in this present study. Speculation on this nonsignificant relationship may be that although the level of family adaptability is important in the development of family self-concept, the influences of family cohesion may have been more influential with the present subjects. Subjects of this study were Introduction to Psychology students, many of whom were living away from home for the first time. Although they have been able to more readily adapt to the separation, the emotional bonding which attaches an individual to his family is shown to be a significant force in family self-concept development.

Nonsignificant correlations between family adaptability and family cohesion may be explained by the difference in the types of questions. The cohesion items were formulated to address issues concerning the emotional bonding among family members while the adaptability items were designed to measure the amount of change within the family structure.

Coopersmith (1967) has shown that a child who experiences success during his early years and parental warmth, respect, and encouragement will attain a positive self-image. As a result, parental encouragement and support to attend college may also have been a factor in establishing significance between family cohesion and family self-concept.

In conclusion, the lack of significant findings between family adaptability and family self-concept might be attributed to the subject population. For example, the population of college students may, in general, gain most of their family self-concept from the emotional bonding (cohesion) of family members rather than from change within the family structure (adaptability). Future research should examine other possible subjects and compare the findings to the findings of the present study. Other subjects could include a population of blue collar

workers who have not attended college, high school students who are still living at home, or a population of graduate students. Finally, the literature seems to suggest a relationship between family relationships and family self-concept. Thus, it is recommended that future studies continue in this area in order to determine the strength of the relationship between family relationships and self-concept formation.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Anderson, W., & Bauer, B. (1985). Clients with MMPI high D-Pd: Theory implications. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 41, 181-187.
- Balk, D. (1983). Adolescents grief reactions and self-concept perceptions. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 12, 137-161.
- Bell, C. B., & Bell, L. G. (1983). Parental validation and support in the development of adolescent daughters. Adolescent Development in the Family, 22, 27-41.
- Bowes, A. J. (1983). A comparison of children's self-concepts and family interaction patterns. (Doctoral dissertation, United States International University) Dissertation Abstracts International, 43, 3013B.
- Cooper, C. R., Grotevant, H. D., & Condon, M. S. (1983). Individuality and connectedness in the family as a context for adolescent identity formation and role-taking skill. Adolescent Development in the Family, 22, 43-59.
- Cooper, J. E., Holman, J., & Braithwaite, V. A. (1983). Self-esteem and family cohesion: The child's perspective and adjustment. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 9, 153-159.
- Coopersmith, S. (1967). The antecedents of self-esteem. San Francisco: Freeman.
- Dintz, S., & Pfau-Vincent, B. N. (1982). Self-concept and juvenile delinquency: An update. Youth and Society, 14, 133-158.
- Erikson, E. H. (1968). Identity: Youth and crisis. New York: Norton.

- Falbo, T. (1980). Only children, achievement, and interpersonal orientation. Presented at the 88th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Montreal.
- Fitts, W. (1965). Tennessee Self Concept Scale manual. Nashville, Tennessee: Counselor Recordings and Tests.
- Grotevant, H. D. (1983). The contribution of the family to the facilitation of identity formation in early adolescence. Journal of Early Adolescence, 3, 225-237.
- Heider, F. (1958). The psychology of interpersonal relations. New York: Wiley.
- Hill, J. P., & Palmquist, W. F. (1978). Social cognition and social relations in early adolescence. International Journal of Behavioral Development, 1, 1-36.
- Himes-Chapman, B. S., & Hansen, J. C. (1983). Family environments and self-concepts of delinquent and mentally ill adolescents. Family Therapy, 10, 288-298.
- Hjorth, C. W., & Ostrov, E. (1982). The self-image of physically abused adolescents. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 11, 71-76.
- Nelson, G. (1984). The relationship between dimensions of classroom and family. Journal of Community Psychology, 12, 276-287.
- Newman, B. M., & Murray, C. I. (1983). Identity and family relations in early adolescence. Journal of Early Adolescence, 3, 293-303.
- Nichols, M. P. (1984). Family therapy: Concepts and methods. New York: Garner Press Inc.
- Olson, D. H., McCubbin, H. I., Barnes, H., Larsen, A., Muxen, M., & Wilson, M. (1982). Family inventories. St. Paul: University of Minnesota Press.

- Parish, T. S. (1980). Young adults' evaluations of themselves and their parents as a function of family structure and disposition. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 10, 173-178.
- Parish, T. S. (1981). Concordance of children's descriptions of themselves and their parents as a function of intact versus divorced families. Journal of Psychology, 107, 199-200.
- Perry, M. A., Wells, E. A., & Dorron, L. D. (1983). Parent characteristics in abusing and nonabusing families. Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 12, 329-336.
- Raschke, M., & Raschke, V. (1979). Family conflict and children's self-concepts: A comparison of intact and single parent families. Journal of Marriage and Family, 41, 367-374.
- Rathus, S. A., & Sieger, L. T. (1976). Reliability and validity of a self-concept scale for researchers in family relationships. Journal of Family Counseling, 4, 57-60.
- Revicki, D. A. (1981). The relationship among socioeconomic status, home environment, parent involvement, child self-concept, and child achievement. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 206 645)
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). Society and the adolescent self-image. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Silver, R. L., & Wortman, C. B. (1980). Coping with undesirable life events. In Garber, J., & Seligman, M. E. P. (eds.). Human helplessness: Theory and applications. New York: Academic Press.
- Slater, E. J., Stewart, K. J., & Linn, M. W. (1983). The effects of family disruption on adolescent males and females. Adolescence, 18, 931-943.

- Slater, E. J., & Haber, J. D. (1984). Adolescent adjustment following divorce as a function of familial conflict. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 52, 920-921.
- Solvberg, H., & Blaker, R. (1975). Communication efficiency in couples with and without a schizophrenic offspring. Family Process, 14, 515-534.
- Song, In-Subj, & Hattie, J. (1984). Home environment, self-concept, and academic achievement: A causal modeling approach. Journal of Educational psychology, 76, 1268-1281.
- Tesser, A. (1985). Self-esteem maintenance in family dynamics. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39, 77-91.
- Watkins, D., & Astilla, E. (1980). Self-esteem and family relationships: A Fillipino study. International Journal of Sociology of the Family, 10, 141-144.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT

The Department/Division of Psychology supports the practice of protection for human subjects participating in research and related activities. The following information is provided so that you can decide whether you wish to participate in the present study. You should be aware that even if you agree to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time and that, if you do withdraw from the study, you will not be subjected to reprimand or any other form of reproach.

1. Procedures to be followed in the study, as well as identification of any procedures which are experimental.

You will be asked to take two paper and pencil tests on which you must rate your present situation on a scale from 1 to 5.

2. Description of any attendant discomforts or other forms of risk involved to subjects taking part in the study.

There should be no discomfort involved.

3. Description of benefits to be expected from the study or research.

This research should help to show the effects of family relationship on self-concept and how therapists may better work with families in order to promote healthier self-concepts among family members.

4. Appropriate alternative procedures that would be advantageous for the subject.

"I have read the above statement and have been fully advised of the procedures to be used in this project. I have been given sufficient opportunity to ask any questions I had concerning the procedures and possible risks involved. I understand the potential risks involved and I assume them voluntarily. I likewise understand that I can withdraw from the study at any time without being subjected to reproach."

Date

Subject

APPENDIX B

Tennessee Self Concept Scale (Family Self Scores)

	Fitts (1965)	Quednow (1986)
Mean	70.83	67.70
Standard Deviation	8.43	10.22

Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scale (Cohesion Scores)

	Olson (1985)	Quednow (1986)
Mean	39.80	34.80
Standard Deviation	5.40	6.80

Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scale (Adaptability Scores)

	Olson (1985)	Quednow (1986)
Mean	24.10	25.50
Standard Deviation	4.70	7.40