

## INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.
5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

**Xerox University Microfilms**

300 North Zeeb Road  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

76-19,707

ALLEN, Jill, 1947-  
IDENTITY FORMATION IN LATE-ADOLESCENT  
WOMEN.

City University of New York, Ph.D., 1976  
Psychology, clinical

**Xerox University Microfilms,** Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

IDENTITY FORMATION IN LATE-ADOLESCENT WOMEN

by

Jill Allen

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate  
Faculty in Psychology in partial fulfill-  
ment of the requirement for the degree  
of Doctor of Philosophy, The City Univer-  
sity of New York.

1976

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Psychology in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

April 7th, 1976  
date

David F. Ricks  
Chairman of Examining Committee

April 7th, 1976  
date

Florence L. Denmark  
Executive Officer

Dr. David F. Ricks

Dr. Herbert Nechin

Dr. Mae Lord

Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank my committee, Drs. David Ricks, Mae Lord, and Herbert Nechin, for their warm interest, and for their helpful criticisms and suggestions. I am especially indebted to my sponsor, Dr. Ricks, for exposing me to his creative and liberating way of thinking about research problems, for being so receptive and encouraging in his response to my ideas, and for his consistent availability and helpful guidance.

I am very grateful to Drs. Bernard Gorman, Thad Harshbarger, and Ruth Ellen Galper for their expert advice on various statistical problems. I am particularly indebted to Dr. Gorman for his patient and generous help with the computer phase of my data analysis.

I would like to thank Ms. Susan Packer for her informed and perceptive assistance in the process of selecting items for inclusion in the Separation Problems Subscale of the IPM. I would also like to express my appreciation to Ms. Elizabeth Dinsmore, and Ms. Elaine Tuccillo, who rated the identity status interviews, for the very competent and clinically astute job they did. In addition, I would like to thank Dr. Andrew Karpf, Dr. Linda Penn, Ms. Ellen Schorr, and Dr. Barry Stengel for their help in assessing the social desirability of the IPM items.

Finally, I am deeply grateful to my husband, Barry, for his unflinching encouragement and support during the long period it took to complete this study.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
INTRODUCTION .....	1
ONE--REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE .....	2
Identity Formation in Adolescence: Theory and Research .....	2
Adolescent Identity Formation and Object Relations; Especially Separation-Individuation..	7
Research in the Area of Separation-Individuation....	15
Adolescent Identity Formation and Identification....	19
Special Issues in Female Identity Formation.....	24
Hypotheses .....	27
TWO--METHODOLOGY .....	30
Measuring Instruments.....	30
Subjects .....	30
Measurement of the Variables .....	33
Assessment of Pattern of Identity Formation.....	33
Assessment of Separation-Impeding Interaction Patterns.....	36
Assessment of Mothers' Accuracy of Perception of Their Daughters.....	44
Assessment of Extent of Mother-Daughter Identification.....	47
Peer Relations Scale.....	49

Chapter	Page
THREE--RESULTS.....	51
Hypothesis #1: Separation-Impeding Mother-Daughter Interaction and Daughter's Identity Status.....	51
Hypothesis #2: Accuracy of Mother's Perception of Daughter and Daughter's Identity Status.....	53
Extent of Mother-Daughter Identification and Daughter's Identity Status.....	55
Awareness of Mother-Daughter Divergence of Perception.....	58
Daughter's Accuracy in Perceiving Divergence of Perception and Identity Status.....	59
Accuracy of Perception of Mother-Daughter Divergence and Degree of Assumed Divergence.....	61
Actual Mother-Daughter Divergence, Assumed Divergence, and Identity Status.....	64
Identity Status and Socially Undesirable Responses...	67
Separation Problem Scores and Psychotherapy.....	69
Father Absence and Identity Status.....	70
Peer Relations and Identity Status.....	71
FOUR--FACTOR ANALYSIS OF THE IPM.....	73
Purposes and Limitations.....	73
Results of the Factor Analysis.....	74
The First Factor in Each Analysis.....	74
Factors Reflecting Separation-Impeding Interaction Patterns.....	75

Chapter	Page
Additional Factors that Differentiated	
Among the Identity Statuses .....	81
Tentative Nature of These Results.....	86
FIVE--DISCUSSION .....	87
The Hypotheses .....	87
Identity and Identification .....	92
Awareness of Divergence of Perception Between	
Mother and Daughter .....	94
Identity Status and Negative Feelings .....	97
Late Adolescence: Three Developmental Lines.....	98
Appendix A. Measures; Instructions to Subjects and	
Raters.....	106
Appendix B. The Eight Factor Analyses Performed on the	
IPM Data .....	143
References .....	161

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Comparisons Of The Four Identity Statuses On The Different Perspectives Of The Separation Problems Subscale Of The IPM.....	52
2 The Relationship Between Daughter's Identity Status And Mother's Accuracy In Predicting Daughter's Responses To Disagreed-On IPM Questions.....	54
3 The Relationship Between Daughter's Identity Status And Mother's Accuracy In Predicting Daughter's Socially Undesirable IPM Responses .....	55
4 The Relationship Between Daughter's Identity Status And Mother-Daughter Dissimilarity.....	56
5 The Relationship Between Daughter's Identity Status And Daughter's Accuracy In Predicting Mother's Responses to Disagreed On IPM Questions .....	60
6 The Relationship Between Accuracy Of Perception Of Divergence And Degree Of Assumed Divergence On The IPM .....	61
7 Identity Status And Daughter's Accuracy Of Perception Of Mother Corrected For Unwarranted Assumed Divergence And Convergence.....	62
8 The Relationship Between Daughter's Identity Status And Number Of Disagreements Between Mother And Daughter On The Direct Perspective Of The IPM.....	64
9 Identity Status And Number Of Disagreements Between Mother And Daughter Assumed To Exist By 1) Mothers, And 2) Daughters.....	65
10 Daughter's Identity Status And The Degree To Which Daughter Gives More Socially Undesirable Responses Than Mother To The IPM.....	68
11 Separation Problems Subscale Scores And Psychotherapy...	70
12 Mean Self-Ratings On The Seven Point Peer-Relations Scale For The Four Identity Statuses.....	72

TABLE	PAGE
13 Daughter's Satisfaction With And Idealization Of Mother, (As Seen By Mother), And Daughter's Identity Status .....	78
14 Low Autonomy And Absence Of Intense Hostility Vis-A-Vis Mother (As Seen By Daughter), And Daughter's Identity Status.....	80
15 Degree To Which Daughter Experiences Mother As Having A Generally Positive Attitude Towards Her, And Daughter's Identity Status.....	82
16 Degree To Which Mother Sees Daughter As Self-Confident And Self-Satisfied, And Daughter's Identity Status...	83
17 Degree To Which Daughter Sees Mother As Disliking Herself, And Daughter's Identity Status.....	84

## Abstract

## IDENTITY FORMATION IN LATE ADOLESCENT WOMEN

by

Jill Allen

Advisor: Professor David Ricks

Identity formation, the major developmental task of late-adolescence, has been the subject of more theory than empirical study. The present dissertation aimed to investigate empirically the relationship between the fate of the identity crisis in late-adolescent women, and several aspects of their relationships with their mothers.

Successful handling of the identity crisis was hypothesized to be related to a minimum of separation-impeding interaction in the mother-daughter relationship, and to accurate perception of the daughter on the part of the mother. The relationship between the fate of the identity struggle and the degree of identification with the mother was also investigated without making a specific hypothesis.

Forty-eight female college students and their mothers served as subjects. On the basis of her response to the Identity Status Interview, each young woman was assigned to one of four identity statuses: identity achievement, moratorium, (the adaptive statuses); identity foreclosure, and identity diffusion (the maladaptive statuses).

A subset of items from the Interpersonal Perception Method (IPM) involving attitudes and behaviors on the part of both mothers and late-adolescent daughters that would, according to theory, impede the separation process, was used to test the first hypothesis. The mothers' predictions of their daughters' responses to the IPM were used to test

the second hypothesis. Degree of identification with the mother was operationally defined as degree of profile similarity between mother and daughter on the Interpersonal Checklist.

The results of the study failed to confirm either hypothesis: The four identity statuses did not differ in the amount of separation-impeding interaction reported or in the degree to which the mothers perceived their daughters accurately. The statuses were characterized by different degrees of mother-daughter identification: Identity achievement daughters showed the most identification; moratorium and diffusion daughters showed the least; foreclosure daughters occupied an intermediate position.

The foreclosure status differed from the other three statuses in that both the daughters and their mothers were less attuned to areas of divergence of perception between them than were the daughters and mothers in the other statuses. Also, the foreclosure mothers were more negative than their daughters about the mother-daughter relationship, while this pattern was reversed for the mothers and daughters in the other statuses.

The moratorium daughters were critical and distant towards their mothers; no other status showed this pattern. Identity achievement and moratorium daughters were more sure of their mothers' affection than were foreclosure and diffusion daughters.

It was argued that both hypotheses were based on reasoning that was insufficiently grounded in empirical study of the normal adolescent separation process. The findings of this study form a coherent

pattern which suggests that a critical, distancing stance towards mother, disruption of identifications with her, and an awareness of areas of divergence of perception between oneself and mother characterize the moratorium phase of normal identity formation. The identity achievement phase seems to involve cessation of criticism and distancing, re-establishment of identifications with the mother, and continued awareness of areas of mother-daughter divergence. During both phases, the mother-daughter bond is never ruptured. Parallels between this sequence and Mahler's descriptions of the practicing and rapprochement phases of separation-individuation in the toddler were drawn. Foreclosure daughters apparently cannot risk criticizing their mothers; diffusion daughters may be so distant from their mothers that no rapprochement is possible.

## INTRODUCTION

Identity formation, the major developmental task of late-adolescence, has been the subject of more theory than empirical study. Most empirical work done in this area has involved construct validation of measures of identity achievement.

The present study aims to investigate empirically the relationship between the fate of the identity crisis in the late-adolescent woman, and several aspects of her relationship with her mother. The aspects chosen are considered by ego-psychologists to be important determinants of the success of the identity formation process. These include 1) the degree of separation from the mother achieved by the daughter; 2) the degree to which the mother is accurate in her perception of her daughter; and 3) the degree to which the daughter identifies with her mother.

The present study is an attempt to gain insight into the way in which the processes of identity formation, separation from mother, and identification with mother inter-relate during late-adolescence for women.

## CHAPTER ONE

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

#### Identity Formation in Adolescence: Theory and Research

According to Erikson, (1963, 1968), adolescence is a period of struggle for identity. Adolescents are primarily concerned with defining themselves. This involves determining what place they would like to occupy in the world of adults that they are almost ready to join; assessing the place that they already do occupy in that world and in the world of their peers; discovering and recognizing their abilities; coming to terms with their limitations; etc. Erikson believes that the normal process of finding the answers to these questions is not one that primarily involves conscious thought. He believes it does involve groping and experimenting with different solutions until the adolescent finds ones that fit his or her unique set of requirements.

Most theorists in the area of adolescent psychology believe that an extensive reorganization of the personality normally occurs during this period, in response to the tremendous maturational changes and social pressures which characterize it (Erikson, 1963, 1968; Blos, 1962; Freud, A., 1960; Josselyn, 1954). A disruption of established defensive patterns and a re-animation of childhood conflicts occur, providing an opportunity to improve on previous solutions. In the area of identity formation, there is a reassessment of childhood identifications involving an accentuation of some of these identifications and a repudiation of others, as well as a push toward new identifications with peers and with adults outside the immediate family. These identifications and the other elements which make up a person's identity (including "constitutional

givens, idiosyncratic libidinal needs, favored capacities,...effective defenses, successful sublimations and consistent roles", (Erikson, 1968)) are synthesized and intergrated into an increasingly coherent configuration which must also be geared towards the occupational, sexual and social prototypes that the society has to offer. All of this implies that adolescence is a time of increased psychological activity, instability and growth. Erikson describes the final stages of identity formation as typically subjecting the adolescent to more role confusion than he or she has ever experienced before or probably ever will again. However, the confusion, the relative fluidity of defenses, and the need to be daring in fantasy and in reality are also the adolescent's way of mastering new experiences and of allowing for the occurrence of enough experimentation so that the best avenues for self-expression can be found. He speculates that the whole process is the adolescent equivalent of play in childhood and is itself a kind of "social play" (Erikson, 1968).

In order for these processes to occur, Erikson argues that the adolescent needs a psychosocial moratorium where no permanently self-defining commitments are demanded of him or her, and no permanently self-defining judgments are made of him or her by society.

Some adolescents do not engage in the process of role experimentation leading to eventual identity formation. These adolescents fall into two groups. The first group makes early, firm commitments to a particular occupation, set of values, and lifestyle without prior experimentation, and moves toward achievement of these goals without any apparent confusion, doubt, or discomfort. The content of these choices

often conforms to the wishes and values of parents or other authority figures. There is a rigid, constricted, dogmatic quality about this type of person, and he or she reports relatively little change during adolescence. Erikson calls this pattern identity foreclosure. The second group is incapable of making even the tentative and temporary commitments that make experimentation possible because they experience themselves as so vaguely defined. All roads seem equally possible and impossible. They are easily influenced by others and may flit from one outlook to another, or become apathetic. Erikson calls this pattern identity diffusion.

As opposed to the rather extensive body of theoretical work on the topic of adolescent identity formation, empirical research in this area has a relatively short history and is limited primarily to construct validation. The most ambitious program of such research thus far has been carried out by Marcia and his colleagues.

Marcia (1964) devised a semi-structured interview designed to reveal the process by which an individual arrived at (or is arriving at) his or her occupation choice, religious and political beliefs, and sexual values. On the basis of their response to this interview, Marcia and his colleagues assign their college-age subjects to one of four 'identity statuses' derived from Erikson's theoretical writings. Two of these statuses, identity foreclosure and identity diffusion, have already been described. The other two statuses are called identity achievement and moratorium. Moratorium subjects are engaging in considerable experimentation with life alternatives. Identity achievement subjects have already gone through such a period of experimentation and are ready to commit themselves to certain values and goals.

Marcia and his co-workers are engaged in establishing the construct validity of the identity statuses, and have demonstrated that they constitute a meaningful way to group late adolescents of both sexes. A major finding is that foreclosure subjects of both sexes are higher in their endorsement of authoritarian values than those in any of the other statuses, and that either moratorium or identity achievement subjects are the least authoritarian (Marcia, 1966; Marcia and Friedman, 1970; Schenkel and Marcia, 1972). It is perhaps this authoritarianism that provides foreclosure subjects with a certain kind of strength and stability. On an Asch type test of conformity both they and the identity achievement subjects conform less than the moratorium and diffusion subjects, and feel less anxiety about their non-conformity (Todor and Marcia, 1973). Also, foreclosure subjects of both sexes score lower than any of the other statuses on a test of anxiety and general maladjustment; in the male sample, moratorium subjects score highest, while in the female sample, diffusion subjects tend to score highest with moratorium subjects next to highest (Marcia, 1967; Marcia and Friedman, 1970; Schenkel and Marcia, 1972).

However, there is evidence that the strength and stability of the foreclosure subjects breaks down under certain conditions and may be somewhat superficial. Foreclosure subjects perform worse than any of the other statuses on a stressful concept attainment task. They show greater disparity between level of aspiration and achievement level than any other group, and they maintain high goals in spite of failure. In contrast, identity achievement subjects perform better than any of the other statuses on this task, persevering longer on problems and maintaining a realistic level of aspiration. Moratorium subjects are the

most variable on this task (Marcia, 1966). Foreclosure subjects (and diffusion subjects) are also more vulnerable to self-esteem manipulation of either a positive or negative nature than are identity achievement or moratorium subjects. Diffusion subjects are more responsive to disguised attempts to manipulate their self-esteem, while foreclosure subjects are more responsive to undisguised attempts to do so (Marcia, 1967).

In the purely intellectual area (I.Q., cognitive efficiency, and cognitive style), no clear-cut differences among identity statuses were found (Marcia and Friedman, 1970; Bob, 1968).

Adolescent Identity Formation and Object Relations,  
Especially Separation-Individuation

A few studies involving the relationship between an adolescent's pattern of dealing with identity issues and some aspect of his or her object relations have been done.

Orlofsky, Marcia and Lesser (1973) found that, of the four identity statuses, identity achievement subjects show the greatest capacity for engaging in intimate personal relationships. Foreclosure and diffusion subjects show stereotyped and superficial interpersonal relationships. Diffusion subjects are the most isolated, and moratorium subjects are the most variable.

A longitudinal study of the identity formation of black and white lower class high school males was done by Hauser (1971). He asked each subject to do eight Q-sorts each year (self image, how mother would want you to be, how father would want you to be, self at start of junior high, self in ten years, self if all of your dreams came true, self as friends see you, self as other people see you). The yearly average intercorrelation between these self images was considered to be a measure of self-concept integration. White subjects were more likely to show a pattern of increasing integration than were black subjects, for whom the level of integration was more likely to remain constant (identity foreclosure). One aspect of this lack of change for the black subjects was their unchanging view of how both parents wanted them to be, especially their fathers. In contrast, the white subjects' views of how their parents wanted them to be did change over the four years.

Webster, Heist and Williams (1960) compared students who change a great deal during college with those who don't. They found that the former are more independent than the latter and show more understanding and objectivity in describing their parents. The parents of the changers emerge as real people with positive and negative features, while the non-changers usually describe their parents in an undifferentiated, positive way.

An investigation of the relationship between degree of identity achievement and maternal identification in college women was made by Dignan (1965). She constructed an ego identity scale which focuses on the experience of the subject in seven areas: sense of self, uniqueness, self-acceptance, role expectations, stability, goal directedness, and interpersonal relations. She found that there was a positive correlation between subjects' scores on her scale and degree of assumed similarity to their mothers. For freshman subjects, there was also a positive correlation between actual mother-daughter similarity and degree of identity achievement experienced by the subject. For sophomore subjects, the relationship between actual mother-daughter similarity and degree of experienced identity achievement was curvilinear: moderately identified subjects had the highest identity scores while subjects at the two extremes of identification had lower identity scores.

The relationship between an adolescent's object relations and his or her pattern of identity formation is worth further study. The vicissitudes of the adolescent's object relations may determine the fate of his or her identity struggle. This is essentially the position of Blos (1962), (1967), and Jacobson (1964), who assert that strengthening of the ego and

modification and increasing integration of the superego which underlie the achievement of a stable identity in late adolescence are processes which depend on and result from particular changes in the adolescent's object relations. These changes include a loosening and eventual relinquishment of the dependent tie to the parents, and a final relinquishment of oedipal wishes and fantasies.

Jacobson (1964) stresses the importance of age-appropriate loosening of the symbiotic bond for the development of a firm sense of identity. Her writings suggest that there are two periods in the life cycle where adequate separation is of particular importance: the period roughly corresponding to the second and third years of life which Mahler (1968) calls the separation-individuation period, and adolescence, which Blos (1967) calls the second separation-individuation period. During the first separation-individuation period, the child, due to rapid maturation begins to move away from the mother physically. This results in the child's realization that he or she is separate from mother, can lose mother, etc., which causes the child considerable anxiety. Jacobson points out that even in the normal course of events, the urge to separate co-exists in children with strong wishes to return to a symbiotic mode of relating with the mother. If the mother has a need to prevent the child from separating, chances are that the child will be unable to give up his or her urges for and fantasies of fusion with the mother, and will instead remain fixated at a symbiotic-narcissistic level of object relations where objects are seen as part of the self and as existing only to gratify its needs.

The implications of this type of fixation for identity formation are far-reaching. Jacobson believes that it is age-appropriate ego and super-

ego development that provide a sense of identity at every age. She sees symbiotic fixation as resulting in slow ego development and inadequate superego development for several reasons. First, the child continues to borrow the mother's ego to the same extent that he or she did during infancy so that the child's own ego functions are not given an opportunity to develop. Second, the child is unable to separate realistic self-images from wishful ones, because his or her illusions of infantile omnipotence have remained unchallenged. This distinction as well as the growing distinction between self and object images is what makes selective identifications possible, and is in part what motivates the child to establish them. (Selective identifications differ from the earlier occurring primitive identifications in that they aim for partial, realistic likeness with the object while primitive identifications aim for incorporation of or fusion with the object.) These selective identifications underlie adequate ego and superego development in childhood. The major motives for establishing selective identifications are oedipal. The child identifies mainly with admired and envied rivals, rather than with the primary love object. The whole experience of dealing with rivals results in increasing differentiation and articulation of the self and object images. All of these processes strengthen the child's sense of identity. The child may not have these experiences if he or she does not experience the mother as shared to a sufficient degree with anyone else.

Blos (1967) points out that adolescence, the second separation-individuation period, bears many similarities to the first. As is true in the first separation-individuation period, a forward surge in maturation results in the need for changes in psychic structures. Also, the

loosening of dependent ties to the family produces depression and anxiety in the adolescent, which corresponds to the separation anxiety of the toddler described above. Finally, this too is a period when parental interference with separation results in serious problems for the offspring, namely, a slowing down of ego and superego development which in turn causes identity problems. However, most psychoanalytic theorists agree that the single most important determinant of psychopathology in adolescence is the degree of secondary autonomy of ego and superego functions achieved in childhood, because this determines the ability of the adolescent to withstand the regressions and upheavals that characterize adolescent development, and even to resist some degree of parental interference with adolescent separation. A major determinant of the degree of ego and superego autonomy achieved in childhood is successful passage through the first separation-individuation period.

Many authors have discussed the types of parental behavior which encourage or discourage separation-individuation. Jacobson writes:

"Even in the earliest symbiotic stage of the mother-infant relationship, the best emotional climate is indeed one in which the mother prepares the process of the child's individuation by a kind of maternal love that is aware of the differences between her own and the child's needs and roles, and tries to gratify both." (1964, p. 57)

In contrast are parental attitudes which involve a blurring or distortion of the child's separateness and individuality. The themes of parental narcissism and intrusiveness in particular come up again and again in the clinical and theoretical literature on this subject. Jacobson (1964) describes three such patterns: 1) when parents sacrifice their own needs to those of the child to the point of self-extinction- these are parents who live through the child; 2) when parents overprotect or dominate the child, keeping him or her passive and dependent, and forcing him or her

to borrow their ego which prevents the development of the child's own ego; 3) when parents treat the child as an extension of themselves, ignoring his or her individual needs, and sacrificing them to their own narcissistic requirements.

Erikson (1968) describes the mothers of male adolescents who develop identity diffusion as being very invested in status and facade, and as fearful, intrusive, and possessive with their children. They want their children to identify with them and not with their fathers because of their own needs for approval and recognition. Giovacchini (1971) describes two male adolescent patients with identity pathology as having dangerous and engulfing maternal introjects. He describes the mothers of both of these patients as having been overstimulating. Borowitz (1971) describes two 12 year old male patients who had highly sexualized relationships with their mothers. He describes the mothers as viewing their children as narcissistic extensions, and as being unable to tolerate their children's separation because of needs to project their self-hatred on to their children. Their behavior towards their sons alternated between clinging and rejection. He feels that the original trauma in both cases was a failure on the part of the mother to recognize and respond appropriately to the child's real individuality, thus fostering a craving for recognition and for a close, special relationship with the mother that drove the child to sacrifice his real identity in order to fit in with his mother's needs.

Stierlin (1971, 1974) discusses several parent-child interaction patterns that discourage adolescent separation. He points out that parents of adolescents are in the midst of their own developmental crisis

(getting older, eventual retirement, etc.), and may discourage their offspring from separating in order to avoid dealing with their own crisis.

In what Stierlin calls the binding mode of parent-child interaction, parents try to literally tie their children to them in one of three ways:

Affective Binding - Gross overgratification of regressive wishes by the parents results in the child becoming a spoiled monster whom no one except his parents will tolerate, and whose expectations from others are grossly inappropriate. As a result he remains in the family orbit where the relationships are often sadomasochistic.

Cognitive Binding - This involves parental interference with the child's ability to perceive and articulate his or her own feelings, needs, motives, and goals, especially when they differ from those that the parents want him or her to have, see him or her as having, or have themselves. It often begins very early in the child's life when he or she is too dependent to be able to resist parental pressure, and will deny his or her own perceptions rather than risk parental rejection or disapproval. Parental perceptions of the child as weak, sick or incompetent, especially if begun very early, are internalized and make it very difficult for the adolescent to trust himself or herself enough to stop depending on parental judgment.

Superego Binding - In this pattern, the parents convey to the adolescent that they cannot survive without him or her. These adolescents often have the compulsion to rescue their parents, play the role of family therapist, etc. Separation is seen as tantamount to murder.

In what Stierlin calls the delegating mode of parent-child interaction, parents unconsciously put pressure on their adolescent offspring to go out into the world and accomplish various 'missions' which are designed to fulfill poorly integrated, conflict-laden needs of the parent, or compensate for gaps in the parent's psychic structures. Common subtypes of the delegating mode include: 1) covert parental pressure on the adolescent to express sexual, rebellious, or aggressive impulses that the parent has but would find too threatening to experience consciously; 2) covert pressure on the adolescent to compensate for the parent's narcissistic injuries by fulfilling aspirations which the parent could not fulfill, outdoing people with whom the parent competed unsuccessfully, etc.; 3) covert pressure on the adolescent to act out and get punished for fantasies about which the parent feels guilty; and, 4) covert pressure on the adolescent to be the embodiment of the parent's 'bad self'.

One aim of the present study is to assess the degree to which the separation-impeding types of parent-child interactions described above exist in the relationships of college-age women with their mothers, and to investigate the hypothesis that these types of relationships are more characteristic of subjects with the identity diffusion and identity foreclosure patterns than they are of subjects with the identity achievement and moratorium patterns. It is important to mention that, in addition to the patterns of parent-child interaction described above, parental attitudes which encourage premature parent-child separation are also thought to result in identity problems (Bowlby, 1973; Jacobson, 1964; Stierlin, 1974). However, this type of pattern is beyond the scope of the

present study and will not be investigated except in so far as it too is characterized by a failure on the part of the parent to respond to the child's individuality, and often exists in alternation with the pattern of using the child as a narcissistic extension.

#### Research in the Area of Separation-Individuation

Research on the first separation-individuation period has, for the most part, been observational in nature. Through observation of interactions of normal children between the ages of 6 and 36 months of age with their mothers, the existence of four sequential phases that together compose this period has been established (Mahler, 1965; Mahler, 1968; Mahler, 1970; Mahler and La Perriere, 1965; Mahler, Pine, and Bergmann, 1975).

From approximately 6 months to 10 months, the infant is in what Mahler calls the differentiation phase. This phase is characterized by an increase in infant-initiated activity. The infant is beginning to creep, climb, stand up, and look beyond his or her immediate environment. These emerging functions are expressed in close proximity to the mother, and the infant seems chiefly interested in his or her own bodily movements, and in making physical contact with the mother. This is the start of the infant's gradual disengagement from the symbiosis with the mother, and Mahler reports the existence of a group of mothers with symbiotic needs who cannot tolerate this gradual disengagement. They discourage the infant's groping for independence, and when he or she becomes a toddler, they push him or her into autonomy instead of allowing a gradual separation.

The next phase, called the practicing phase, occurs from approximately 10 to 15 months and is characterized by great narcissistic investment on the part of the child in his or her own activities and body, and in the objects of his or her expanding investigation of reality. The child is able to tolerate frustrations, such as falls, very well, and often seems oblivious to the presence of the mother, but needs periodic physical contact with her for what Mahler calls 'emotional refueling'. Development is slowed up when the mother's attention is not readily available and the child has to use up an undue amount of energy in order to get it.

The third phase, called the rapprochement phase, occurs from approximately 14 to 22 months. With the mastery of walking, the child's awareness of his or her psychological separateness from mother increases resulting in increased anxiety and lessened frustration tolerance when compared with the practicing phase. The child now evidences a constant concern over the mother's whereabouts and needs to share all of his or her new skills with her. During this phase it is the mother's ability to tolerate these new developments, and her willingness to enthusiastically share in the child's increasing individuation that enables optimal development. Danger signals include severe separation anxiety and repetitive darting away from mother with the aim of provoking her pursuit.

The fourth phase, (third year of life), is characterized by tremendous progress in individuation. Complex cognitive functions including language and fantasy develop. The actual continued presence of the mother is no longer so important to the child.

During these stages, normal mother-child interactions were often

characterized by a certain degree of temperamental disparity and mutual misreading of cues. However, interactions between psychotic children and their mothers are characterized by a far greater amount of mismatching than are normal interactions. Mahler and her colleagues were impressed by the average child's ability actively to seek and obtain what he or she needs from the mother during these stages even when there were initial deficiencies in maternal responses.

Separation processes during adolescence have been less thoroughly studied than the separation-individuation period in early childhood.

Stierlin (1971) studied the way in which parental perceptions of their adolescent children influenced the child's ability to separate. Families of adolescents who were in family therapy were investigated. Family sessions, individual interviews with family members, family Rorschachs, and family art evaluations were used to assess the way each member perceived the other members with particular focus on parental perceptions and expectations of their adolescent children. Three areas of parental perception seem to be most influential in determining the adolescent's capacity to separate: 1) whether or not the adolescent is seen as potentially able to be autonomous; 2) whether or not the adolescent is seen as potentially able to form relationships outside of the family; and, 3) whether the adolescent's separation is seen as good and normal, or bad and destructive. Perceptions of the adolescent as 'sick' are more detrimental to separation than perceptions of the adolescent as 'bad'. Also, if one of the two parents believes the adolescent can separate, the prognosis for separation is better than if both parents believe he or she cannot separate.

Murphy, Silber, Coelho, Hamburg, and Greenberg (1963) studied the development of autonomy in the freshman year of college and its relationship to various patterns of parent-child interaction. Subjects were grouped into high autonomy and low autonomy groups, and the high autonomy subjects were further subdivided into those who were able to maintain a close relationship with their parents and those who were not. The parents of high-autonomy high-related subjects are very well-defined people; are successful, (many of the mothers as well as the fathers were professionals); are not child-centered; are not afraid to clearly communicate values and preferences to their children; are supportive of their children's development of autonomy; are able to tolerate a wide variety of avenues of experimentation on the part of their children as long as it falls within the realm of family values; are confident of their children's ability to handle situations and are unlikely to offer unsolicited help; are respectful of their children's privacy; and, are in favor of their children's separation because they see it as necessary for growth. The parents of low-autonomy subjects are unclear about their values and are afraid of expressing their preferences to their children. They are unclear about the boundaries between themselves and their children. In that 1) they often want their children to fulfill their frustrated aspirations, and 2) they do not clearly perceive their children's abilities and interests. They lack confidence in their children's ability to achieve autonomy. Communication between family members is vague with each member failing to articulate his or her needs and feelings. The parents of high-autonomy low-related subjects provide many of the conditions for the development of autonomy in that they see their children as

separate, identify many of their assets, and provide opportunities for them to develop abilities and interests. However, the roles assigned to the subject in the family are inflexible, and when subjects become more independent and change their values, these parents cannot accept it.

Douvan and Adelson (1966) found that autonomy and self-direction are characteristic of those adolescents whose parents encourage gradual detachment from the family. The question of whether the adolescent spends most of his or her spare time with peers or with the family is very successful in differentiating autonomous from non-autonomous subjects.

These studies support the idea that some types of parental behavior are conducive to the process of separation-individuation, and others are not.

#### Adolescent Identity Formation and Identification

Most developmental theorists accord childhood identifications a central place in psychosocial development. As was explained earlier, Jacobson (1964) believes that much of early ego and superego development occurs through the process of identification, and that the existence of selective identifications, especially with the same-sex parent during the oedipal period, are evidence that some renunciation of symbiotic and oedipal wishes have occurred. It would therefore be expected that in childhood, a high level of identification with the same-sex parent, (i.e., a strong push to engage in behaviors and adopt attitudes that are similar to those of the same-sex parent), is a sign of healthy development. In fact, research in this area has shown that high identification in children is related to warm, positive relationships with parents (Mussen and Distler, 1959; Mussen and Parker, 1965).

In adolescence, however, leading theorists (Erikson, 1968; Blos, 1962; and Jacobson, 1964), suggest that a direct relationship between degree of similarity to parents and optimal psychosocial development no longer holds. These authors agree that if identification in childhood has been weak, the adolescent will be likely to experience extreme difficulty in coping with the many changes that occur in adolescence because he or she will have nothing around which to organize an adult identity. However, they also agree that healthy adolescent development involves modification of childhood identifications, and that the adolescent who continues to maintain essentially his or her parents' characteristics and attitudes is not developing optimally.

Research in the area of adolescent-parent identification has shown that low identification with parents is related to maladjustment. Deitz (1969) found that delinquent males were less identified with their parents than non-delinquent males. Klein and Gould (1969) found that low-alienated college women identified to a greater extent with their mothers than with their fathers, whereas alienated women identified with neither parent. Lazowick (1955) found that low-anxiety college women are more similar to their mothers on the semantic differential than are high-anxiety college women, who are even less similar to their mothers than low-anxiety college men are to their mothers

Dignan's (1965) study on the relationship between ego identity and maternal identification in female college freshman and sophomores, which was described earlier, constitutes the only attempt thus far to investigate empirically the relationship between identity achievement and identification in late adolescence. For both freshman and sophomore subjects, there is a positive correlation between score on Dignan's ego identity

scale and degree of mother-daughter similarity assumed by the daughter. For freshman subjects, the same positive correlation is found between actual mother-daughter similarity and ego identity score. For sophomore subjects, moderately similar subjects have the highest identity scores, while subjects at the two extremes of similarity show lower identity scores. From these results, Dignan concludes that maternal identification shows a positive relationship to female identity achievement in late adolescence.

Dignan's method of assessing level of identity achievement, (an ego identity scale), has some major drawbacks especially when used with adolescent and late adolescent subjects. The scale is actually a measure of the subject's degree of certainty of his or her identity, and this should fluctuate during the course of normal adolescent development rather than remain high. An adolescent who dares to proceed in a new direction may, temporarily, be uncertain about himself or herself and thus achieve a lower score on such a scale than would an adolescent who, by rigidly sticking with the familiar, succeeds in maintaining a limited, inflexible, but nevertheless relatively clear self image. But, the risk taker would be handling the task of identity formation in a healthier way than the rigid adolescent. In other words, the scale might not be able to differentiate between identity achievement and identity foreclosure patterns, and might rate foreclosure subjects higher than moratorium subjects. Thompson (1963), found that prospective nuns whose values changed as a result of a training program evidenced an initial drop in score on Dignan's ego identity scale, and subsequently, an increase over the score they achieved before the training program began. This study is

supportive of the idea that a subject's score on an ego identity scale like Dignan's is not necessarily reflective of the true status of his or her identity formation, but may instead unduly reflect the vicissitudes of that very process.

The significance of the various stages in the course of a particular individual's identity formation cannot be fully understood when viewed in isolation, which is what happens when a scale is administered to the individual at one point in time, but can better be understood when viewed in their developmental context. For this reason, this dissertation will employ Marcia's (1964) interview method for assessing ego identity status rather than an ego identity scale. This interview requires the subject to report on the process by which he or she has arrived at various beliefs, and the interviewer utilizes this information to decide which of the four identity statuses best characterizes a particular subject's pattern of identity formation.

It is also the author's opinion that the relationship between degree of identity achievement and degree of mother-daughter similarity or identification is more complicated than Dignan's interpretation of her results would indicate. Dignan has shown that a subjective sense of certainty about one's identity is positively correlated with assumed and actual mother-daughter similarity in freshman women, and with assumed mother-daughter similarity in sophomore women. However, it does not necessarily follow that mother-daughter similarity would be positively correlated with a more developmentally oriented measure of identity achievement. As was said, the theoretical literature would not predict a direct relationship between degree of parental identification and identity achievement in late adolescence. It would seem that parental

identifications must be modified in some way for optimal identity formation to occur. In fact, it seems possible that the degree of actual or admitted similarity to the parents might change during the course of identity formation, depending on the vicissitudes of this process and of the process of separation from parents. This is one possible interpretation of Dignan's finding that sophomores who scored highest on the ego-identity scale showed lower actual mother-daughter similarity than freshmen who scored highest on the scale.

The variable of parental identification could act as a mediator in the processes of adolescent separation and identity formation. The late adolescent woman, may, to some extent, need to repudiate childhood identifications with her mother in order to loosen the dependent tie to her mother. When the young woman is more secure in her independence from her mother, some of these old identifications are probably re-integrated into the young woman's personality because they are no longer threatening to her independence. In addition, Jacobson (1964) believes that new identifications with parents during adolescence are important in the process of adolescent separation-individuation. These identifications involve new perceptions of the parents as sexual adults who tolerate sexuality and independence in their late adolescent offspring. Thus, changes in the extent and quality of identification probably play an important role in furthering the process of separation-individuation in late adolescence.

Similarly, in the process of identity formation, the period of exploration of alternatives is considered by Erikson (1968) to be characterized by a disruption of childhood identification patterns,

followed by a new integration of these patterns, of the new identifications added during adolescence, and of the other elements that form one's identity. It is possible that the adolescent going through the exploratory (moratorium) period would show a drop in the amount of parental identification, and then an increase when his or her identity was consolidated.

It is the author's feeling that we do not know very much about the fate of parental identifications during adolescence, or about their relationship to the processes of identity formation and separation-individuation. One aim of this dissertation is to add to that knowledge.

#### Special Issues in Female Adolescent Identity Formation

In the mid 1950's, Douvan and Adelson (1966) interviewed a vast number of subjects of both sexes, between the ages of 11 and 18. They found that, while the development of an independent value system and a breaking away from parental values were important for the boys, this was not so for most of the girls. Girls were most invested in their interpersonal relationships and the quality of these alone predicted their ego strength. For boys, on the other hand, the development of internal standards and independence were related to ego strength. The girls in this sample were characterized by smooth relationships with their parents, while the boys generally went through a rebellious period.

These findings support theoretical notions that identity achievement in women primarily involves the establishment of oneself as a sexually attractive woman, and the development of the ability to, on the basis of experience, choose a husband (Erikson, 1968).

However, more recent studies lead to different conclusions about the modal patterns of female identity formation. Constantinople (1969) studied 952 college students in order to delineate normative patterns of development during the college years for both sexes. The questionnaire that she used was developed by Wessman and Ricks in 1966, and consisted of items reflecting either successful or unsuccessful resolution of Erikson's first six developmental crises (trust, autonomy, initiative, industry, identity, and intimacy). In both cross sectional and longitudinal studies, she found consistent increases in the successful resolution of the identity crisis for both males and females from freshman to senior year. This suggests that the females in this study were involved in establishing a set of values, and in defining themselves apart from their relationships. However, Constantinople found that the sexes differed with regard to the resolution of identity diffusion. The males showed a steady decrease in diffusion responses over the four years, but the same clear pattern did not exist for the females, many of whom actually showed an increase in identity diffusion during the four years. These findings were interpreted as reflective of increasing conflict for the women between traditional and occupational roles, as a result of going to college, which is oriented toward preparation for an occupation.

The work of Marcia and Friedman (1970) and Schenkel and Marcia (1972) on identity status in college women also suggests that female identity formation patterns are not as different from male identity formation patterns as the Douvan and Adelson study would suggest, but that some important differences do exist. Female subjects did go through a struggle

for an independent identity, but the most important issue around which this struggle occurred was that of sexual values. For female subjects, working out a set of values in this area was more likely to result in a subjective sense of identity achievement, and was a better predictor of high functioning on other measures than was the case for working out an occupational goal. In contrast, a study of disturbed and normal male adolescents done by Schacter (1968) found that occupational choice was more strongly associated with identity crisis resolution for his subjects than was establishment of peer-group role, sex role, or ideology.

The results of a study by Gump (1972) are also at odds with the Douvan and Adelson findings. Gump found that female college seniors with the highest ego strength scores were pursuing both family and career objectives. Traditional and career oriented subjects did not differ in their success in establishing relationships with men. Ego strength seemed to be negatively related to the adoption of the traditional feminine role.

In a study by Marcia and Friedman (1970) female identity achievement subjects were found to have fairly high anxiety levels and fairly low self-esteem, which was not the case for male identity achievement subjects in previous studies. However, in a study done by Schenkel and Marcia (1972), female identity achievement subjects were found to resemble male identity achievement subjects on these two measures. The authors interpreted this change as resulting from the increasing social support for women working out an independent identity provided by the woman's movement.

The author feels that the studies cited above lend themselves to the following interpretations: First, it seems that more women are now engaging in a struggle to achieve an independent identity in adolescence than

was the case fifteen or twenty years ago. In fact, this pattern, rather than the pattern of not doing so, seems to be normative, at least for those late adolescent women who are in college. Second, the issues of central concern to women in their efforts to establish their identities are no longer exclusively the traditionally feminine ones, although these are still quite important. Third, the social climate is an important determinant of whether the struggle for an independent identity occurs, of the ease or difficulty with which it occurs, and of the issues that are considered central in this struggle.

This dissertation will focus on both traditionally feminine issues (attitudes toward permarital sex, style of dress, and child-rearing practices), and traditionally masculine or sexually neutral issues (occupational choice, religious beliefs, and political beliefs) in exploring the process of identity formation in college women. The author anticipates a fair amount of consistency in pattern of identity formation across these two groups of issues.

### Hypotheses

Hypothesis #1: The mother-daughter relationships of late-adolescent women who are handling the task of identity formation maladaptively (i.e., those subjects with identity foreclosure or identity diffusion patterns), are characterized by more separation-impeding patterns of interaction than are the mother-daughter relationships of late-adolescent women who are handling the task of identity-formation more successfully (i.e., those subjects with identity achievement and moratorium patterns).

The types of parent-child interactions which, on the basis of theory and research in the area of separation-individuation, are thought to impede separation, were described earlier in this chapter.

Hypothesis #2: Mothers of subjects with identity foreclosure and identity diffusion patterns are less accurate in their perceptions of their daughters' feelings and attitudes than are the mothers of subjects with identity achievement and moratorium patterns.

The rationale for this hypothesis is two-fold. First, it would seem that inaccurate perception of another person would be a necessary result of inadequate separation from that person, because the existence of blurred boundaries between oneself and another person results in a tendency to project one's own feelings and attitudes on to that person. Furthermore, the parent who needs to prevent the child's separation would probably have a tendency to misperceive or deny the existence of the child's wishes for autonomy, and of any other wishes or behaviors of the child which stand in opposition to what the parent needs from the child. To sum up, inaccurate perception of the daughter by the mother should be a consequence of a failure in separation between mother and daughter. If such a failure is characteristic of those daughters showing maladaptive identity formation (hypothesis #1), then inaccurate perception of the daughter by the mother should also characterize them.

The second rationale for hypothesis #2, is that, apart from its connection with separation problems, a history of inaccurate perception of the child by the parents might, by itself, have the effect of undermining the process of identity formation. Accurate perception of the child on the part of the parents results in accurate feedback from the parents to the child about the child's personality; conversely, inaccurate perception results in inaccurate feedback. It seems to the author that accurate feedback from parents supports and accelerates the process of

identity formation in the child by aiding her in her efforts to form a self-image that is increasingly accurate, complex, and separated from object images. Inaccurate feedback from parents would undermine the child's identity formation because it would increase her confusion regarding her self-image.

#### Identity and Identification

The third relationship that will be explored in this study is the relationship between extent of mother-daughter identification and identity status. The aim of this exploration will be to see if significant differences in extent of mother-daughter identification exist among the four identity statuses. Because of the ambiguity of the theoretical and empirical literature regarding the fate of parental identifications during adolescence, no predictions as to the direction of possible differences will be made.

## CHAPTER TWO

### METHODOLOGY

#### Measuring Instruments

Three principal measures were used in this study:

1. Marcia's Identity Status Interview, to which the author has added two content areas;
2. The Interpersonal Perception Method (Laing, Phillipson, and Lee, 1966), and;
3. The Interpersonal Adjective Checklist (La Forge and Suczek, 1955).

All three of these measures were administered to the late adolescent women who served as subjects in the order presented above. Only the second and third measures were administered to their mothers, and this was done by mail. In addition, a personal data sheet and a brief peer relations scale developed by Roff, Sells, and Golden (1972) were administered to the daughters but not to their mothers. Copies of all of the measures appear in Appendix A.

#### Subjects

Forty-eight young women ranging in age from 19 to 22, and their mothers served as subjects. Subjects were recruited through poster advertising placed in various locations on the campuses of Brooklyn College and New York University. The poster stated that subjects had to be women in their junior or senior year of college, briefly described the procedure and the time commitment required, and promised payment of seven dollars.

In a preliminary phone contact, each prospective subject was told that this was a study about her goals and beliefs, and about her relation-

ship with her parents. She was also informed that there were three requirements for being in the study: 1) she must be between 19 and 23 years of age; 2) there must not have been any long separations from her mother during her childhood or early adolescence; and 3) her mother must be willing to participate in the study by answering two questionnaires by mail, for which her mother would be paid three dollars. A few prospective subjects were screened out for not meeting one of the first two requirements. In no case did a subject refuse to participate because of the third requirement, however, nine of the 60 young women originally interviewed could not be used as subjects because their mothers, in spite of having agreed to participate, failed to return their questionnaires.<sup>1</sup>

After completing the identity status interview, and before starting the IPM (Interpersonal Perception Method), each daughter in the study was encouraged not to worry about making a good impression in answering the mother-daughter questionnaire, but instead to describe the way things really were, at this point between her and her mother. She was also reassured that all mother-daughter relationships have their problems. After completing all of the measures, the daughter was given an opportunity to express her reactions, and was instructed to in no way consult with her mother when her mother filled out either of the two questionnaires. She was told that no discussion of their responses should take place until

<sup>1</sup>Three additional mother-daughter pairs could not be used in the data analysis because the tape recordings of the interview were inaudible.

the mother's questionnaires were mailed back to the author. The importance of this for the validity of the study was stressed. The daughter was then paid seven dollars.

A manila envelope, addressed to the author with postage paid, and containing the IPM and the Interpersonal Checklist, was either mailed to the mother, or brought to her by her daughter. The same instructions described in the previous paragraph were also included in written form. (A copy appears in Appendix A). The author's phone number was provided in case the mothers had questions about any aspect of the study. Upon receipt of the mother's data, she was sent a check for three dollars.

The sample was predominately middle class and white. Approximately three fifths of the families were Jewish, one fifth were Catholic, and one fifth were Protestant. Twenty-four of the young women attended Brooklyn College. The rest were enrolled in New York University's summer session. They attended colleges all over the east coast, but the majority attended New York University. The majority of the Brooklyn College subjects lived with their parents, and the majority of the subjects tested at New York University lived away from their parents. Only one of the young women was married, and three others were living with boyfriends.

Over half of the daughters were majoring in the social sciences with 19 of them majoring in psychology. Eight were majoring in fields related to fine arts, and four more were majoring in either film, music, or journalism. Four were majoring in education, four in english, and one each in history and chemistry. One was undecided.

## Measurement of the Variables

### Assessment of Pattern of Identity Formation

For reasons explained in Chapter One, Marcia's (1964) developmentally oriented interview method was used to determine the identity status of the daughters. The interview is semi-structured. Subjects are questioned about their beliefs, values, and choices in each of the following areas: occupation, religion, politics, and premarital sex. (This last area is only used by Marcia when the subjects are women.) The author has added two more areas to the interview for women: style of dress and child rearing. These traditionally feminine areas were added to the interview in order to provide a more complete picture of the identity crisis in late adolescent women.

In each of the areas that make up the interview, the subject is questioned in detail about where she stands at present, how that stance developed, how her parents feel about the issue and about her stance, and how strong her commitment is to her stance, i.e., does she act on her beliefs and is she willing to change her choice? On the basis of her answers, each subject is assigned to an identity status (either identity achievement, moratorium, foreclosure, or diffusion), for each interview area. (Each interview is tape recorded and all ratings are made from the recordings.) Then the rater must decide which of the four identity statuses would fit best as an overall description of the subject. Clinical judgment is exercised here in that the final rating does not have to match the rating that appears most frequently in the individual areas, although it usually does (Marcia, 1964).

As is described in Marcia's scoring manual (1964), a subject is rated as identity achievement if she has passed through a decision-making period

and appears committed to her choices. This type of subject comes across as strong and resilient. She seems like she would not be overwhelmed in a new environment, or by unexpected responsibilities. She also seems to be forming some solid interpersonal commitments. A subject is rated as moratorium if she is presently in a crisis period, and is trying to make up her mind among various alternatives. Commitments are likely to be vague and general. There is a sense of active struggle. A subject is rated foreclosure if she had not passed through any substantial period of decision-making, but is nevertheless committed to her choices. These choices are likely to coincide with those of parents or parent surrogates, and they are accepted unquestioningly by the subject. Because of her commitment and apparent self assurance, the foreclosure subject appears similar to the identity achievement subject except that she is usually more rigid and does not seem like she would function well in unfamiliar or stressful situations. A subject is rated identity diffusion if there is little commitment to choices. She may or may not have passed through a crisis. Some identity diffusion subjects seem committed to a lack of commitment. They seek to avoid entangling alliances. No area of potential gratification is given up.

The author has altered Marcia's identity status criteria in one way: Marcia classifies all apathetic, undefined subjects as identity diffusion, even if their parents are like this and they were brought up to be this way. The author believes that, at least when the subjects are women, this is a mistake. Remaining undefined and going along with the values of important men in her life is a traditional female pattern and may be more indicative of a need to fit into a well-defined role that is approved of

by authorities (foreclosure pattern) than of an inability to resolve the identity crisis in any way (diffusion pattern). In order to decide between these two statuses in such a case, the rater must decide whether the lack of values represents a continuation of parental values (foreclosure) or is a departure from them (diffusion), and whether it is accompanied by calmness and rigidity (foreclosure), or by anxiety, depression, and confusion (diffusion).

In addition to these general criteria for classification, the scoring manual contains specific criteria and examples for each status in the first three areas. Criteria for each status in the area of premarital sex appear in two articles (Marcia and Friedman, 1970; Schenkel and Marcia, 1972). The author formulated criteria for each status in the two areas that she added to the interview. A copy of these can be found in Appendix A.

Each subject is given an overall identity status rating according to the procedures described above, by two raters. Interjudge reliability in assigning subjects this overall rating has averaged between 65 and 75 percent (Marcia, 1966, 1967; Bob, 1968; Podd, Marcia, and Rubin, 1970). Marcia and his co-workers consider this degree of agreement satisfactory given the complexity of the variable. In the present study, interjudge reliability was 68 percent. Disagreements were able to be resolved through discussion in all cases. The author served as one of the raters. For 41 of the 48 subjects, the other rater was a fifth year graduate student in clinical psychology. For the other seven subjects, a third year graduate student in clinical psychology served as the second rater. Both of these assistants had no knowledge of any aspect of the study other than the identity status interviews. They were each given several hours

of training by the author on the rating procedure.

Twenty-five of the 48 interviews were conducted by the author. The remaining 23 interviews were conducted by a second year graduate student in clinical psychology who received several hours of training from the author on the interview procedure.

Extensive work on the construct validity of the identity statuses has been done by Marcia and his colleagues. It is described in Chapter One. For the most part, it has supported the validity of the statuses.

#### Assessment of the Extent to which Separation-Impeding Interaction Patterns Exist in the Mother-Daughter Relationship

Each mother-daughter pair was questioned separately about their relationship by means of a questionnaire called the Interpersonal Perception Method (IPM). This enabled the mothers to be questioned by mail.

The IPM, which is the subject of a book by Laing, Phillipson, and Lee, (1966), has as its focus the study of any dyad. The format is true-false.<sup>1</sup> Whether or not each of a wide array of attitudes and behaviors characterizes either member of the dyad, or their relationship, is assessed by each member. For each attitude or behavior, the member is asked in the following order:

1. whether this is the other member's attitude or behavior towards her,
2. whether this is her attitude or behavior towards the other member,
3. whether this is the other member's attitude or behavior towards

herself, and

<sup>1</sup>Actually, the subject is presented with four alternative answers to each statement: very true, slightly true, slightly untrue, and very untrue. However, the authors suggest that only the true vs. untrue distinction be used in analyzing the responses.

4. whether this is her attitude or behavior towards herself.

The above four questions constitute the direct perspective of the IPM. In addition, the IPM has a meta-perspective which requires each member to predict how the other member will answer each of the above four questions about each attitude or behavior.<sup>1</sup>

Sixty different attitudes and behaviors (dyadic issues) are covered in the IPM. They were chosen from a group of approximately 2,000 suitable words and phrases that were taken from a small standard dictionary. The list was reduced by eliminating redundancies, synonyms, and antonyms. After experience with the remaining items, 84 were chosen, excluding those that were most difficult for subjects to understand. Finally, those 84 items were reduced to 60 following test-retest studies and a careful re-examination of the content of each item in terms of its clinical usefulness, and the ability of the subjects to accept it as meaningful. The rejected issues were, for the most part, those showing lower test-retest agreement, where the content was fairly closely covered by another item. A few issues with somewhat low test-retest agreement were retained because of their clinical usefulness.

Reliability of the IPM was assessed for individuals involved in disturbed and non-disturbed marriages (Laing, Phillipson, and Lee, 1966). For the disturbed marriages, the test-retest reliability of the 60 issues ranged from 71 percent to 95 percent, with the bulk of the issues falling between 76 percent and 85 percent. There were 6 issues falling above this

<sup>1</sup>The IPM also has a meta-metaperspective which requires each member to predict how the other member will predict the first member's answers. The meta-metaperspective was not used in this study.

range, and 5 issues falling below it. For the non-disturbed marriages, the test-retest reliability of the 60 issues ranged from 61 percent to 100 percent. Six issues fell below 76 percent, 5 issues fell between 76 and 80 percent, 6 issues fell between 81 and 85 percent, 10 issues fell between 86 and 90 percent, 20 issues fell between 91 and 95 percent, and 13 issues fell between 96 and 100 percent.

In order to assess internal consistency, responses to 7 pairs of issues that overlap considerably in meaning, and 6 pairs of issues that are opposite in meaning were studied. Both disturbed and non-disturbed marriage groups gave largely consistent answers to these pairs of issues, with the non-disturbed group being somewhat more consistent than the disturbed group. Average level of consistency across the 13 pairs of issues was 95.9 percent for the non-disturbed marriage group and 78.3 percent for the disturbed marriage group. (Laing, Phillipson, and Lee, 1966).

No formal validation of the IPM has been attempted as of yet, but it has proven useful in clinical work with couples and has generated information about them that has been supported by subsequent clinical work with them (Laing, Phillipson, and Lee, 1966).

In order to shorten the length of the experimental procedure, the author eliminated 8 of the IPM issues. Three of these were highly correlated with other IPM issues according to the internal consistency study described above. The remaining 5 were, in the author's opinion, either ambiguous or similar to other IPM issues. The author added two of her own issues that, in her opinion, were relevant to the assessment of mother-daughter separation. The 8 eliminated issues and the 2 added ones are listed in Appendix A.

To sum up, the mothers and daughters in this study had to answer the above-mentioned four questions about each of 54 different attitudes and behaviors (dyadic issues), from both the direct perspective, and the meta-perspective. There were 432 questions or items in all.

Hypothesis #1 states that the mother-daughter relationships of identity foreclosure and identity diffusion subjects have more separation-impeding patterns of interaction than do the mother-daughter relationships of identity achievement and moratorium subjects. In order to use the IPM to assess the extent to which separation-impeding interactions exist in the mother-daughter relationships of the subjects, the author had to determine which IPM items clearly reflected any of the separation-impeding patterns of parent-child interaction described in the first chapter. The first step in this process was to list all of the patterns described in Chapter One. Two separate lists were made. The first consisted only of attitudes and behaviors on the part of a mother towards her late-adolescent daughter which would be separation-impeding. The second consisted only of attitudes and behaviors on the part of a late-adolescent daughter towards her mother which would be separation-impeding. The two lists are reproduced below:

List #1: Attitudes and Behaviors on the Part of the Mother that Impede Separation

1. Mother sees daughter as inadequate, inferior, unable to manage on her own, or unlikely to succeed (Stierlin, 1971, 1974).
2. Mother treats daughter in a way that conveys that she holds her in low esteem (Aggression toward the daughter without contempt is not indicative of this pattern). (Stierlin, 1971, 1974).

3. Mother is over-involved with and over-invested in daughter, or is involved with her in ways that are not age-appropriate, e.g., mother infantilizes daughter, mother and daughter are embroiled in a sado-masochistic relationship, mother's life revolves around daughter, mother tries to live vicariously through daughter (Jacobson, 1964; Stierlin, 1974).
4. Mother takes over for daughter, dominating and over-protecting her (Jacobson, 1964; Stierlin, 1974; Giovacchini, 1971).
5. Mother is overly dependent on daughter, letting daughter take over for her (Stierlin, 1974).
6. Mother's perception of daughter is distorted in some significant way. (An overly positive view as well as an overly negative view constitutes a distortion). (Stierlin, 1971, 1974; Borowitz, 1971).
7. Mother is unable to tolerate daughter's individuality. She must control or change her (Jacobson, 1964; Erikson, 1968; Giovacchini, 1971).
8. Mother's response to daughter is frankly narcissistic, that is, she responds in terms of her own needs regardless of whether they conflict with daughter's needs. Examples are exploitation of daughter, interest in daughter mainly as a narcissistic extension, and competition with daughter. (This pattern differs from one of neglect or active rejection. There is much investment in the daughter, but its nature is narcissistic.) (Jacobson, 1964; Stierlin, 1974; Borowitz, 1971).
9. Mother is extremely guilt-inducing (Stierlin, 1974).

List #2: Attitudes and Behaviors on the Part of the Late-Adolescent Daughter that Impede Separation

1. Daughter is over-involved with and over-invested in mother, e.g., daughter infantilizes mother, daughter and mother are embroiled in a sado-masochistic relationship (Stierlin, 1974), daughter's life revolves around mother, daughter tries to live vicariously through mother.
2. Daughter takes over for mother, dominating and overprotecting her.
3. Daughter is overly dependent on mother, letting mother take over for her (Jacobson, 1964; Stierlin, 1974).
4. Daughter idealizes mother. (Note that an overly negative view of mother is not included in this list. The reason for this is that the process of loosening ties to parents in adolescence seems to typically involve some unrealistic devaluation of them. When it becomes extreme, it becomes separation-impeding and is subsumed under the pattern of sado-masochistic over-involvement.)
5. Daughter is unable to tolerate mother's individuality. She must control or change her (Jacobson, 1964; Stierlin, 1974).
6. Daughter is extremely narcissistic in the way she relates to mother, e.g., mother is exploited, her needs are ignored, etc. (Jacobson, 1964; Stierlin, 1974). (It seems to the author that a greater degree of narcissism is appropriate for the late adolescent daughter than is the case for her mother, especially within the mother-daughter relationship. Therefore, competitiveness on the part of the daughter towards her mother is not included in these lists, while the reverse is.)

Next the author considered all of the IPM questions involving the mother's attitudes or behaviors toward the daughter and the daughter's attitudes or behaviors toward the mother in relation to the two lists of criteria described above in order to determine which items, in her judgment, unambiguously reflected any of the criteria, and which did not. (The direction in which the item had to be answered in order to reflect one or more of the criteria was also specified.) This same task was also completed by a second judge who was a second year graduate student in clinical psychology. For the 54 items involving the mother's attitudes or behaviors toward the daughter, there was agreement between the two judges as to whether or not 44 of them reflected any of the separation-impeding patterns (82 percent). For the 54 items involving the daughter's attitudes or behaviors toward the mother, there was agreement between the two judges as to whether or not 41 of them reflected any of the separation-impeding patterns (76 percent). Chi square tests comparing these values with those that would be expected by chance were significant ( $p < .001$ ).

Those items on which there was disagreement regarding whether they reflected any of the separation-impeding patterns were discussed by the two judges. As a result of these discussions, the wording of five items was changed in order to clarify their meaning in relation to the criteria, and thereby facilitate decision on whether or not they should be included in the "Separation Problems Subscale". (The nature of these word changes is reported in Appendix A.) In all cases, the judges were able to arrive at a mutually agreeable decision about whether or not to include a disputed item in the subscale. Thirty-three items involving the

mother's behaviors and attitudes toward the daughter, and 20 items involving the daughter's behaviors and attitudes toward the mother were considered to clearly reflect one or more of the separation-impeding patterns and were therefore chosen to compose a "Separation Problems Subscale" of the IPM.

The wording of 11 other items in the Separation Problems Subscale was changed so as to equalize the number of items in it that had to be answered affirmatively and negatively in order to reflect separation-impeding patterns. A list of the 53 items that compose the Separation Problems Subscale in their revised form, and the 11 revised items in their original form appear in Appendix A.

The Separation Problems Subscale was used to test Hypothesis #1. For every item scored in the direction reflecting separation-impeding interaction, the mother-daughter pair received one point. As was the case for all of the IPM items, each of the 53 items in the Separation Problems Subscale was answered from four different perspectives for each mother-daughter pair: 1) the daughter's direct perspective; 2) the daughter's meta-perspective; 3) the mother's direct perspective; and 4) the mother's meta-perspective. These provided four different estimates of the degree of separation-impeding interaction existing in each mother-daughter relationship. In addition, a combined score, which was computed by totalling the number of Separation Problem Scale items answered in the direction reflecting separation-impeding interaction on any of the four perspectives, provided a fifth estimate. In order to test Hypothesis #1, the subjects were grouped according to the daughter's identity status, and were compared using each of these five estimates of

the degree of separation-impeding interaction in the mother-daughter relationship. Thus there were five separate tests of Hypothesis #1.

Assessment of the Extent to which Mothers are Accurate in Their Perceptions of Their Daughters

Hypothesis #2 states that mothers of subjects with identity foreclosure and identity diffusion patterns are less accurate in their perceptions of their daughters' feelings and attitudes than are mothers of subjects with identity achievement and moratorium patterns. In order to assess the degree to which the mothers of the young women in each of the four identity statuses can accurately perceive their daughters' attitudes and feelings, each mothers meta-perspective on the IPM was compared with her daughter's direct perspective. For example, the item "My mother fights with me" is answered either true or false by the daughter (daughter's direct perspective), Her mother is asked "How would your daughter answer the following? "My mother fights with me" (mother's meta-perspective). These two answers will either be the same (accurate perception), or different (inaccurate perception).

A) Response Sets and Accuracy of Perception Scores:

A straightforward index of accuracy of perception involving number of responses predicted correctly has been shown to be inadequate in a number of studies (Hastorf and Bender, 1952; Hastorf, Bender and Weintraub, 1955; Gage and Cronbach, 1955; Cronbach, 1958). This is because response sets on the part of the perceiver can artificially inflate or deflate such scores, making their validity questionable. In fact, Cronbach (1958) argues persuasively that data supposedly reflecting differences in accuracy of interpersonal perception can often be better explained by differences in intra- personal response sets on the part

of the perceiver.

One response set that can artificially inflate accuracy of perception scores is that of assumed similarity. This response set involves a tendency on the part of the perceiver to see the other as similar to the self regardless of actual similarity. If the other is in fact quite similar to the perceiver, the perceiver will have a high accuracy of perception score, despite the fact that the perceiver is assuming similarity rather than picking up cues about the other. In the same vein, Hastorf, Bender and Weintraub (1955) found that a straightforward index of accuracy in predicting another person's responses to a personality questionnaire is positively correlated ( $r=.53$ ) with similarity to the other person on that questionnaire. This finding supports the possibility that such accuracy scores reflect an assumed similarity response set rather than genuine accuracy of perception.

Another response set that can artificially inflate accuracy of perception scores involves a tendency on the part of the perceiver to see the other as behaving in a socially desirable manner, regardless of whether or not this is actually true. If this tendency is shared with the other, the accuracy of perception score will again be quite high for reasons having nothing to do with the ability of the perceiver to pick up cues from the other (Lindgren and Robinson, 1953; Dymond, 1954).

B) Method of Controlling for an Assumed Similarity Response Set:

In order to control for the possible influence of a response set of assumed similarity on accuracy of perception scores, accuracy of maternal perception was assessed separately for those items where the direct perspectives of mother and daughter converged, and for those items where

the direct perspectives of mother and daughter diverged. An example of convergence of direct perspectives between mother and daughter would have the daughter answering 'true' to the item "My mother fights with me", and her mother answering 'true' to the item "I fight with my daughter". An example of divergence of direct perspectives would have the daughter answering 'true' to the item "My mother fights with me", and her mother answering 'false' to the item "I fight with my daughter".

An index of maternal accuracy of perception using only those items where there was divergence of direct perspectives between mother and daughter was used to test Hypothesis #2, thereby eliminating the possibility of artificial inflation of the accuracy score due to a response set of assumed similarity.

C) Method of Controlling for a Socially Desirable Response Set:

In order to control for the possible influence of a shared tendency to respond in a socially desirable manner on accuracy of perception scores, accuracy of maternal perception was assessed separately for those responses answered by the daughter in a socially desirable direction, and for those responses answered by her in a socially undesirable direction.

The question of which IPM items have socially desirable and undesirable alternatives was answered by giving the direct perspective of the IPM to five clinicians. They were instructed to answer in such a way as to describe what was, in their judgment, the ideal mother-daughter relationship where the daughter is a college junior or senior. If neither alternative of a particular item seemed more ideal, they were instructed to write 'neutral' next to it. Those items that at least four out of the five clinicians answered in the same direction were considered to have

socially desirable and undesirable alternatives. These included all but eight of the 216 questions on the direct perspective of the IPM.

An index of maternal accuracy of perception using only those items where the daughter answered in a socially undesirable direction was used to test Hypothesis #2, thereby eliminating the possibility of artificial inflation of the accuracy of perception score due to a shared tendency on the part of mother and daughter to answer in a socially desirable direction.

In summary, two separate indices of maternal accuracy of perception, (percentage of disagreed on items predicted accurately by mother and percentage of items answered by daughter in a socially undesirable direction predicted accurately by mother), were used to test Hypothesis #2.

#### Assessment of the Extent of Mother-Daughter Identification

The question of whether or not significant differences in extent of identification with their mothers exist among the daughters in the four identity statuses was explored in this study without making any predictions about the results.

In this study, mother-daughter identification is operationally defined as mother-daughter profile similarity on the Interpersonal Adjective Checklist. This checklist was developed by the Kaiser Foundation Psychology Staff, especially La Forge and Suczek, in the middle 1950's (La Forge and Suczek, 1955; Leary, 1957). It was carefully tailored to fit the theoretical system developed by that group (the Interpersonal Personality System). However, the authors of the checklist believe that, since the theory attempts to deal with all interpersonal aspects of personality, the checklist is comprehensive and can be used

in research independent of the theory (La Forge and Suczek, 1955).

The present form of the checklist (Form IV), consists of sixteen sets of eight items, which measure sixteen dimensions of interpersonal relatedness: autocratic, managerial, responsible, hypernormal, cooperative, overconventional, docile, dependent, self-effacing, masochistic, distrustful, rebellious, aggressive, sadistic, competitive, and narcissistic. The 128 items are administered to subjects in alphabetical order. However, when scored, the sixteen dimensions are arranged in a circle with each dimension located next to the two other dimensions with which it is most highly correlated. The circle has two axes: hostility-affection and dominance-submission.

An intensity dimension has been built into the checklist so that, of the eight items subsumed under each interpersonal dimension, one is worth four points because it reflects "an extreme amount of the trait", three items are worth three points each because they reflect "a marked or inappropriate amount of the trait", three items are worth two points each because they reflect "a moderate or appropriate amount of the trait", and one item is worth one point because it reflects a "mild or necessary amount of the trait". The particular words chosen to represent each intensity within a trait are the result of an extensive revision process where the social desirability and likelihood of responding positively to each item were carefully evaluated. As a result, intensity #4 words are responded to positively by about 10 percent of the population; intensity #3 words by about 33 percent of the population; intensity #2 words by about 67 percent; and intensity #1 words by about 90 percent (La Forge and Suzcek, 1955).

Test-retest reliability averaged .73 for each of the 16 variables, and .78 for each of the eight variable pairs (La Forge and Suzcek, 1955). This level of reliability is considered by the authors to be sufficient for use in personality research. Regarding the internal consistency of the measure, the average correlations for variables ranging from one to eight steps apart in the circle show a steady decrease. Some evidence for the construct validity of the scales is provided by their significant correlations with clinical judgments, and with conceptually similar scales on the MMPI (Leary, 1957). Some validation for the scales has also been provided in a variety of non-clinical situations (Bentler, 1965).

#### Peer Relations Scale

In order to supplement and possibly clarify the data on identity formation, separation from mother, and identification with mother, that are the main focus of this study, some information on the relative adequacy of the daughters' peer relations was gathered. A seven point scale developed by Roff, Sells, and Golden (1972) for the purpose of having elementary school teachers rate their students' level of acceptance-rejection by their peers, was employed. The daughters were asked to rate themselves on this scale three times: 1) as they were at age 13; 2) as they were in the years before age 13; and 3) as they have been in the years after age 13. A descriptive statement about their past and present peer relationships was also requested, especially if there had been changes in the level of acceptance-rejection.

Teacher ratings of pupils on this scale generate a normal distribution of scores, and are positively correlated with sociometric ratings done by the pupils (Roff, Sells, and Golden, 1972).

## CHAPTER THREE

### RESULTS

On the basis of the identity status interview and classification system developed by Marcia (1964), each of the 48 late adolescent subjects in this study was assigned to one of four identity statuses. Five subjects were assigned to the identity achievement status, 24 subjects were assigned to the moratorium status, 13 subjects were assigned to the identity foreclosure status, and 6 subjects were assigned to the identity diffusion status.

#### Hypothesis #1: Separation-Impeding Mother-Daughter

##### Interaction and Daughter's Identity Status

Hypothesis #1 states that those young women handling the identity crisis maladaptively (those classified as identity foreclosure or identity diffusion) are more likely to be involved in interactions with their mothers which impede separation than are those young women handling the identity crisis more successfully (those subjects classified as identity achievement or moratorium). In order to test this hypothesis, the different statuses were compared on the author's Separation Problems Subscale of the IPM. As was explained in Chapter Two, the Separation Problems Subscale was answered from four different perspectives for each mother-daughter pair. The different statuses were compared on each of these perspectives separately. In addition, the four identity statuses were compared using a combined score which took into account all four perspectives of the Separation Problems Subscale. For each of the 5 comparisons, the scores were converted to ranks and a Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance was performed. (Note

that the higher the rank, the greater the amount of separation - impeding interaction.) The results of these analyses are presented in Table 1.

Table 1  
COMPARISONS OF THE FOUR IDENTITY STATUSES ON THE DIFFERENT  
PERSPECTIVES OF THE SEPARATION PROBLEMS SUBSCALE OF THE  
IPM

Perspective	Mean Rank				H	P
	I.A.	Morato- rium	Foreclo- sure	Diffusion		
1. Daughter's direct	23.20	26.31	22.04	23.67	.87	N.S.
2. Daughter's meta	20.10	25.69	24.15	24.17	.68	N.S.
3. Mother's direct	22.30	22.62	28.96	24.17	1.88	N.S.
4. Mother's meta	24.00	22.08	27.31	28.50	1.73	N.S.
5. Combined score	21.50	26.04	21.46	27.42	1.39	N.S.

NOTE: d.f. = 3 in all comparisons. H value for  $p (.05) = 7.82$ .

Table 1 indicates that there is no significant relationship between the daughter's identity status and score on the Separation Problems Subscale of the IPM on any of the four perspectives, or on the combined score. Thus, no evidence was provided for Hypothesis #1; the four identity statuses did not differ regarding the extent to which either the mothers

or the daughters reported the existence of the separation-impeding interaction patterns described in Chapter 1.

Hypothesis #2: Accuracy of Mother's Perception of  
Daughter and Daughter's Identity Status

As was explained in Chapter 2, the hypothesis that mothers of young women who are handling the identity crisis maladaptively (those classified as identity foreclosure or identity diffusion), are less accurate in their perceptions of their daughters' attitudes and feelings than are the mothers of young women who are handling the identity crisis more successfully was tested in two ways: The first involved assessment of maternal accuracy in predicting only those IPM responses on the part of the daughter which diverged from the mother's own (i.e., direct perspective) responses to the same question. (What is being assessed here is the degree to which the mother is aware of differences in perception between herself and her daughter.) The second involved assessment of maternal accuracy in predicting only those IPM responses on the part of the daughter which were socially undesirable.

The percentage of disagreed-on IPM items for which the mother's prediction of her daughter's response was accurate was computed for each mother-daughter pair. These percentage scores were then converted to ranks. (Note that the higher the rank, the greater the awareness of areas of divergence, because, the greater the proportion of disagreed-on IPM items predicted accurately by the mother.) The four identity statuses were compared by means of a Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance. Table 2 presents the mean ranks for the four identity statuses, and the results of the analysis of variance.

TABLE 2  
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DAUGHTER'S IDENTITY STATUS AND MOTHER'S  
ACCURACY IN PREDICTING DAUGHTER'S RESPONSES TO DISAGREED-ON  
IPM QUESTIONS

	I.A.	Morato- rium	Foreclo- sure	Diffusion	H	P
Mean Rank...	30.00	25.96	19.04	25.92	3.08	N.S.

NOTE: d.f. = 3. H value for p (.05) = 7.82.

Table 2 indicates that mothers of daughters in the four identity statuses do not differ significantly in their awareness of areas of divergence between themselves and their daughters, and are equally likely to misperceive their daughters as seeing things the way they (the mothers) do, when in fact, the daughters see things differently.

In the second test of Hypothesis #2, the percentage of the daughter's IPM responses predicted accurately by her mother was computed only for those questions answered by the daughter in a socially undesirable direction. These percentage scores were converted to ranks. (Note that the higher the rank, the more accurate the mother was in predicting her daughter's socially undesirable responses to the IPM.) The four identity statuses were compared by means of a Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance. The results of this analysis, and the mean ranks for the four identity statuses are presented in Table 3.

TABLE 3  
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DAUGHTER'S IDENTITY STATUS AND MOTHER'S  
ACCURACY IN PREDICTING DAUGHTER'S SOCIALLY UNDESIRABLE IPM  
RESPONSES

	I.A.	Morato- rium	Foreclo- sure	Diffusion	H	P
Mean Rank...	22.90	21.56	30.23	25.83	3.43	N.S.

NOTE: d.f. = 3. H value for p (.05 level) = 7.82

Table 3 indicates that the four identity statuses do not differ significantly in degree of accuracy of maternal perception of the daughter for those IPM items answered by her in a socially undesirable direction. Thus, neither test of Hypothesis #2 provided any evidence for it; the mothers of daughters in the identity achievement and moratorium groups were not found to be more accurate in their perception of their daughters than were the mothers of daughters in the foreclosure and diffusion groups.

Extent of Mother-Daughter Identification and  
Daughter's Identity Status

As was explained in Chapter 1, the possibility that the four identity statuses differ in terms of the extent of mother-daughter identification characteristic of them was explored in this study without hypothesizing a direction for these differences. The variable of mother-daughter identification was operationally defined as degree of mother-daughter profile similarity on the Interpersonal Adjective Checklist (1955). The statistic used to measure profile similarity was the dis-

tance measure (D or D square), which was originally introduced into psychology by Osgood and Suci (1952), and by Cronbach and Gleser (1953). The advantage of the distance measure over a correlation coefficient in measuring profile similarity is that the distance measure takes into account the shape, level, and dispersion of the profile scores, whereas the correlation coefficient takes into account only their shape (Nunnally, 1967). D square, the sum of the squared differences between mother and daughter on each of the 16 scales on the Interpersonal Adjective Checklist, was computed for each mother-daughter pair. (This provided a measure of dissimilarity rather than similarity in that the higher the value of D square, the more dissimilar the two profiles.) These D square scores were then converted to ranks. (Note that the higher the rank, the more dissimilar the mother-daughter pair.) The four identity statuses were compared by means of a Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance. Table 4 presents the results of this analysis, and the mean ranks for each of the four identity statuses.

TABLE 4  
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DAUGHTER'S IDENTITY STATUS  
AND MOTHER-DAUGHTER DISSIMILARITY

	I.A.	Moratorium	Foreclosure	Diffusion	H	P
Mean Rank...	9.00	27.48	20.90	32.50	9.33	.03

NOTE: d.f. = 3.

Table 4 indicates that there are significant differences between identity statuses with regard to degree of mother-daughter similarity. The identity achievement group is the most similar to their mothers, and the diffusion and moratorium groups are the least similar to their mothers. The foreclosure subjects occupy an intermediate position with regard to mother-daughter similarity. In order to test for the presence of significant differences between the individual means shown in Table 4, the Scheffé method was employed, using the ranks as scores. A comparison of the mean of the identity achievement group with an average of the means of the moratorium and diffusion groups yielded a value of  $t = 3.09$ , which is significant at  $p < .05$ . This result indicates that the young women in the identity achievement status are significantly more similar to their mothers than are the young women in the moratorium and identity diffusion statuses when the means of these two groups are averaged together. Young women in the identity achievement status were found to be significantly more similar to their mothers than were young women in the identity diffusion status ( $t = 2.88$ ;  $p = .055$ ). There was a trend in the direction of young women in the identity achievement status being more similar to their mothers than young women in the moratorium status ( $t = 2.76$ ;  $p < .10$ ). No other comparisons of the means presented in Table 4 yielded significant results.

These results, which partially confirm Dignan's (1965) findings concerning the relationship between maternal identification and female identity formation, suggest that degree of identification with the mother is an important element in the young woman's identity formation process, because different degrees of maternal identification seem to be associated with different patterns of identity formation.

Awareness of Divergence of Perception Between Mothers  
and Daughters: The Sample as a Whole

For every mother in the sample, and for all but three of the 48 daughters in the sample, the amount of divergence of perception between mother and daughter on the IPM was underestimated. In other words, both late-adolescent daughters and their mothers are likely to assume the existence of more convergence in their perceptions about their relationship, themselves, and each other, than actually exists.

The daughters in the sample underestimated the amount of divergence less than the mothers in the sample. They experienced more divergence of perception in their relationships with their mothers than their mothers did, and the difference was highly significant. (The mothers and daughters were compared on the amount of divergence experienced by means of a Wilcoxin matched-pairs signed-ranks test. The resulting value of  $z$  was 4.74, which is significant at  $p < .00006$ .)

The daughters were also more accurate in predicting their mothers' IPM responses when they diverged from their own direct perspective responses, than their mothers were in predicting their daughters' responses when the two diverged. In other words, the daughters were more accurate than their mothers in pinpointing areas of divergence of perception between mother and daughter. This difference was also highly significant. (A Wilcoxin matched-pairs signed-ranks test comparing mothers and daughters on the amount of actual disagreement between mother and daughter of which each was aware, yielded a value of  $z$  equal to 5.21, which is significant at  $p < .00006$ .)

Daughter's Accuracy in Perceiving Areas of Divergence  
Between Self and Mother, and Daughter's Identity  
Status

Although the mothers of the daughters in the four identity statuses did not differ in their accuracy in predicting those IPM responses of their daughters that disagreed with their own direct perspective responses on the IPM, one unpredicted finding of the present study is that the daughters in the different identity statuses did show significant differences on this type of accuracy score. In other words, the daughters in the different identity statuses differed significantly in the degree to which they were accurate in pinpointing areas of divergence of perception between themselves and their mothers. The percentage of disagreed-on IPM questions for which the daughter's prediction of her mother's responses was accurate constituted the accuracy score. These percentage scores were then converted to ranks. (Note that the higher the rank, the greater the proportion of actual mother-daughter divergence of which the daughter is aware.) The four identity statuses were compared by means of a Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance. The mean ranks for the four identity statuses and the results of the analysis of variance are presented in Table 5.

TABLE 5

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DAUGHTER'S IDENTITY STATUS AND DAUGHTER'S  
ACCURACY IN PREDICTING MOTHER'S RESPONSES TO DISAGREED ON  
IPM QUESTIONS

	I.A.	Morator- rium	Foreclo- sure	Diffusion	H	P
Mean Rank...	26.30	30.10	13.58	24.25	11.84	.01

NOTE: d.f. = 3.

Table 5 suggests that the daughters in the foreclosure status are less accurate in pinpointing areas of divergence of perception between themselves and their mothers, than are the daughters in any of the other identity statuses. In order to see if this difference was significant, the Scheffé method was employed, using the ranks as scores. A comparison of the mean of the foreclosure group with an average of the means of the identity achievement, moratorium, and identity diffusion groups yielded a value of  $t = 3.04$ , which is significant at  $p < .05$ . This result indicates that the daughters in the foreclosure status are significantly more likely to assume convergence of perception between themselves and their mothers when it does not exist, than are the daughters in the other three identity statuses. When moratorium and foreclosure groups were compared on this variable, the moratorium daughters were significantly more accurate in pinpointing areas of mother-daughter divergence of perception than were the foreclosure daughters ( $t = 3.83$ ;  $p < .01$ ). All other comparisons of the means presented in Table 5 yielded insignificant results.

Accuracy of Perception of Divergence and  
Degree of Assumed Divergence

For both mothers and daughters, accuracy in pinpointing areas of divergence on the IPM was found to have a high positive correlation with the amount of divergence between mother and daughter on the IPM that was predicted (degree of assumed or experienced divergence). Table 6 presents the Spearman rank correlation coefficients between accuracy of perception of divergence and degree of assumed or experienced divergence for the sample of mothers, and for the sample of daughters.

TABLE 6  
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ACCURACY OF PERCEPTION OF  
DIVERGENCE AND DEGREE OF ASSUMED DIVERGENCE ON  
THE IPM

	$r_s$	p
Mothers.....	.86	<.0005
Daughters .....	.85	<.0005

These high correlations raise the possibility that the 'accuracy in pinpointing areas of divergence' score used in this study is more parsimoniously interpretable as a measure of the degree to which a response bias in the direction of assuming divergence between oneself and the other is operating. In order to control for the operation of such a response set, the author modified the above-mentioned accuracy score in the following way: Realizing that, to the degree that such a response set of assumed convergence is operating, the daughter's accuracy

in perceiving convergence would be lowered, the author decided to average each daughter's accuracy in perceiving divergence with her accuracy in perceiving convergence. In other words, the percentage of disagreed-on IPM questions where the daughter accurately predicts her mother's response, and the percentage of agreed-on IPM questions where the daughter accurately predicts her mother's response were averaged. This made it possible to control for response bias in either direction (unwarranted assumed divergence and unwarranted assumed convergence), because the operation of either of these response sets would result in a lowered accuracy score.

The daughters' averages were converted to ranks. (Note that the higher the rank, the higher the average of the two accuracy-of-perception scores, and therefore, the higher the daughter's overall accuracy of perception of her mother, corrected for both kinds of response biases.) The four identity statuses were compared by means of a Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance. The results of this analysis, and the mean ranks for the four identity statuses on this overall accuracy measure are presented in Table 7.

TABLE 7  
IDENTITY STATUS AND DAUGHTER'S ACCURACY OF PERCEPTION  
OF MOTHER CORRECTED FOR UNWARRANTED ASSUMED  
DIVERGENCE AND CONVERGENCE

	I.A.	Morato- rium	Foreclo- sure	Diffusion	H	P
Mean Rank...	28.50	28.98	15.27	23.25	8.56	.04

NOTE: d.f. = 3.

Table 7 suggests that the daughters in the identity foreclosure status are lower than the daughters in the identity achievement and moratorium statuses on this measure of accuracy of perception of their mothers, and that the daughters in the identity diffusion status occupy an intermediate position with regard to this measure.

Using the ranks as scores, the Scheffé method was employed to test for the presence of significant differences between the individual means shown in Table 7. A comparison of the mean score of the foreclosure group with an average of the mean scores of the identity achievement and moratorium groups yielded a value of  $t = 2.77$ ;  $p < .10$ . This result indicates the presence of a trend in the direction of greater accuracy of perception of their mothers on the part of identity achievement and moratorium daughters when compared with foreclosure daughters. When moratorium and foreclosure groups were compared on this accuracy measure, the moratorium daughters were significantly higher than the foreclosure daughters ( $t = 3.05$ ;  $p < .05$ ). No other comparisons between means yielded significant results.

When the means presented in Table 7 are compared with those presented in Table 5, it can be seen that this modified measure results in increases in accuracy for foreclosure and identity achievement subjects, and decreases for moratorium and diffusion subjects, suggesting that the latter two statuses are more likely to assume divergence of perception vis-a-vis their mothers when it does not exist, than are the former two statuses. However, the differences between groups, while smaller than those reported in Table 5, are still significant, suggesting that the differences among the daughters in the four identity statuses in accuracy

in pinpointing areas of divergence of perception vis-a-vis their mothers are not merely a function of differences in tendency to assume divergence vis-a-vis their mothers.

Actual Divergence between Mother and Daughter,  
Assumed Divergence between Mother and Daughter,  
and Identity Status

The number of actual disagreements between mother and daughter on the direct perspective of the IPM did not show a significant relationship to the identity status of the daughter. The mother-daughter pairs were ranked according to number of actual disagreements on the IPM, and the four identity statuses were compared by means of a Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance. Table 8 presents the mean ranks for each of the identity statuses, and the results of the analysis of variance. (Note that the higher the rank, the greater the number of disagreements between mother and daughter.)

TABLE 8  
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DAUGHTER'S IDENTITY STATUS AND NUMBER  
OF DISAGREEMENTS BETWEEN MOTHER AND DAUGHTER ON THE  
DIRECT PERSPECTIVE OF THE IPM

	I.A.	Morato- rium	Foreclo- sure	Diffusion	H	P
Mean Rank...	25.00	26.89	17.61	29.41	4.64	N.S.

NOTE: d.f. = 3. H value for p (.05 level) = 7.82

While the variable of actual mother-daughter divergence did not show any significant relationship to identity status, the variable of assumed or experienced mother-daughter divergence did, for both the mothers and the daughters. In Table 9, the four identity statuses are compared on the number of disagreements between mother and daughter on the IPM that are thought to exist by 1) the mother, and 2) the daughter. For both comparisons, the scores were converted to ranks and were analyzed by means of a Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance. (Note that the higher the rank, the more divergence of perception experienced in the mother-daughter relationship.)

TABLE 9  
IDENTITY STATUS AND NUMBER OF DISAGREEMENTS BETWEEN  
MOTHER AND DAUGHTER ASSUMED TO EXIST BY 1)MOTHERS,  
AND 2) DAUGHTERS

	I.A.	Morato- rium	Foreclo- sure	Diffusion	H	P
Mean Rank (mothers)....	29.80	26.35	16.00	31.00	7.11	.07
Mean Rank (daughters)..	24.80	29.70	13.38	27.50	11.79	<.01

NOTE: d.f. = 3.

Table 9 suggests that daughters in the identity foreclosure status experience their perceptions and those of their mothers as converging more than is the case with daughters in any of the other statuses. In order to see if this difference was significant, the Scheffé method was employed, using the ranks as scores. A comparison of the mean of the

foreclosure daughters with an average of the means of the identity achievement, moratorium, and identity diffusion daughters yielded a value of  $t = 3.19$ , which is significant at  $p < .05$ . When moratorium and foreclosure daughters were compared on degree of assumed or experienced divergence of perception from mother, the moratorium daughters were significantly higher than the foreclosure daughters ( $t = 3.79$ ;  $p < .01$ ). All other comparisons of the daughters' means presented in Table 9 yielded insignificant results.

Table 9 also suggests the presence of a trend in the direction of more assumed convergence of perception between mother and daughter on the part of mothers of daughters in the foreclosure status than is the case for the mothers of daughters in the other statuses. In order to see if this difference was significant, the Scheffé method was employed, using the ranks as scores. A comparison of the mean of the foreclosure mothers with an average of the means of the identity achievement, moratorium, and identity diffusion mothers yielded a value of  $t = 2.80$ ;  $p < .10$ . Thus, the presence of the trend described above was confirmed. No other comparisons of the mothers' means presented in Table 9 yielded significant results.

In summary, both late adolescent daughters and their mothers tend to underestimate the degree to which they see things differently. Daughters as a group are aware of more divergence of perception vis-a-vis their mothers than are mothers as a group vis-a-vis their daughters. Daughters as a group are also more accurate in pinpointing areas of divergence of perception in the mother-daughter relationship than are mothers as a group. Daughters in the foreclosure status experience

less divergence of perception vis-a-vis their mothers than do daughters in any of the other three statuses, and are also less accurate in pinpointing areas of such divergence than are daughters in any of the other three statuses. While mothers of daughters in the four statuses do not differ in their accuracy in pinpointing areas of divergence of perception between themselves and their daughters, the mothers of daughters in the foreclosure status tend to experience less such divergence than do the mothers of daughters in any of the other statuses. The four statuses do not differ in amount of actual divergence of perception between mother and daughter.

#### Identity Status and Socially Undesirable Responses<sup>1</sup>

As was the case with the mothers of daughters in the four identity statuses, the daughters in the different statuses did not differ significantly in degree of accuracy in predicting their mothers socially undesirable responses to the IPM ( $H = 2.05$ ). Neither the mothers or daughters when grouped according to the daughter's identity status, differed significantly in the number of direct perspective IPM questions answered in a socially undesirable direction ( $H = .65$ , and  $5.89$ , respectively). In addition, neither the mothers or the daughters, when grouped according to the daughter's identity status, showed significant differences in the number of socially undesirable responses that they predicted would be given by the other member of the mother-daughter pair ( $H = .85$ , and  $1.85$ , respectively).

<sup>1</sup>For all of the comparisons reported in this section, a Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance was used. In each case, d.f. = 3, and the value of  $H$  for  $p$  (.05 level) = 7.82.

The only significant difference among the four identity statuses having to do with socially undesirable responses involves the questions of whether it was the mother or the daughter who gave more socially undesirable responses to the IPM, and what the magnitude of this difference was. For three quarters of the mother-daughter pairs, the daughter gave more socially undesirable responses to the direct perspective of the IPM than her mother did. For the other quarter, the reverse was true. It seemed to the author that the foreclosure subjects constituted a very large proportion of the mother-daughter pairs where the mother gave more socially undesirable responses than the daughter. In order to test this statistically, the number of socially undesirable responses given by the daughter to the direct perspective of the IPM minus the number of socially undesirable responses given by the mother to the direct perspective of the IPM was computed for each subject pair. The resulting scores were then ranked. Scores with minus signs in front of them received the lowest ranks. The four identity statuses were compared on these ranks by means of a Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance, the results of which are presented in Table 10.

Table 10  
DAUGHTER'S IDENTITY STATUS AND THE DEGREE TO WHICH DAUGHTER  
GIVES MORE SOCIALLY UNDESIRABLE RESPONSES THAN  
MOTHER TO THE IPM

	I.A.	Morato- rium	Foreclo- sure	Diffusion	H	P
Mean Rank...	26.80	28.54	14.62	27.83	8.96	<.04

Table 10 suggests that the foreclosure status differs from the other three statuses. For the other three statuses, the daughter tends to give more socially undesirable responses to the IPM than her mother does. For the foreclosure status, the reverse tends to be true. In order to see if this difference was significant, the Scheffé method was employed, using the ranks as scores. A comparison of the mean of the foreclosure group with an average of the means of the identity achievement, moratorium, and identity diffusion groups yielded a value of  $t = 2.88$ , which is significant at  $p = .055$ . This result indicates that the difference described above is significant.

The Relationship of the Separation Problems Subscale Score  
to Whether or Not the Daughter Has Had Psychotherapy

As was explained in Chapter 2, a Separation Problems Subscale of the IPM, developed by the author, was used to assess the extent to which separation impeding mother-daughter interactions existed in the mother-daughter relationships of the subjects. While no relationship was found between scores on this scale and the daughter's identity status, these scores did show a significant relationship to whether or not the daughter was presently, or had ever been, in therapy. Fifteen of the daughters had had some psychotherapy (3 were classified as identity achievement, 9 were classified as moratorium, 1 was classified as foreclosure and 2 were classified as diffusion); 33 of the daughters had never been in therapy. These two groups were compared on a combined separation problems score which took into account all four perspectives of the Separation Problems Subscale. The combined scores were converted to ranks and analyzed by means of a Mann-Whitney U Test. Table 11 presents the

results of this analysis. (Note that the higher the rank, the more problems with separation.)

TABLE 11  
SEPARATION PROBLEMS SUBSCALE SCORES AND PSYCHOTHERAPY

	Therapy	No Therapy	U	z	P (two tailed)
Mean Rank...	30.30	21.86	160.5	1.94	.053

Table 11 indicates that those daughters who had been exposed to psychotherapy had higher separation problem scores than those daughters who had not had any therapy. These results do not answer the question of which of the two variables is cause and which is effect. In other words, it is possible that subjects who have more separation problems are more likely to seek therapy than subjects who have less separation problems. This would explain the results. However, another possible explanation is that subjects who are in therapy are more aware of their separation problems than subjects who are not in therapy.

#### Father Absence and Daughter's Identity Status

Nine of the 48 daughters in the sample were separated from their fathers at some point during the years before late adolescence (college) due to death of the father or divorce of the parents. Five of these daughters were in the identity foreclosure status (N=13), 3 were in the moratorium group (N=24), and 1 was in the identity diffusion group (N=6). No daughter in the identity achievement status (N=5) had been separated from her father while growing up. The 3 subjects who lost their fathers through death were all in the identity foreclosure status. In order to see if the foreclosure group had significantly more father absence than

the other three groups, a chi square test was done comparing the foreclosure group with the other 3 statuses combined. It revealed the presence of a trend in the direction of greater father absence for the foreclosure status than for the other 3 statuses combined (chi square = 2.96;  $p = .09$  for a two-tailed test.)

#### Peer Relations Scale and Identity Status

For each of the four identity statuses, scores on the 7 point Peer Relations Scale (Roff, Sells and Golden, 1972) were skewed towards the 'acceptance' end of the scale. When asked to rate their peer-relations since age 13, which includes the present, none of the young women in the sample chose any of the three descriptions at the 'rejection' end of the scale. In fact, none of the subjects in the foreclosure and diffusion statuses described themselves as in any way rejected by peers at any of the three points in time about which the subjects were questioned (at age 13, before age 13, and after age 13). Four of the 24 moratorium subjects described themselves as rejected by peers before age 13, and three more described themselves as rejected by peers at age 13. One additional moratorium subject described herself as being rejected by peers during both of these periods. Of the five subjects in the identity achievement status, one described herself as rejected by peers before age 13, and another described herself as rejected by peers at age 13.

Mean self-ratings on the Peer Relations Scale for each status at each of the three points in time are reported in Table 12. (Note that the lower the number, the more successful with peers.)

TABLE 12  
MEAN SELF-RATINGS ON THE SEVEN POINT PEER-RELATIONS  
SCALE FOR THE FOUR IDENTITY STATUSES

	I.A.	Moratorium	Foreclosure	Diffusion
At age 13	4.00	3.46	3.62	3.67
Before age 13	3.80	3.55	3.23	3.17
After age 13	3.00	2.90	2.85	2.83

These mean self-ratings are so similar that, in the author's judgment, it was unnecessary to test for a significant difference among the identity statuses. For all four statuses, there seems to be a tendency to rate one's present level of peer-relations (i.e., after age 13), as somewhat higher than the two past levels.

CHAPTER FOUR  
FACTOR ANALYSIS OF THE IPM  
Purposes and Limitations

The IPM responses of the mothers and daughters in this study were factor analyzed for two reasons: First, factor analysis would reveal whether or not the items picked by the author for the Separation Problems Subscale actually clustered together in this sample. Second, factor analysis might provide additional information about the way in which the mother-daughter relationships of the subjects in the four identity statuses differed.

The sample of daughters and the sample of mothers were kept separate rather than combined for the factor analysis, in order to increase the likelihood of obtaining readily interpretable factors. For both samples, only the direct perspective IPM responses were used. Responses to each of the four different types of questions on the IPM, (i.e., mother's attitudes or behaviors towards daughter; daughter's attitudes or behaviors towards mother; mother's attitudes or behaviors towards herself; and daughter's attitudes or behaviors towards herself), were factor analyzed separately. Again, this was done in order to increase the likelihood of obtaining readily interpretable factors. Altogether, eight separate factor analyses were performed: four for the sample of daughters, and four for the sample of mothers. For each factor analysis, the Varimax Rotation System was used. This system generates orthogonal factors.

All subjects who completed the IPM were used in the factor analyses even if they were not included in the actual study because a complete

set of data from mother and daughter was not obtained. The sample of daughters used in the factor analyses numbered 60, and the sample of mothers used in the factor analyses numbered 51. Each of the eight factor analyses was done on 54 items.

In order for the factors derived from a factor analysis to be considered characteristic of the measure being studied rather than merely characteristic of the way the items clustered for the particular sample being studied, the ratio of subjects to items must be much larger than was the case in these factor analyses. Therefore, it must be emphasized that, while the factors derived from these factor analyses can provide information about the way in which the IPM items clustered together for the two samples in the study, they are not generalizable to other samples.

### Results of the Factor Analyses

For each of the eight factor analyses, there were many factors with an eigen value above one, each of which accounted for a small proportion of the variance. This suggests that the domain covered by the IPM is quite complex. For each of the factor analyses, attention was limited to the first six factors. A list of the first six factors generated by each of the eight factor analyses, with their defining items, and with the proportion of the variance accounted for by each, can be found in Appendix B.

### The First Factor in Each Analysis

In seven of the eight factor analyses performed on the IPM data, the first factor was the same. It was a general positive factor; a

mixture of affection, acceptance, nurturance and respect. It was the first factor in all four of the factor analyses performed on the daughters' IPM responses, and was also the first factor in three of the four factor analyses performed on the mothers' IPM responses. It was not the first factor in the factor analysis performed on the mothers' responses to those IPM items involving their daughters' attitudes and behaviors towards them. Instead, it was the fourth factor in this analysis. The first factor in this analysis was labeled hostility-tearing down. This suggests that the issue of whether or not their daughters are hostile and belittling towards them is of central concern to the mothers in this sample when they describe the way their daughters act towards them. This pattern would seem to support the popular belief that adolescents tend to be critical of their parents.

#### Factors Reflecting Separation-Impeding Interaction Patterns

Four of the 8 factor analyses performed on the IPM data involved items concerning either the mother's behavior towards the daughter, or the daughter's behavior towards the mother. The first 6 factors generated by each of these four factor analyses were examined in order to see if any of them reflected any of the separation-impeding mother-daughter interaction patterns described in the first chapter of this study.

The factor analysis which involved the mothers' responses to those items concerning their attitudes or behaviors towards their daughters yielded 5 different factors that seemed to reflect the separation-impeding

interaction patterns described in Chapter One: 1) hostile-exploitative (factor #2); 2) respect and absence of dissatisfaction<sup>1</sup> (factor #2); 3) rejecting-competitive (factor #4); 4) cruel, tears down (factor #5); and 5) anxiously preoccupied(with daughter) (factor #6). It is possible that combining these patterns into a single scale as the author did, served to obscure differences between groups. However, when the subjects were grouped according to the identity status of the daughter, and their scores on each factor were compared, no significant differences among the identity statuses were found on any of these 5 factors.<sup>2</sup>

The factor analysis which involved the daughters' responses to those items concerning their mothers' attitudes and behaviors towards them yielded 3 factors that seemed to reflect one or more of the separation-impeding interaction patterns described in Chapter One: 1) absence of tearing down, deception, and distortion (factor #2); lets daughter be herself (factor #3); and 3)  fights with, irritating, critical (factor #5). A fourth factor, labeled interest in daughter's thoughts and motives (factor #6), bore an ambiguous relationship to the

<sup>1</sup>A low score on this factor would be separation-impeding according to the criteria listed in Chapter One.

<sup>2</sup>For all significance tests reported in this Chapter, the factor scores of the subjects were converted to ranks and a Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance was performed. Values of  $H > 6.25$  ( $p = .10$ ) are reported. Lower values of  $H$  are considered insignificant. (d.f. = 3 for all comparisons.)

separation-impeding interaction patterns described in Chapter One in that it seemed to involve both respect for the daughter and over-involvement with her. This factor raises the possibility that respect on the part of the mother for the late adolescent daughter may not always be associated with separation-enhancing behavior on the mother's part. On none of the factors described above were there significant differences among the four identity statuses.

The factor analysis which involved the mothers' responses to those items concerning their daughters attitudes and behaviors towards them yielded one factor that reflected a separation-impeding interaction pattern described in the first chapter: overinvolvement with mother (factor #6). When subjects were grouped according to the daughter's identity status and were compared on this factor, no significant differences were found. Another factor, labeled satisfaction with mother, idealization of her, absence of detachment (factor #3), bore an ambiguous relationship to the separation-impeding patterns described in the first chapter because it seemed to involve both over-concern, idealization and fear vis-a-vis the mother, and the ability to let the mother be; to leave her alone. This factor seemed to involve a dimension that might be described as uncritical acceptance and involvement with mother vs. a stance towards mother that is both critical and detached. When subjects were grouped according to the daughter's identity status and compared on this factor, the presence of a trend was revealed. Table 13 presents the results of the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance done on the scores for this factor after they were converted to ranks. (Note that the higher the rank, the more satisfaction with and the less detachment from the mother.)

TABLE 13  
DAUGHTER'S SATISFACTION WITH AND IDEALIZATION OF  
MOTHER, (AS SEEN BY MOTHER), AND DAUGHTER'S  
IDENTITY STATUS

	I.A.	Morato- rium	Foreclo- sure	Diffusion	H	P
Mean Rank....	29.40	19.42	28.15	32.83	6.79	.08

According to Table 13, the mothers of moratorium subjects seem less likely to experience their daughters as satisfied with them, and as idealizing of the, and seem more likely to experience their daughters as detached from them, than are mothers of daughters in any of the other identity statuses. In order to see if this difference was significant, the Scheffé method was employed, using the ranks as scores. A comparison of the mean score of the moratorium group with an average of the mean scores of the identity achievement, foreclosure, and identity diffusion groups yielded a value of  $t = 2.65$ ;  $p < .10$ . This result indicates that the difference described above is a trend.

The presence of this trend suggests that the moratorium daughters, in addition to being in the midst of a struggle to form an identity, are also in the midst of a struggle with their mothers which involves dissatisfaction, criticism and distancing on the part of the daughters. This struggle is out in the open, as shown by the fact that the mother is aware of it: it is the mother's perception of the mother-daughter

relationship on which this factor is based. This result also suggests that none of the other three statuses are in the midst of such a struggle with their mothers.

The factor analysis which involved the daughters' responses to those items concerning their attitudes and behaviors towards their mothers yielded one factor that reflected a separation-impeding interaction pattern described in the first chapter: sadistic-competitive (factor #3). There were no significant differences among the identity statuses on this factor. Another factor, labeled low autonomy vis-a-vis mother; absence of intense hostility, was ambiguously related to the separation-impeding patterns described in Chapter One. It contained items like 'I owe everything to my mother', which suggest low autonomy, as well as items reflecting the absence of humiliation and exploitation of the mother; (the presence of such patterns is considered separation-impeding). One way of explaining this juxtaposition involves the idea that a certain type of difficulty in separating from the mother precludes the expression of intense hostility. This type of difficulty in separating is quite different from the type where the daughter is infantile, demanding, and narcissistic vis-a-vis her mother. It may instead involve extreme difficulty in admitting the presence of angry, critical feelings towards the mother. Daughters in the different identity statuses showed significant differences on this factor. Table 14 presents the results of the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance done on the scores for this factor after they were converted to ranks. (Note the higher the rank the greater the difficulty with autonomy vis-a-vis the mother, in the absence of intense hostility.

TABLE 14  
LOW AUTONOMY AND ABSENCE OF INTENSE HOSTILITY VIS-A-VIS  
MOTHER (AS SEEN BY DAUGHTER), AND DAUGHTER'S  
IDENTITY STATUS

	I.A.	Morato- rium	Foreclo- sure	Diffusion	H	P
Mean Rank....	17.60	19.70	31.85	33.50	10.80	.02

Table 14 suggests that foreclosure and diffusion subjects show more autonomy difficulties vis-a-vis their mothers of the type that precludes expressing intense hostility towards them than do identity achievement and moratorium subjects. In order to see if this difference was significant, the Scheffé method was employed using the ranks as scores. An average of the means of the foreclosure and diffusion groups was compared with an average of the means of the identity achievement and moratorium groups. This comparison yielded a value of  $t = 3.14$ , which is significant at  $p < .05$ . This result indicates that the difference described above is significant.

In summary, 9 factors involving the mother's behavior towards the daughter, and 4 factors involving the daughter's behavior toward the mother reflected separation-impeding patterns. Three of these 13 factors represented patterns that were not specified in the literature on separation-individuation. What these 3 patterns had in common was

the juxtaposition of hostility between mother and daughter and separation, or, conversely, the juxtaposition of absence of hostility between mother and daughter and inadequate separation.

None of the factors involving separation-impeding behavior of the mother towards the daughter, either from the mother's point of view or from that of the daughter, differentiated significantly among the identity statuses. Possible reasons for the failure of these factors to show the predicted significant relationship to identity status will be discussed in the next chapter.

Two of the factors involving separation-impeding behavior of the daughter towards the mother differentiated significantly among the identity statuses. One of them seemed to involve the daughter's detaching herself from the mother through a process of criticism of and dissatisfaction with her. The moratorium group seemed to be engaged in this process; the other three groups did not. The other factor that differentiated significantly among the identity statuses involved a pattern of low autonomy and absence of intense hostility vis-a-vis the mother. This pattern characterized the foreclosure and diffusion groups, but not the identity achievement or moratorium groups.

#### Additional Factors that Differentiated Among the Identity Statuses

The first factor generated by the factor analysis of the daughters' responses to those items concerning their mothers attitudes and behaviors towards them was labeled general positive: affection, acceptance, respect and nurturance. When subjects in the four identity statuses were compared on this factor, the presence of a trend was revealed.

Table 15 presents the results of the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance done on the scores for this factor after they were converted to ranks. (Note that the higher the rank, the more positive the daughter feels her mother's general attitude towards her is.)

TABLE 15  
DEGREE TO WHICH DAUGHTER EXPERIENCES MOTHER AS HAVING A  
GENERALLY POSITIVE ATTITUDE TOWARDS HER, AND  
DAUGHTER'S IDENTITY STATUS

	I.A.	Morato- rium	Foreclo- sure	Diffusion	H	P
Mean Rank...	32.80	27.54	19.46	16.30	6.62	.09

According to Table 15, daughters in the identity achievement and moratorium statuses tend to experience their mothers as having a more positive general attitude towards them than do daughters in the foreclosure and diffusion statuses. In order to see if this difference was significant, the Scheffé method was employed, using the ranks as scores. An average of the means of the identity achievement and moratorium groups was compared with an average of the means of the foreclosure and diffusion groups. This comparison yielded a value of  $t = 2.63$ ;  $p < .10$ . This result indicates that the difference described above is a trend. (Interestingly, the factor based on the mothers' view of how positive their general attitude towards their daughters were did not differentiate significantly among identity statuses.) No other comparisons done on

the means presented in Table 15 yielded significant results.

The first factor yielded by the factor analysis of the mothers' responses to those items concerning their daughters' attitudes and behaviors towards themselves was labeled high self-esteem, self-confidence, self-satisfaction. When subjects were grouped according to their daughter's identity status and compared on this factor, the presence of a trend was indicated. Table 16 presents the results of the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance done on the scores for this factor after they were converted to ranks. (Note that the higher the rank, the higher the daughter's self-esteem, according to her mother.)

TABLE 16  
DEGREE TO WHICH MOTHER SEES DAUGHTER AS SELF-CONFIDENT  
AND SELF-SATISFIED, AND DAUGHTER'S IDENTITY  
STATUS

	I.A.	Morato- rium	Foreclo- sure	Diffusion	H	P
Mean Rank...	30.80	19.17	28.85	31.17	7.12	.07

Table 16 suggests that mothers of daughters in the moratorium group tend to see their daughters as less self-confident and less satisfied with themselves than do mothers of daughters in any of the other three statuses. In order to see if this difference was significant, the Scheffé method was employed, using the ranks as scores. A comparison of the mean of the moratorium group with an average of the means of the identity

achievement, foreclosure, and identity diffusion groups yielded a value of  $t = 2.76$ ;  $p < .10$ . This result indicates that the difference described above is a trend.

It is possible that the upheaval and self questioning that the moratorium subject is experiencing causes lowered self-esteem. The factors based on the daughters' own descriptions of themselves resulted in no significant differences among the identity statuses, but two such factors that resulted in nearly significant differences are consistent with the view of moratorium subjects as the opposite of complacent, and as self-critical.

The second factor yielded by the factor analysis of the daughters' responses to those items concerning their mothers' attitudes and behaviors towards themselves was labeled self dislike, self contempt. When subjects in the four identity statuses were compared on this factor a trend was found to exist. Table 17 presents the results of the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance done on the scores for this factor after they were converted to ranks. (Note that the higher the rank, the more the daughter sees the mother as disliking herself.)

TABLE 17  
DEGREE TO WHICH DAUGHTER SEES MOTHER AS DISLIKING  
HERSELF, AND DAUGHTER'S IDENTITY STATUS

	I.A.	Moratorium	Foreclosure	Diffusion	H	P
Mean Rank....	23.40	28.29	23.62	12.17	6.50	.09

Table 17 suggests that daughters in the diffusion group tend to see their mothers as disliking themselves less than is the case for daughters in any of the other identity statuses. In order to see if this difference was significant, the Scheffé method was employed, using the ranks as scores. A comparison of the mean of the identity diffusion group with an average of the means of the identity achievement, moratorium, and foreclosure groups yielded a value of  $t = 2.14$ ;  $p > .10$ . This result indicates that the difference described above is not significant. When moratorium daughters were compared with diffusion daughters regarding the degree to which they saw their mothers as disliking themselves, the presence of a trend was revealed with the moratorium daughters being higher than the diffusion daughters ( $t = 2.63$ ;  $p < .10$ ). All other comparisons of the means presented in Table 17 yielded insignificant results.

The factors based on the mothers' own descriptions of themselves result in no significant or even near significant differences between groups. However, the daughters in the diffusion groups not only tend to see their mothers as not disliking themselves; they also may see themselves this way. (Diffusion subjects were lower than the other three statuses on a factor labeled self-hatred:  $p = .15$ ). In their interviews, the diffusion subjects came across as confused, unhappy, and as having difficulty maintaining adequate self-esteem. Therefore, it is difficult to know how to interpret their seeing their mothers and perhaps also themselves as having less than the average amount of problems with self-dislike. Perhaps this constitutes an attempt to deny feelings of self-dislike. It may also be a consequence of a

passive, resigned attitude towards the self on the part of mother and daughter, where change, and achievement of goals is not expected, and therefore, dissatisfaction with self is minimized.

#### Tentative Nature of These Results

Because 48 separate tests of significance were done using the factor scores, approximately 5 would be expected to be significant by chance when  $p = .10$ . The number of tests that were significant was 5. Therefore, all of the significant results reported in this chapter may be due to chance. Replication of these results in future studies is necessary before their validity can be established.

## CHAPTER FIVE

## DISCUSSION

The HypothesesHypothesis #1

The results of this study do not support the hypothesis that success in handling the identity crisis in late-adolescence is related to a low number of separation-impeding interaction patterns in the mother-daughter relationship. Subjects in identity achievement and moratorium identity statuses, and their mothers, are just as likely to report the existence of behaviors and attitudes on the part of both mother and daughter which are theoretically considered to be separation-impeding as are subjects and mothers of subjects in the foreclosure and diffusion statuses.

One possible interpretation of these results is that the variable of mother-daughter separation is not an important one in predicting the fate of the late-adolescent woman's identity crisis. However, other unpredicted results of the present study suggest that the young women in the two healthier identity statuses have achieved more separation from their mothers than have the young women in at least one of the two less healthy identity statuses (identity foreclosure). These results involve the degree to which each daughter is able to accurately pinpoint areas of divergence of perception between herself and her mother. It seems to the author that this dimension can serve as a rough index of the degree to

which the daughter's internal representations of self and mother are both separate and articulated. The daughters in the identity foreclosure status were significantly less accurate on this dimension than were the daughters in the other three statuses, thus suggesting that inadequate separation of daughter from mother is related to one type of identity problem (identity foreclosure). Why then, was there no relationship between the index of separation-impeding mother-daughter interaction patterns and identity status (Hypothesis #1)? There are two possible explanations.

First, it is possible that the mother-daughter interaction patterns described in Chapter One under the heading of separation-impeding interaction patterns, are not in fact crucial determinants of whether or not the late-adolescent daughter is able to separate from the mother. The separation-impeding interaction patterns outlined in Chapter One were derived, in great part, from general theoretical notions about the nature of separation-impeding interaction, and from empirical study of the separation-individuation period in early childhood. They were not, for the most part, derived from an empirical study of the normal separation-individuation process during adolescence. Perhaps these interaction patterns play a crucial role in determining the outcome of the separation-individuation period in early childhood, but are superseded by a different set of mother-daughter interaction patterns which are crucial in impeding separation in adolescence. The adolescent separation-individuation period, like the separation-individuation period that

occurs in early childhood, probably has its own sequence of phases, each of which requires a particular change in the adolescent's way of relating to her parents in order for optimum development to occur. Perhaps more study of the phases in the normal adolescent separation process is needed before the factors that impede progress through each phase can be determined.

The present study provides insight into what some of the phases in the normal separation process for late adolescent women may be. For example, tentative results derived from the factor analysis suggest that open criticism of, disillusionment with, and detachment from the mother on the part of the late-adolescent daughter occur in those subjects who are actively struggling to form an independent identity (moratorium group). These same subjects are relatively accurate in perceiving areas of divergence of perception between themselves and their mothers. Therefore, it is possible that open dissatisfaction with and detachment from the mother may be an important part of the moratorium phase of the normal separation process in late-adolescent women. Perhaps, if the daughter feels secure enough in her relationship with her mother, and/or strong enough within herself to be able to be frankly dissatisfied with and distant from her mother, it does not matter whether the mother is domineering, overprotective, or exhibits any of the other separation-impeding interaction patterns described in Chapter One, because the separation process will occur anyway. Conversely, if the daughter is inhibited in her expression of anger and distance vis-a-vis her mother, separation may not occur, even in the absence of the separation-

impeding patterns on which Hypothesis #1 was based.

An alternative explanation for the lack of support for Hypothesis #1 involves the possibility that the author's Separation Problems Subscale of the IPM is not a valid measure of the degree to which the separation-impeding interaction patterns outlined in Chapter One exist in the mother-daughter relationships of the subjects. The validity of the subscale can be questioned on the grounds that it is totally dependent on the subjects' conscious awareness of the dynamics of their mother-daughter relationships. It is true that both members of the mother-daughter pair are asked about their relationship, so that the defensiveness would have to be mutual for an existing pattern to go unreported, but it is certainly conceivable that this could occur. In fact, it is probably most likely to occur in more regressed, symbiotic relationships. The use of family projective techniques like the Relation Rorschach (Loveland, 1967), adapted for use with mothers and their late-adolescent daughters, or direct observation and content analysis of the interaction between mother and daughter in order to assess the degree of separation-impeding interaction existing in the mother-daughter relationship, would control for possible confounding effects of degree of insight and defensiveness characteristic of the subjects, and might yield different results. The use of these techniques with a non-clinical population like the one in the present study would, in the author's opinion, be a worthwhile direction for future research.

### Hypothesis #2

The results of this study also do not support the hypothesis that success in handling the identity crisis in late-adolescence is related to accurate perception of the late-adolescent daughter on the part of her mother. When asked to predict their daughters' responses to a questionnaire that concerned both the mother-daughter relationship, and personality characteristics of both mother and daughter, (the IPM), mothers of subjects in the identity achievement and moratorium statuses were no more accurate than were mothers of subjects in the foreclosure and diffusion statuses in perceiving areas of divergence between their own views and those of their daughter, or in predicting their daughter's socially undesirable responses to this questionnaire.

As was the case for the separation-impeding interaction patterns on which Hypothesis #1 was based, accuracy of perception of the daughter by the mother may be an important determinant of the fate of the separation-individuation period in early childhood. It would seem that healthy development of self-representations in the very young child is quite dependent on parental feedback that clearly recognizes the child's individuality. The failure to confirm Hypothesis #2 suggests that, by the time the individual reaches late-adolescence, healthy development of self-representations no longer depends on accurate parental perception and feedback. In fact, it is the search for confirmation of one's individuality from people outside the family, especially peers, that is considered typically adolescent (Blos, 1962).

The author assumed that if a mother was accurate in her perception of her daughter in early childhood, she would continue to be accurate in her perception of her daughter when the daughter reached late-adolescence. This may not be a valid assumption. It is possible that many late-adolescents do not allow their mothers to know them very well during this period in order to facilitate separation. If this is a common pattern, the variable of maternal accuracy of perception of the late-adolescent daughter would not be a good predictor of the fate of identity formation and separation in the late-adolescent daughter, because it would fail to distinguish between maternal inaccuracy caused by the daughter's attempts to distance herself from her mother, and maternal inaccuracy caused by emotional problems on the part of the mother.

It seems to the author that, as was true for Hypothesis #1, the rationale for Hypothesis #2 was not sufficiently grounded in empirical study of the normal adolescent separation process. The author believes that this is an important direction for future research, and that some of the unpredicted results of the present study are relevant to the understanding of this process.

#### Identity and Identification

The results of this study strongly suggest that the variable of mother-daughter identification is an influential one in the process of identity formation for late-adolescent women. Subjects in the identity achievement status showed significantly higher identification with their mothers than did subjects in the diffusion and moratorium statuses. Subjects in the foreclosure status occupied an inter-

mediate position with regard to mother-daughter identification.

These results partially support Dignan's (1965) research which suggests that degree of identification with mother is positively correlated with degree of identity achievement in late adolescent women, in that the subjects who had passed through the identity crisis period successfully (identity achievement status), had the highest degree of identification with their mothers, while the subjects who are considered to be the least adequate in their handling of the identity crisis (identity diffusion status) showed very low identification with their mothers.

However, the moratorium subjects, who are defined as being in the midst of a struggle to evolve an adult identity, are also characterized by low identification with their mothers. Since most of these moratorium subjects seemed to be on the way to forming a stable, non-constricted adult identity, and since all of the identity achievement subjects describe themselves as having gone through a moratorium period, it seems reasonable to consider these two statuses as, to a large extent, representing the same population at different stages of the identity formation process. This suggests that a sequence of events involving disruption of identifications with the mother followed by re-establishment of identifications with her occurs during late-adolescence for the relatively healthy young woman. The writings of Erikson (1968) and Jacobson (1964) allude to this possibility. The results of the present study imply that the disruption of identifications and the moratorium phase of identity formation are intimately connected, and that moving from the moratorium phase to identity achievement may require a re-integration

of parental identifications. A longitudinal approach would be valuable in testing out whether in fact the same subjects are low identifiers with their mothers in the moratorium phase, and high identifiers with their mothers when they reach identity achievement. The results of this study suggest that this would be the case, and that Dignan's (1965) idea that degree of mother-daughter identification is positively correlated with degree of identity achievement is an oversimplification.

Awareness of Divergence of Perception  
Between Mother and Late-Adolescent  
Daughter

The amount of divergence of perception between mothers and their late-adolescent daughters was almost universally underestimated by both mothers and daughters. In other words, the vast majority of late-adolescent women and their mothers (93 out of 96), thought their perceptions were more similar to those of the other member of the mother-daughter pair than they actually were. It is quite possible that the tendency to err in this direction exists in all human relationships: if two members of a dyad have not made a point of revealing their respective views of a given piece of mutually experienced reality, it may be natural to assume that the other member views it in the way that seems most accurate to the first member.

However, there are interesting group differences in the extent to which divergence of perception between mother and daughter is underestimated. The daughters in the study showed less under-

estimation of amount of divergence of perception between themselves and their mothers than their mothers did. Also, the daughters were more accurate in pinpointing areas of divergence of perception than were their mothers. Both differences were highly significant. These findings suggest that the awareness of divergence of perception between mother and late-adolescent daughter is much more important to the daughter than it is to the mother. Perhaps this is because the daughter, who is struggling to loosen dependency ties to the parents (Blos, 1962, 1967), is aided in this process by an increased awareness of areas in which she and her mother see things differently. The mother has no corresponding need to loosen the ties and, in fact, as Stierlin (1974) points out, this process may be resisted by her because it threatens to trigger her own developmental crisis around growing old. Therefore, she would have less investment in differentiating herself from her daughter than visa-versa.

It seems that an increased awareness of the areas of divergence of perception between themselves and their mothers is characteristic of late-adolescent women. However, the young women in the identity foreclosure status depart from this pattern. They are significantly less accurate in pinpointing areas of divergence of perception vis-a-vis their mothers, and experience significantly less such divergence of perception than is the case for any of the other identity statuses. It was argued in the last paragraph that a relatively high awareness of areas of divergence between self and mother might be helpful in the struggle to loosen the dependent tie to the mother. It seems

to the author that the disruption of mother-daughter identifications during late-adolescence is a related phenomenon and might serve a similar function. Neither of these processes is characteristic of the foreclosure group. Perhaps these young women are not moving towards a loosening of ties to parents, but are instead maintaining strong ties to parents. From their interview material they seem to fall into two subgroups: The first subgroup is characterized by obvious dependence on their mothers. The second subgroup is characterized by apparent early independence, which was probably premature. Needs for attention and security rather than needs for autonomy seemed characteristic of them. In both subgroups, the tie to the parents is maintained rather than loosened.

The mothers of foreclosure subjects experienced less divergence of perception vis-a-vis their daughters than did mothers of daughters in any of the other identity statuses. (This was a trend.) Thus, both foreclosure subjects and their mothers depart from the rest of their respective samples in their marked underestimation of mother-daughter divergence. The age-appropriate separation of daughter from mother seems not to be occurring in these subjects.

Diffusion subjects and their mothers resemble the two more healthy identity statuses more than they resemble the foreclosure status in their awareness of divergence of perception between mother and daughter. It seems that diffusion subjects have loosened the dependent tie to the mother, but doing this has not been sufficient to ensure successful passage through the identity crisis. In their interview material, they come across as distant from their mothers,

(and fathers), but as seriously lacking in autonomy. They seem to be extremely dependent on people outside the immediate family. Sometimes the object of the dependency fluctuates; in some cases it remains constant. All 6 of the diffusion subjects in the sample seem to be struggling with an extremely strong regressive pull that is apparently actively encouraged by their parents: These are the women whose parents encourage them not to work, not to have a career, to find a rich man and get married, in short, to be passive. The parents' message also seems to involve being manipulative and exploitative; "Get someone to take care of you".

#### Identity Status and Negative Feelings

Daughters in all of the identity statuses except foreclosure, tend to give more socially undersirable responses to the IPM than their mothers do. For the foreclosure subjects, the reverse is true. In other words, only in the foreclosure status is the mother more critical and negative than the daughter in her descriptions of the mother-daughter relationship, the mother's personality, and the daughter's personality. Other tentative results of the present study based on the factor analysis suggest that dissatisfaction and disillusionment with the mother on the part of the daughter is an important part of healthy separation and identity formation in the moratorium phase of late-adolescence. For the foreclosure subjects, the roles are reversed when it comes to experiencing dissatisfaction: the mother experiences more of it than the daughter. This may be one reason why foreclosure subjects are relatively unsuccessful in separating from their mothers.

As is true for the two more healthy identity statuses, diffusion subjects are more critical and negative than are their mothers in their descriptions of the mother-daughter relationship. However, other tentative results of the present study based on the factor analysis suggest that they may not communicate these critical feelings to their mothers. (Diffusion subjects and foreclosure subjects scored significantly higher than identity achievement and moratorium subjects on a factor involving both low autonomy vis-a-vis the mother, and the absence of intense disparagement of her.)

Thus, the present study provides some tentative evidence that identity achievement and moratorium subjects have less trouble expressing hostility openly in their relationships with their mothers than do foreclosure and diffusion subjects. Additional tentative results derived from the factor analysis suggest that young women in the two more healthy identity statuses experience their mothers as having a more positive attitude towards them than do foreclosure or diffusion subjects. These results, taken together, suggest that the mothers of young women in the two more healthy identity statuses may be better able to tolerate their daughters' anger and criticism than are the mothers of young women in the two less healthy identity statuses.

#### Late Adolescence: Three Developmental Lines

Theoretical and empirical work on the adolescent identity crisis suggests that, broadly speaking, three different outcomes of this crisis are possible: identity achievement, identity foreclosure, and identity diffusion. The first outcome is considered desirable. The

last two outcomes are considered undesirable because they are characterized by either personality constriction (identity foreclosure) or personality disorganization (identity diffusion). The results of this study suggest that, for late-adolescent women, each of these outcomes is related to differences in the evolution of the mother-daughter relationship during the late-adolescent period. These differences will now be summarized.

#### The Developmental Line Which Ends in Identity Achievement: Normal Late-Adolescence

This developmental line includes the moratorium phase and the identity achievement phase. The results of the present study show that subjects who are in a moratorium period with regard to identity issues are characterized by low identification with their mothers. It seems likely that, in most cases, identification with the mother was not always low, but instead, has been disrupted during this period. The author further believes that this disruption of identifications with the mother is stimulated by, and in turn stimulates, the process of separation from the mother. (The daughter's need to differentiate herself from her mother motivates her to renounce identifications with her mother, which in turn, makes the daughter feel more different from her mother.) Subjects in the moratorium phase are characterized by an awareness of the areas where their own perceptions diverge from those of their mothers, thus suggesting that some degree of separation from their mothers has occurred. The subjects in the moratorium phase appear to be engaged in an intensive effort to loosen the dependent tie to the parents as well as to form an independent identity. These two processes seem to be intimately

connected. Each stimulates the other.

One interpretation of the data from the women in the moratorium phase is that their movement through this phase is temporarily dominated by open criticism of, dissatisfaction with, and distance from the mother. Yet, other trends in the data suggest that the bond between mother and daughter is not ruptured during the moratorium phase. In spite of the daughter's open devaluation of the mother, and of her need for her, the daughter in the moratorium phase experiences her mother's attitude towards her as basically positive; as one of affection and respect. These results support Stierlin's (1974) theory that a "loving fight" between the adolescent and his or her parents is the mechanism through which healthy separation is accomplished, and the stage is set for subsequent identity achievement and reconciliation with the parents.

The author also sees parallels between the process of distancing from parents without rupture of the bond between parent and adolescent, and the practicing subphase of the separation-individuation period in early childhood (Mahler, 1965, 1968, 1970). Both are characterized by a decisive and triumphant moving away from the mother, and are dependent on the continued support and availability of the mother for their success. Mahler has demonstrated that during the practicing subphase of the separation-individuation period in early childhood, it is of critical importance that the mother tolerate the child's physical distancing from her, and that she be available for "emotional refueling" when the child needs her. During late-adolescence, perhaps it is critical that the mother (and father as well), be able

to tolerate the late-adolescent's emotional distancing, and her anger when it is in the service of self-assertion, without becoming so threatened that the tie between parent and adolescent is in danger of being ruptured. The present study provides tentative evidence that a separation process involving anger and distance toward the mother on the part of the daughter, without rupture of the mother-daughter bond, is what occurs during the moratorium phase.

A comparison of subjects classified as identity achievement and those classified as moratorium can provide insight into what the transition from the moratorium phase to the identity achievement phase might entail. Identity achievement subjects show a higher degree of identification with their mothers than do any other late-adolescent women. Moratorium subjects are characterized by low identification with their mothers. Identity achievement subjects are not engaged in a process of criticizing and distancing themselves from their mothers; moratorium subjects are. Both identity achievement and moratorium subjects show relatively high awareness of areas of divergence of perception between themselves and their mothers, are not inhibited in experiencing or expressing hostility towards their mothers, and experience their mothers as having a basically positive attitude towards them.

It is possible that the moratorium phase gives way to the identity achievement phase when the young woman begins to feel more secure in her achievement of autonomy vis-a-vis her mother. Perhaps she no longer is as strongly tempted to regress to a dependent position in her relationship with her mother, and, having asserted her individua-

lity in a variety of situations, perhaps she feels more secure and relaxed about it. At this point, it would no longer be so threatening for the young woman to admit that she is similar to her mother in certain respects, and even to establish new identifications with this mother who now views her as a young adult rather than as a child (Jacobson, 1964). Thus, the amount of identification with the mother would increase, but the identifications would be integrated into an independent personality, the structure of which has changed considerably during the moratorium period.

The end of the moratorium phase and the beginning of the identity achievement phase also seems to involve a shift in the major theme of the mother-daughter relationship. Where there was previously a need on the part of the daughter to actively promote distance between herself and her mother through aggressive self-assertion, there is now the ability to tolerate greater closeness and harmony.

In the author's opinion, there are parallels between this 'identity achievement phase' of late-adolescence, and the rapprochement subphase of the separation-individuation period in early childhood. The author is suggesting that in this identity achievement phase, the daughter needs to establish a type of closeness with her mother that is qualitatively different from the mother-daughter closeness that preceded the adolescent autonomy struggle. It is a closeness based on the mother's recognition of her daughter as an independent young adult. In the rapprochement subphase, there is also a re-establishment of closeness between mother and child that differs

from the symbiotic union that preceded the first two separation-individuation subphases. It is a closeness involving recognition of the child as a separate individual.

#### The Developmental Line Which Ends in Identity Foreclosure

Young women who show the foreclosure pattern of identity formation differ from those in the moratorium phase of the identity achievement pattern on all of the variables discussed in this chapter. They show relatively low awareness of areas of divergence of perception between themselves and their mothers, they are characterized by moderate identification with their mothers, they are not engaged in a process of distancing themselves from their mothers through critical self-assertion vis-a-vis their mothers, they are inhibited in experiencing and expressing anger towards their mothers, and they are relatively unsure of their mothers' affection and respect.

Clearly, the foreclosure subjects have not engaged in a struggle to differentiate themselves from their mothers and to loosen the dependent tie to her. In other words, the foreclosure subjects seem blocked in their ability to go through the moratorium phase. Instead, they seem to maintain and bolster the personality organization achieved during latency. The reason for this block may involve difficulty on the part of the mother in tolerating the aggressive, critical self-assertion on the part of the daughter that seems to lead to adequate separation in late-adolescence.

### The Developmental Line which Ends in Identity Diffusion

Young women who show the diffusion pattern of identity formation are similar to those in the moratorium phase of the identity achievement pattern in two important ways: They are relatively high in awareness of areas of divergence of perception between themselves and their mothers, and they show low identification with their mothers. They differ from the moratorium subjects in that they are not engaged in a process of distancing themselves from their mothers through critical self-assertion vis-a-vis her. In fact, they seem inhibited in expressing anger towards their mothers, and they are not as sure of their mothers' affection and respect as are the moratorium and identity achievement subjects.

It seems plausible that, as was true for the foreclosure subjects, the diffusion subjects are blocked in their ability to go through the moratorium phase, but their problems with it are different from those of foreclosure subjects. Whereas, the foreclosure subjects resist differentiation and distance from their mothers, the diffusion subjects certainly seem to experience this. In fact, it was the author's impression from the interview material that these subjects were too distant from their mothers; they seemed indifferent towards their mothers. They described their mothers as weak and as not having much to offer them. Perhaps diffusion subjects are blocked in their ability to separate from parents by means of the "loving fight" (Stierlin, 1974) because there is not a sufficient amount of positive feeling between them and their parents. (This is quite different from the problem of the foreclosure subjects who seem to feel they

must suppress and repress negative feelings towards and differences from their parents.) Perhaps the mother-daughter bond has been ruptured for the diffusion subjects, rather than gradually loosened and transformed. Perhaps the difficulties of the diffusion subjects illustrate the important point that the separation process, in order to be adaptive, must always result in the transformation of an object relationship rather than its destruction.

APPENDIX A

MEASURES; INSTRUCTIONS TO SUBJECTS AND RATERS

CONSENT FORM

I would like to interview you about some of your experiences. I will be asking you about your beliefs and about your relationship with your parents. The discussion will be taped. You have my assurance that the material on this tape will be kept in confidence. It will be heard only by professionals like myself who are assisting me with this research. Under no circumstances will I allow anyone else to hear this tape.

Please bear in mind that this study is intended to focus upon characteristics of groups of people, and not of individuals. It is in no way intended to gather information about you as an individual. In order to insure your complete anonymity, you will be assigned a subject number which will be the only identifying code on the the tape and on all subsequent data analysis.

You will be paid \$7.00 in cash for participating in this research.

-----

I have read the paragraphs above and have been given the opportunity to satisfy any and all questions I had relating to the material contained therein. I understand that the answers that I shall give will be held in the strictest confidence.

I give my informed consent to participate in this study.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(signed by)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(date)

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Subject Number \_\_\_\_\_
2. Age \_\_\_\_\_
3. College \_\_\_\_\_
4. Which year? \_\_\_\_\_
5. Major \_\_\_\_\_
6. Marital Status \_\_\_\_\_
7. Ever been in therapy? \_\_\_\_\_ Dates \_\_\_\_\_
8. Father's occupation \_\_\_\_\_
9. Has he ever worked at anything else? If so, describe below.
  
10. Mother's occupation \_\_\_\_\_
11. Has she ever worked at anything else? If so, describe below.

CONSENT FORM

Your daughter has indicated that you would be willing to fill out two questionnaires as part of a research project in which she has already participated. You have my assurance that your answers will be held in the strictest confidence.

Please bear in mind that this study is intended to focus upon characteristics of groups of people and not of individuals. It is in no way intended to gather information about you as an individual. In order to insure your complete anonymity, you will be assigned a subject number, which will be the only identifying code on the questionnaires and on all subsequent data analysis.

The completed questionnaires and this form should be sent to me in the envelope provided for that purpose. Upon receipt of your questionnaires I, Jill Allen, will send you a check for \$3.00. If you have any question about the study, please call me (evenings) at 701-2420. Please do not consult with your daughter in filling out the questionnaires.

I have read the paragraphs above and have been given the opportunity to satisfy any and all questions I had relating to the material contained therein. I understand that the answers I shall give will be held in the strictest confidence.

I give my informed consent to participate in this study.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(signed by)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(date)

Please write your home address below so I can send you a check.

Dear Participant,

Please try not to worry about making a good impression when you answer these questionnaires.

All relationships, especially those between children and parents, have their problems. But, sometimes, in answering questionnaires like this, people present a picture of what they want their relationship to be, rather than what their relationship is like in their own minds. What I want you to do is tell me how things really are, at this point, between you and your daughter.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

*Jill Allen*

## IDENTITY STATUS INTERVIEW

A. Occupation

1. Have you made any career plans yet?
2. When did you decide on them?
3. What made you choose \_\_\_\_\_?
4. Was it hard to make the decision? Had you ever considered anything else? Was there ever a period when you were unsure of what you wanted?
5. Did your parents want you to go into any particular career? What would they like to see you do?
6. How willing do you think you would be to change your goals? What might make you change them?

B. Religion

1. How do you feel about religion? Do you believe in God?
2. How and when did you arrive at this way of thinking?
3. Did you ever feel differently? Did you ever feel unsure of your beliefs?
4. What are your parents' religious beliefs?
5. How do they feel about yours?
6. How likely are you to change your beliefs?
7. Are you involved in religious activities or discussions?

C. Politics

1. What are your political views? Are there any issues that you feel strongly about?
2. How and when did you arrive at these beliefs?
3. Did you ever feel differently? Did you ever feel unsure of your political views?
4. What are your parents' political views?
5. How do your parents feel about your political views?
6. How likely are you to change your political beliefs?
7. Are you involved in any political activities or discussions?

D. Pre-Marital Intercourse

1. What are your views on pre-marital intercourse? What criteria do you use to determine your actions?
2. How and when did you develop these views?
3. Have you always felt this way? Have you ever had any doubts? How did you resolve them?
4. What do your parents think about your sexual values and behavior?
5. Do you ever feel that your values are hard to carry out? Do you ever feel like doing something that conflicts with your values? What do you do? How frequently does this occur?
6. How likely are your values in this area to change?

E. Clothing

1. How would you describe your style of dress?
2. Has this always been your style? Did you ever dress differently?
3. Have you ever been unsure of how you wanted to dress?
4. Who do you dress to please?
5. Who do you go shopping with?
6. Do you ever have trouble deciding what you like?
7. How does your mother dress?
8. How does she want you to dress?
9. Do you think your style of dress will change? Do you want it to?

F. Child-Rearing Practices

1. What are your views about bringing up children? Are there any issues in this area that you feel strongly about?
2. How did you arrive at these beliefs? When?
3. Did you ever feel differently? Were you ever unsure of your views?
4. What were your mother's child rearing practices?
5. Are there any areas in which you would do things differently from her?
6. How likely are you to change your views?

Criteria for Identity Status Ratings in the  
Two Interview Areas Added by the Author

Clothing (Style of Dress)

A subject is rated identity achievement in this area if the following description is true of her: Her style of dress has undergone some change during her adolescence. At this point she knows what she likes and what she doesn't like; what expresses her personality and what doesn't. She is satisfied with her style. She does not feel, for example, that she would wear different clothes if she only had the courage. She dresses mainly for herself, and perhaps to a lesser extent for a boyfriend.

A subject is rated moratorium in this area if the following description is true of her: Her style of dress is in the process of changing. She feels she is moving in a particular direction and has not gotten there yet, or she is experimenting in order to find a style with which she is comfortable.

A subject is rated identity foreclosure in this area if the following description is true of her: Her style of dress has not changed during her adolescence. Her taste is often similar to her mother's. In extreme cases, her mother usually accompanies her shopping and plays a large role in picking out the subject's clothes.

A subject is rated identity diffusion in this area if the following is true of her: She does not have a personal style of dress and is not moving in the direction of developing one. This can manifest itself in several ways. Her style of dress might undergo frequent radical changes. She might be willing to wear anything either be-

cause she would feel comfortable in anything or because she is completely indifferent about clothes. A third possible manifestation of identity diffusion in this area would involve being unable to make up her mind about what to buy, and depending on others (excluding her mother) to decide for her.

### Child-Rearing Practices

This is not an area that is explicitly discussed while a child is growing up. Instead, the child learns his family's values in this area on a preconscious level, through his or her own experiences. Therefore, most subjects will not have held definite views in this area during childhood.

A subject is rated identity achievement in this area if the following description is true of her: She has definite views in this area which have developed as a result of thinking about these issues during adolescence. Her beliefs differ in some way from those of her parents.

A subject is rated moratorium in this area if the following description is true of her: She is in the process of thinking about and struggling with questions in this area. She is most typically questioning some of her parents' child-rearing practices.

A subject is rated identity foreclosure in this area if the following description is true of her: She has definite views in this area which correspond, for the most part, with those of her parents, or of some authority. She typically has no criticism of the way she was brought up.

A subject is rated identity diffusion in this area if the following description is true of her: She often has no opinions in this area. Questions about how she would raise a child have never occurred to her.

Modifications of the IPM Made by the Author

Dyadic Issues from the IPM Omitted by the Author

1. can't come to terms with
2. pities
3. lets down
4. is good to
5. is at one with
6. creates difficulties for
7. believes in
8. gets into a false position

Dyadic Issues Added by the Author

1. feels shows good common sense
2. chief confidant is

Changes in Wording Instituted in Order to Clarify Whether or Not to Include Item in Separation Problems Subscale

1. 'is dissappointed in' was changed to 'has turned out to be the type of daughter (mother) I wanted'.
2. 'takes good care of' was changed to 'takes good care of when necessary'.
3. 'doubts' was changed to 'has doubts about daughter's (mother's) ability to take care of herself'.
4. 'analyzes' was changed to 'is always analyzing'.
5. 'worries' was changed to 'is always worrying'.

Changes in Wording in Order to Equalize the Number of Items Answered True and False Which Reflect Separation-Impeding Patterns

1. 'is afraid of' was changed to 'is not afraid of'.
2. 'finds fault with' was changed to 'rarely finds fault with'.
3. 'has doubts about (daughter's) ability to take care of herself' was changed to 'is confident of (daughter's) ability to take care of herself'.
4. 'won't let be self' was changed to 'lets be self'.

5. 'blames' was changed to 'rarely makes feel guilty'.
6. 'has lost hope for (daughter's) future' was changed to 'is hopeful about (daughter's future'.
7. 'has a warped view of' was changed to 'view of (daughter) contains no major distortions'.
8. 'makes a clown of' was changed to 'doesn't make a clown of'.
9. 'feels sorry for' was changed to 'rarely feels sorry for'.
10. 'spoils' was changed to 'doesn't spoil'.
11. 'humiliates' was changed to 'doesn't humiliate'.

MOTHER-DAUGHTER QUESTIONNAIRE

## DIRECTIONS

The following items concern your relationship with your

\_\_\_\_\_.

Each of the 54 items has two sections: A and B. In Section A, the questions are direct. In Section B, you will be putting yourself in your \_\_\_\_\_ place, and giving the answers you think she would give.

Read each statement and check the column to the right of the statement that best applies.

If you feel the statement is very true, put a check ( ) in the (++) column.

If it is slightly true, put a check in the (+) column.

If it is slightly untrue, put a check in the (-) column.

If it is very untrue, put a check in the (--) column.

Please do not leave any questions blank, and don't spend too much time on any one question.

In case there is more than one daughter in the family, remember that I am only interested in the relationship between the daughter serving as a subject and her mother. Whenever the word 'daughter' is used, it applies to her only.

1. A. How true do you think the following are?

1. My daughter understands me.
2. I understand my daughter.
3. My daughter understands herself.
4. I understand myself.

	++	+	-	--
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

B. How would your daughter answer the following?

1. "I understand my mother."
2. "My mother understands me."
3. "I understand myself."
4. "My mother understands herself."

	++	+	-	--
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

2. A. How true do you think the following are?

1. My daughter doesn't make up (or try to make up) my mind for me.
2. I don't make up (or try to make up) my daughter's mind for her.
3. My daughter makes doesn't make up her own mind.
4. I don't make up my own mind.

	++	+	-	--
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

B. How would your daughter answer the following?

1. "I don't make up (or try to make up) my mother's mind for her."
2. "My mother doesn't make up (or try to make up) my mind for me."
3. "I don't make up my own mind."
4. "My mother doesn't make up her own mind."

	++	+	-	--
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

3. A. How true do you think the following are?

1. My daughter is wrapped up in me.
2. I am wrapped up in my daughter.
3. My daughter is wrapped up in herself.
4. I am wrapped up in myself.

	++	+	-	--
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

B. How would your daughter answer the following?

1. "I am wrapped up in my mother."
2. "My mother is wrapped up in me."
3. "I am wrapped up in myself."
4. "My mother is wrapped up in herself."

	++	+	-	--
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

4. A. How true do you think the following are?

- 1. My daughter depends on me.
- 2. I depend on my daughter.
- 3. My daughter depends on herself.
- 4. I depend on myself.

	++	+	-	--
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

B. How would your daughter answer the following?

- 1. "I depend on my mother."
- 2. "My mother depends on me."
- 3. "I depend on myself."
- 4. "My mother depends on herself."

	++	+	-	--
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

5. A. How true do you think the following are?

- 1. My daughter takes me seriously.
- 2. I take my daughter seriously.
- 3. My daughter takes herself seriously.
- 4. I take myself seriously.

	++	+	-	--
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

B. How would your daughter answer the following?

- 1. "I take my mother seriously."
- 2. "My mother takes me seriously."
- 3. "I take myself seriously."
- 4. "My mother takes herself seriously."

	++	+	-	--
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

6. A. How true do you think the following are?

- 1. I have turned out to be the type of mother my daughter wanted.
- 2. My daughter has turned out to be the type of daughter I wanted.
- 3. My daughter has turned out to be the type of person she wanted to be.
- 4. I have turned out to be the type of person I wanted to be.

	++	+	-	--
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

B. How would your daughter answer the following?

- 1. "My mother has turned out to be the type of mother I wanted."
- 2. "I have turned out to be the type of daughter my mother wanted."
- 3. "I have turned out to be the type of person I wanted to be."
- 4. "My mother has turned out to be the type of person she wanted to be."

	++	+	-	--
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

7. A. How true do you think the following are?

1. My daughter can't stand me.

2. I can't stand my daughter.

3. My daughter can't stand herself.

4. I can't stand myself.

B. How would your daughter answer the following?

1. "I can't stand my mother."

2. "My mother can't stand me."

3. "I can't stand myself."

4. "My mother can't stand herself."

	++	+	-	---
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

8. A. How true do you think the following are?

1. My daughter takes good care of me when necessary.

2. I take good care of my daughter when necessary.

3. My daughter takes good care of herself when necessary.

4. I take good care of myself when necessary.

B. How would your daughter answer the following?

1. "I take good care of my mother when necessary."

2. "My mother takes good care of me when necessary."

3. "I take good care of myself when necessary."

4. "My mother takes good care of herself when necessary."

	++	+	-	---
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

9. A. How true do you think the following are?

1. My daughter would like to get away from me.

2. I would like to get away from my daughter.

3. My daughter would like to get away from herself.

4. I would like to get away from myself.

B. How would your daughter answer the following?

1. "I would like to get away from my mother."

2. "My mother would like to get away from me."

3. "I would like to get away from myself."

4. "My mother would like to get away from herself."

	++	+	-	---
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

10. A. How true do you think the following are?

- 1. My daughter is not afraid of me.
- 2. I am not afraid of my daughter.
- 3. My daughter is not afraid of herself.
- 4. I am not afraid of myself.

B. How would your daughter answer the following?

- 1. "I am not afraid of my mother."
- 2. "My mother is not afraid of me."
- 3. "I am not afraid of myself."
- 4. "My mother is not afraid of herself."

	++	+	-	---
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
1.	++	+	-	---
2.				
3.				
4.				

11. A. How true do you think the following are?

- 1. My daughter respects my opinions.
- 2. I respect my daughter's opinions.
- 3. My daughter respects her own opinions.
- 4. I respect my own opinions.

B. How would your daughter answer the following?

- 1. "I respect my mother's opinions."
- 2. "My mother respects my opinions."
- 3. "I respects my own opinions."
- 4. "My mother respects her own opinions."

	++	+	-	---
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
1.	++	+	-	---
2.				
3.				
4.				

12. A. How true do you think the following are?

- 1. My daughter makes me the center of her world.
- 2. I make my daughter the center of my world.
- 3. My daughter makes herself the center of her world.
- 4. I make myself the center of my world.

B. How would your daughter answer the following?

- 1. "I make my mother the center of my world."
- 2. "My mother makes me the center of her world."
- 3. "I make myself the center of my world."
- 4. "My mother makes herself the center of her world."

	++	+	-	---
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
1.	++	+	-	---
2.				
3.				
4.				

18.A. How true do you think the following are?

- 1. My daughter is mean with me.
- 2. I am mean with my daughter.
- 3. My daughter is mean with herself.
- 4. I am mean with myself.

	++	+	-	--
1				
2				
3				
4				

B. How would YOUR DAUGHTER answer the following?

- 1. "I am mean with my mother."
- 2. "My mother is mean with me."
- 3. "I am mean with myself."
- 4. "My mother is mean with herself."

	++	+	-	--
1				
2				
3				
4				

19.A. How true do you think the following are?

- 1. My mother's daughter loves me.
- 2. I love my daughter.
- 3. My daughter loves herself.
- 4. I love myself.

	++	+	-	--
1				
2				
3				
4				

B. How would YOUR DAUGHTER answer the following?

- 1. "I love my mother."
- 2. "My mother loves me."
- 3. "I love myself."
- 4. "My mother loves herself."

	++	+	-	--
1				
2				
3				
4				

15.A. How true do you think the following are?

- 1. My daughter tries to outdo me.
- 2. I try to outdo my daughter.
- 3. My daughter tries to outdo herself.
- 4. I try to outdo myself.

	++	+	-	--
1				
2				
3				
4				

B. How would YOUR DAUGHTER answer the following?

- 1. "I try to outdo my mother."
- 2. "My mother tries to outdo me."
- 3. "I try to outdo myself."
- 4. "My mother tries to outdo herself."

	++	+	-	--
1				
2				
3				
4				

15. How true do you think the following are?

- 1. My daughter fights with me.
- 2. I fight with my daughter.
- 3. My daughter fights with herself.
- 4. I fight with myself.

1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

B. How would YOUR DAUGHTER answer the following?

- 1. "I fight with my mother."
- 2. "My mother fights with me."
- 3. "I fight with myself."
- 4. "My mother fights with herself."

	++	+	-	- -
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

17. A. How would true do you think the following are?

- 1. My daughter torments me.
- 2. I torment my daughter.
- 3. My daughter torments herself.
- 4. I torment myself.

	++	+	-	- -
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

B. How would YOUR DAUGHTER answer the following?

- 1. "I torment my mother."
- 2. "My mother torments me."
- 3. "I torment myself."
- 4. "My mother torments herself."

	++	+	-	- -
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

18. A. How true do you think the following are?

- 1. My daughter takes responsibility for me.
- 2. I take responsibility for my daughter.
- 3. My daughter takes responsibility for herself.
- 4. I take responsibility for myself.

	++	+	-	- -
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

B. How would YOUR DAUGHTER answer the following?

- 1. "I take responsibility for my mother."
- 2. "My mother takes responsibility for me."
- 3. "I take responsibility for myself."
- 4. "My mother takes responsibility for herself."

	++	+	-	- -
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

-7-

19. A. How true do you think the following are?

- 1. My daughter rarely finds fault with me.
- 2. I rarely find fault with my daughter.
- 3. My daughter rarely finds fault with her-  
self.
- 4. I rarely find fault with myself.

B. How would your daughter answer the following?

- 1. "I rarely find fault with my mother."
- 2. "My mother rarely finds fault with me."
- 3. "I rarely find fault with myself."
- 4. "My mother rarely finds fault with her-  
self."

20. A. How true do you think the following are?

- 1. My daughter lets me be myself.
- 2. I let my daughter be herself.
- 3. My daughter lets herself be herself.
- 4. I let myself be myself.

B. How would your daughter answer the following?

- 1. "I let my mother be herself."
- 2. "My mother lets me be myself."
- 3. "I let myself be myself."
- 4. "My mother lets herself be herself."

21. A. How true do you think the following are?

- 1. "My daughter couldn't care less about me."
- 2. "I couldn't care less about my daughter."
- 3. "My daughter couldn't care less about her-  
self."
- 4. "I couldn't care less about myself."

B. How would your daughter answer the follow-  
ing?

- 1. "I couldn't care less about my mother."
- 2. "My mother couldn't care less about me."
- 3. "I couldn't care less about myself."
- 4. "My mother couldn't care less about her-  
self."

	+	+	+	-	-
19. A.1					
19. A.2					
19. A.3					
19. A.4					
19. B.1	+	+	+	-	-
19. B.2					
19. B.3					
19. B.4					
20. A.1					
20. A.2					
20. A.3					
20. A.4					
20. B.1	+	+	+	-	-
20. B.2					
20. B.3					
20. B.4					
21. A.1					
21. A.2					
21. A.3					
21. A.4					
21. B.1	+	+	+	-	-
21. B.2					
21. B.3					
21. B.4					

22. A. How true do you think the following are?

1. My daughter is confident about my ability to take care of myself.
2. I am confident about my daughter's ability to take care of herself.
3. My daughter is confident about her ability to take care of herself.
4. I am confident about my ability to take care of myself.

B. How would your daughter answer the following?

1. "I am confident about my mother's ability to take care of herself."
2. "My mother is confident about my ability to take care of myself."
3. "I am confident about my ability to take care of myself."
4. "My mother is confident about her ability to take care of herself."

	++	+	-	--
1				
2				
3				
4				
B.1	++	+	-	--
B.2				
B.3				
B.4				

23. A. How true do you think the following are?

1. My daughter rarely makes contradictory demands on me.
2. I rarely make contradictory demands on my daughter.
3. My daughter rarely makes contradictory demands on herself.
4. I rarely make contradictory demands on myself.

B. How would your daughter answer the following?

1. "I rarely make contradictory demands on my mother."
2. "My mother rarely makes contradictory demands on me."
3. "I rarely make contradictory demands on myself."
4. "My mother rarely makes contradictory demands on herself."

	++	+	-	--
1				
2				
3				
4				
B.1	++	+	-	--
B.2				
B.3				
B.4				

24. A. How true do you think the following are?

1. My daughter gets on my nerves.
2. I get on my daughter's nerves.
3. My daughter gets on her own nerves.
4. I get on my own nerves.

B. How would your daughter answer the following?

1. "I get on my mother's nerves."
2. "My mother gets on my nerves."
3. "I get on my own nerves."
4. "My mother gets on her own nerves."

	++	+	-	--
1				
2				
3				
4				
B.1	++	+	-	--
B.2				
B.3				
B.4				

-9-

25.A. How true do you think the following are?

1. My daughter mocks me.

2. I mock my daughter.

3. My daughter mocks herself.

4. I mock myself.

	++	+	-	--
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

B. How would YOUR DAUGHTER answer the following?

1. "I mock my mother."

2. "My mother mocks me."

3. "I mock myself."

4. "My mother mocks herself."

	++	+	-	--
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

26.A. How true do you think the following are?

1. My daughter is honest with me.

2. I am honest with my daughter.

3. My daughter is honest with herself.

4. I am honest with myself.

	++	+	-	--
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

B. How would YOUR DAUGHTER answer the following?

1. "I am honest with my mother."

2. "My mother is honest with me."

3. "I am honest with myself."

4. "My mother is honest with herself."

	++	+	-	--
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

27.A. How true do you think the following are?

1. My daughter hates me.

2. I hate my daughter.

3. ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ My daughter hates herself.

4. I hate myself.

	++	+	-	--
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

B. How would YOUR DAUGHTER answer the following?

1. "I hate my mother."

2. "My mother hates me."

3. "I hate myself."

4. "My mother hates herself."

	++	+	-	--
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

-10-

28. A. How true do you think the following are?

- 1. My daughter is always analyzing me.
- 2. I am always analyzing my daughter.
- 3. My daughter is always analyzing herself.
- 4. I am always analyzing myself.

B. How would your daughter answer the following?

- 1. "I am always analyzing my mother."
- 2. "My mother is always analyzing me."
- 3. "I am always analyzing myself."
- 4. "My mother is always analyzing herself."

	<i>f</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>-</i>
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
	<i>f</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>-</i>
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

29. A. How true do you think the following are?

- 1. My daughter treats me like a machine.
- 2. I treat my daughter like a machine.
- 3. My daughter treats herself like a machine.
- 4. I treat myself like a machine.

B. How would your daughter answer the following?

- 1. "I treat my mother like a machine."
- 2. "My mother treats me like a machine."
- 3. "I treat myself like a machine."
- 4. "My mother treats herself like a machine."

	<i>f</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>-</i>
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
	<i>f</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>-</i>
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

30. A. How true do you think the following are?

- 1. My daughter expects too much of me.
- 2. I expect too much of my daughter.
- 3. My daughter expects too much of herself.
- 4. I expect too much of myself.

B. How would your daughter answer the following?

- 1. "I expect too much of my mother."
- 2. "My mother expects too much of me."
- 3. "I expect too much of myself."
- 4. "My mother expects too much of herself."

	<i>f</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>-</i>
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
	<i>f</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>-</i>
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

31. A. How true do you think the following are?

1. My daughter is always worrying about me.
2. I am always worrying about my daughter.
3. My daughter is always worrying about her-  
self.
4. I am always worrying about myself.

B. How would your daughter answer the following?

1. "I am always worrying about my mother."
2. "My mother is always worrying about me."
3. "I am always worrying about myself."
4. "My mother is always worrying about her-  
self."

32. A. How true do you think the following are?

1. My daughter can face up to my conflicts.
2. I can face up to my daughter's conflicts.
3. My daughter can face up to her own con-  
flicts.
4. I can face up to my own conflicts.

B. How would your daughter answer the following?

1. "I can face up to my mother's conflicts."
2. "My mother can face up to my conflicts."
3. "I can face up to my own conflicts."
4. "My mother can face up to her own con-  
flicts."

33. A. How true do you think the following are?

1. My daughter lets me be.
2. I let my daughter be.
3. My daughter lets herself be.
4. I let myself be.

B. How would your daughter answer the following?

1. "I let my mother be."
2. "My mother lets me be."
3. "I let myself be."
4. "My mother lets herself be."

34. A. How true do you think the following are?

- 1. My daughter rarely makes me feel guilty.
- 2. I rarely make my daughter feel guilty.
- 3. My daughter rarely makes herself feel guilty.
- 4. I rarely make myself feel guilty.

B. How would your daughter answer the following?

- 1. "I rarely make my mother feel guilty."
- 2. "My mother rarely makes me feel guilty."
- 3. "I rarely make myself feel guilty."
- 4. "My mother rarely makes herself feel guilty."

	++	+	-	---
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
	++	+	-	---
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

35. A. How true do you think the following are?

- 1. My daughter thinks highly of me.
- 2. I think highly of my daughter.
- 3. My daughter thinks highly of herself.
- 4. I think highly of myself.

B. How would your daughter answer the following?

- 1. "I think highly of my mother."
- 2. "My mother thinks highly of me."
- 3. "I think highly of myself."
- 4. "My mother thinks highly of herself."

	++	+	-	---
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
	++	+	-	---
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

36. A. How true do you think the following are?

- 1. My daughter deceives me.
- 2. I deceive my daughter.
- 3. My daughter deceives herself.
- 4. I deceive myself.

B. How would your daughter answer the following?

- 1. "I deceive my mother."
- 2. "My mother deceives me."
- 3. "I deceive myself."
- 4. "My mother deceives herself."

	++	+	-	---
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
	++	+	-	---
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

37. A. How true do you think the following are?

- 1. My daughter is hopeful about my future.
- 2. I am hopeful about my daughter's future.
- 3. My daughter is hopeful about her own future.
- 4. I am hopeful about my own future.

B. How would your daughter answer the following?

- 1. "I am hopeful about my mother's future."
- 2. "My mother is hopeful about my future."
- 3. "I am hopeful about my own future."
- 4. "My mother is hopeful about her own future."

	++	+	-	--
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
1.	++	+	-	--
2.				
3.				
4.				

38. A. How true do you think the following are?

- 1. My daughter likes me.
- 2. I like my daughter.
- 3. My daughter likes herself.
- 4. I like myself.

B. How would your daughter answer the following?

- 1. "I like my mother."
- 2. "My mother likes me."
- 3. "I like myself."
- 4. "My mother likes herself."

	++	+	-	--
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
1.	++	+	-	--
2.				
3.				
4.				

39. A. How true do you think the following are?

- 1. My daughter's view of me contains no major distortions.
- 2. My view of my daughter contains no major distortions.
- 3. My daughter's view of herself contains no major distortions.
- 4. My view of myself contains no major distortions.

B. How would your daughter answer the following?

- 1. "My view of my mother contains no major distortions."
- 2. "My mother's view of me contains no major distortions."
- 3. "My view of myself contains no major distortions."
- 4. "My mother's view of herself contains no major distortions."

	++	+	-	--
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
1.	++	+	-	--
2.				
3.				
4.				

40.A. How true do you think the following are?

- 1. My daughter readily forgives me.
- 2. I readily forgive my daughter.
- 3. My daughter readily forgives herself.
- 4. I readily forgive myself.

	++	+	-	--
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

B. How would YOUR DAUGHTER answer the following?

- 1. "I readily forgive my mother."
- 2. "My mother readily forgives me."
- 3. "I readily forgive myself."
- 4. "My mother readily forgives herself."

	++	+	-	--
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

41.A. How true do you think the following are?

- 1. My daughter puts me on a pedestal.
- 2. I put my daughter on a pedestal.
- 3. My daughter puts herself on a pedestal.
- 4. I put myself on a pedestal.

	++	+	-	--
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

B. How would YOUR DAUGHTER answer the following?

- 1. "I put my mother on a pedestal."
- 2. "My mother puts me on a pedestal."
- 3. "I put myself on a pedestal."
- 4. "My mother puts herself on a pedestal."

	++	+	-	--
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

42.A. How true do you think the following are?

- 1. My daughter is bitter towards me.
- 2. I am bitter towards my daughter.
- 3. My daughter is bitter towards herself.
- 4. I am bitter towards myself.

	++	+	-	--
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

B. How would YOUR DAUGHTER answer the following?

- 1. "I am bitter towards my mother."
- 2. "My mother is bitter towards me."
- 3. "I am bitter towards myself."
- 4. "My mother is bitter towards herself."

	++	+	-	--
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

43. A. How true do you think the following are?

1. My daughter belittles me.
2. I belittle my daughter.
3. My daughter belittles herself.
4. I belittle myself.

B. How would your daughter answer the following?

1. "I belittle my mother."
2. "My mother belittles me."
3. "I belittle myself."
4. "My mother belittles herself."

	++	+	-	--
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
1.	++	+	-	--
2.				
3.				
4.				

44. A. How true do you think the following are?

1. My daughter is detached from me.
2. I am detached from my daughter.
3. My daughter is detached from herself.
4. I am detached from myself.

B. How would your daughter answer the following?

1. "I am detached from my mother."
2. "My mother is detached from me."
3. "I am detached from myself."
4. "My mother is detached from herself."

	++	+	-	--
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
1.	++	+	-	--
2.				
3.				
4.				

45. A. How true do you think the following are?

1. My daughter doesn't make a clown of me.
2. I don't make a clown of my daughter.
3. My daughter doesn't make a clown of herself.
4. I don't make a clown of myself.

B. How would your daughter answer the following?

1. "I don't make a clown of my mother."
2. "My mother doesn't make a clown of me."
3. "I don't make a clown of myself."
4. "My mother doesn't make a clown of herself."

	++	+	-	--
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
1.	++	+	-	--
2.				
3.				
4.				

-16-

46. A. How true do you think the following are?

- 1. My daughter bewilders me.
- 2. I bewilder my daughter.
- 3. My daughter bewilders herself.
- 4. I bewilder myself.

B. How would your daughter answer the following?

- 1. "I bewilder my mother."
- 2. "My mother bewilders me."
- 3. "I bewilder myself."
- 4. "My mother bewilders herself."

	++	+	-	--
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
1.	++	+	-	--
2.				
3.				
4.				

47. A. How true do you think the following are?

- 1. My daughter doesn't humiliate me.
- 2. I don't humiliate my daughter.
- 3. My daughter doesn't humiliate herself.
- 4. I don't humiliate myself.

B. How would your daughter answer the following?

- 1. "I don't humiliate my mother."
- 2. "My mother doesn't humiliate me."
- 3. "I don't humiliate myself."
- 4. "My mother doesn't humiliate herself."

	++	+	-	--
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
1.	++	+	-	--
2.				
3.				
4.				

48. A. How true do you think the following are?

- 1. My daughter rarely feels sorry for me.
- 2. I rarely feel sorry for my daughter.
- 3. My daughter rarely feels sorry for herself.
- 4. I rarely feel sorry for myself.

B. How would your daughter answer the following?

- 1. "I rarely feel sorry for my mother."
- 2. "My mother rarely feels sorry for me."
- 3. "I rarely feel sorry for myself."
- 4. "My mother rarely feels sorry for herself."

	++	+	-	--
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
1.	++	+	-	--
2.				
3.				
4.				

49. A. How true do you think the following are?

- 1. My daughter makes me into a puppet.
- 2. I make my daughter into a puppet.
- 3. My daughter makes herself into a puppet.
- 4. I make myself into a puppet.

B. How would your daughter answer the following?

- 1. "I make my mother into a puppet."
- 2. "My mother makes me into a puppet."
- 3. "I make myself into a puppet."
- 4. "My mother makes herself into a puppet."

	++	+	-	--
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

50. A. How true do you think the following are?

- 1. My daughter doesn't spoil me.
- 2. I don't spoil my daughter.
- 3. My daughter doesn't spoil herself.
- 4. I don't spoil myself.

B. How would your daughter answer the following?

- 1. "I don't spoil my mother."
- 2. "My mother doesn't spoil me."
- 3. "I don't spoil myself."
- 4. "My mother doesn't spoil herself."

	++	+	-	--
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

51. A. How true do you think the following are?

- 1. My daughter owes everything to me.
- 2. I owe everything to my daughter.
- 3. My daughter owes everything to herself.
- 4. I owe everything to myself.

B. How would your daughter answer the following?

- 1. "I owe everything to my mother."
- 2. "My mother owes everything to me."
- 3. "I owe everything to myself."
- 4. "My mother owes everything to herself."

	++	+	-	--
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

18

52. A. How true do you think the following are?

- 1. My daughter is kind to me.
- 2. I am kind to my daughter.
- 3. My daughter is kind to herself.
- 4. I am kind to myself.

B. How would your daughter answer the following?

- 1. "I am kind to my mother."
- 2. "My mother is kind to me."
- 3. "I am kind to myself."
- 4. "My mother is kind to herself."

	++	+	-	--
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
1.	++	+	-	--
2.				
3.				
4.				

53. A. How true do you think the following are?

- 1. My daughter feels I show good common sense.
- 2. I feel my daughter shows good common sense.
- 3. My daughter feels she shows good common sense.
- 4. I feel I show good common sense.

B. How would your daughter answer the following?

- 1. "I feel my mother shows good common sense."
- 2. "My mother feels I show good common sense."
- 3. "I feel I show good common sense."
- 4. "My mother feels she shows good common sense."

	++	+	-	--
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
1.	++	+	-	--
2.				
3.				
4.				

54. A. How true do you think the following are?

- 1. My daughter's chief confidant is me.
- 2. My chief confidant is my daughter.
- 3. My daughter's chief confidant is herself.
- 4. My chief confidant is myself.

B. How would your daughter answer the following?

- 1. "My chief confidant is my mother."
- 2. "My mother's chief confidant is me."
- 3. "My chief confidant is myself."
- 4. "My mother's chief confidant is herself."

	++	+	-	--
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
1.	++	+	-	--
2.				
3.				
4.				

Separation Problems Subscale of the IPM Scored in the  
Direction that Indicates Separation-Impeding Interaction

- |   |       |
|---|-------|
| 1. Mother doesn't make up (or try to make up) daughter's mind for her.    | False |
| 2. Mother is wrapped up in daughter.                                      | True  |
| 3. Mother takes daughter seriously.                                       | False |
| 4. Mother is not afraid of daughter.                                      | False |
| 5. Mother respects daughter's opinions.                                   | False |
| 6. Mother makes daughter the center of her world.                         | True  |
| 7. Mother tries to outdo daughter   | True  |
| 8. Mother torments daughter.  | True  |
| 9. Mother takes responsibility for daughter.                              | True  |
| 10. Mother rarely finds fault with daughter                               | False |
| 11. Mother lets daughter be herself.                                      | False |
| 12. Mother is confident about daughter's ability to take care of herself. | False |
| 13. Mother rarely makes contradictory demands on daughter.                | False |
| 14. Mother mocks daughter.  | True  |
| 15. Mother hates daughter.  | True  |
| 16. Mother is always analyzing daughter.                                  | True  |
| 17. Mother treats daughter like a machine.                                | True  |
| 18. Mother expects too much of daughter.                                  | True  |
| 19. Mother is always worrying about daughter.                             | True  |
| 20. Mother lets daughter be.  | False |
| 21. Mother rarely makes daughter feel guilty.                             | False |
| 22. Mother thinks highly of daughter.                                     | False |
| 23. Mother is hopeful about daughter's future.                            | False |
| 24. Mother's view of daughter contains no major distortions.              | False |
| 25. Mother puts daughter on a pedestal.                                   | True  |
| 26. Mother belittles daughter.  | True  |
| 27. Mother doesn't make a clown of daughter.                              | False |
| 28. Mother doesn't humiliate daughter.                                    | False |
| 29. Mother rarely feels sorry for daughter.                               | False |
| 30. Mother makes daughter into a puppet.                                  | True  |
| 31. Mother doesn't spoil daughter.  | False |
| 32. Mother owes everything to daughter.                                   | True  |
| 33. Mother's chief confidant is daughter.                                 | True  |
| 34. Daughter doesn't make up (or try to make up) mother's mind for her.   | False |
| 35. Daughter is wrapped up in mother.                                     | True  |
| 36. Daughter is not afraid of mother.                                     | False |
| 37. Daughter makes mother the center of her world.                        | True  |
| 38. Daughter torments mother.   | True  |
| 39. Daughter takes responsibility for mother.                             | True  |
| 40. Daughter lets mother be herself.                                      | False |
| 41. Daughter hates mother.  | True  |
| 42. Daughter is always analyzing mother.                                  | True  |
| 43. Daughter treats mother like a machine.                                | True  |
| 44. Daughter expects too much of mother.                                  | True  |
| 45. Daughter is always worrying about mother.                             | True  |

- |  |       |
|--|-------|
| 46. Daughter lets mother be.                 | False |
| 47. Daughter puts mother on a pedestal.      | True  |
| 48. Daughter doesn't make a clown of mother. | False |
| 49. Daughter doesn't humiliate mother.       | False |
| 50. Daughter makes mother into a puppet.     | True  |
| 51. Daughter doesn't spoil mother.           | False |
| 52. Daughter owes everything to mother.      | True  |
| 53. Daughter's chief confidant is mother.    | True  |

S# \_\_\_\_\_

Imagine the phrase, "I am a person who (is)," in front of each item. Then indicate whether or not each item on the list is descriptive of you as a person.

---

	<u>True</u>	<u>False</u>
1. Able to criticize self	_____	_____
2. Able to doubt others	_____	_____
3. Able to give orders	_____	_____
4. Able to take care of self	_____	_____
5. Acts important	_____	_____
6. Affectionate and understanding	_____	_____
7. Always giving advice	_____	_____
8. Agrees with severyone	_____	_____
9. Always ashamed of self	_____	_____
10. Accepts advice readily	_____	_____
11. Always pleasant and agreeable	_____	_____
12. Appreciative	_____	_____
13. Admires and imitates others	_____	_____
14. Big-hearted and unselfish	_____	_____
15. Bitter	_____	_____
16. Bossy	_____	_____
17. Boastful	_____	_____
18. Apologetic	_____	_____
19. Lets others make decisions	_____	_____
20. Businesslike	_____	_____
21. Can be indifferent to others	_____	_____
22. Cold and unfeeling	_____	_____
23. Can be strict if necessary	_____	_____
24. Cruel and unkind	_____	_____
25. Can be frank and honest	_____	_____
26. Critical of others	_____	_____
27. Can complain if necessary	_____	_____
28. Complaining	_____	_____
29. Can be obedient	_____	_____
30. Clinging vine	_____	_____
31. Cooperative	_____	_____
32. Considerate	_____	_____
33. Dominating	_____	_____
34. Dictatorial	_____	_____
35. Distrusts everybody	_____	_____
36. Dependent	_____	_____
37. Egotistical and conceited	_____	_____
38. Easily embarrassed	_____	_____
39. Easily led	_____	_____
40. Easily fooled	_____	_____
41. Eager to get along with others	_____	_____
42. Encouraging others	_____	_____
43. Enjoys taking care of others	_____	_____
44. Expects everyone to admire him	_____	_____

	<u>True</u>	<u>False</u>
45. Forceful	_____	_____
46. Firm but just	_____	_____
47. Frequently angry	_____	_____
48. Frequently disappointed	_____	_____
49. Friendly	_____	_____
50. Fond of everyone	_____	_____
51. Friendly all the time	_____	_____
52. Forgives anything	_____	_____
53. Good leader	_____	_____
54. Grateful	_____	_____
55. Gives freely of self	_____	_____
56. Generous to a fault	_____	_____
57. Hard-boiled when necessary	_____	_____
58. Hard-hearted	_____	_____
59. Hard to impress	_____	_____
60. Hardly ever talks back	_____	_____
61. Helpful	_____	_____
62. Independent	_____	_____
63. Impatient with other's mistakes	_____	_____
64. Irritable	_____	_____
65. Jealous	_____	_____
66. Kind and reassuring	_____	_____
67. Likes responsibility	_____	_____
68. Likes to compete with others	_____	_____
69. Lacks self-confidence	_____	_____
70. Likes to be taken care of	_____	_____
71. Likes everybody	_____	_____
72. Manages others	_____	_____
73. Meek	_____	_____
74. Modest	_____	_____
75. Makes a good impression	_____	_____
76. Outspoken	_____	_____
77. Often unfriendly	_____	_____
78. Often gloomy	_____	_____
79. Obeys too willingly	_____	_____
80. Oversympathetic	_____	_____
81. Overprotective of others	_____	_____
82. Often admired	_____	_____
83. Proud and self-satisfied	_____	_____
84. Passive and unaggressive	_____	_____
85. Often helped by others	_____	_____
86. Resents being bossed	_____	_____
87. Rebels against everything	_____	_____
88. Resentful	_____	_____
89. Respected by others	_____	_____
90. Self-confident	_____	_____
91. Self-reliant and assertive	_____	_____
92. Somewhat snobbish	_____	_____

	<u>True</u>	<u>False</u>
93. Shrewd and calculating	_____	_____
94. Selfish	_____	_____
95. Stern but fair	_____	_____
96. Self-seeking	_____	_____
97. Sarcastic	_____	_____
98. Straightforward and direct	_____	_____
99. Skeptical	_____	_____
100. Slow to forgive a wrong	_____	_____
101. Stubborn	_____	_____
102. Self-punishing	_____	_____
103. Shy	_____	_____
104. Spineless	_____	_____
105. Sociable and neighborly	_____	_____
106. Spoils people with kindness	_____	_____
107. Self-respecting	_____	_____
108. Thinks only of himself	_____	_____
109. Touchy and easily hurt	_____	_____
110. Timid	_____	_____
111. Trusting and eager to please	_____	_____
112. Too easily influenced by friends	_____	_____
113. Tender and soft-hearted	_____	_____
114. Too lenient with others	_____	_____
115. Tries to comfort everyone	_____	_____
116. Too willing to give to others	_____	_____
117. Tries to be too successful	_____	_____
118. Usually gives in	_____	_____
119. Very anxious to be approved of	_____	_____
120. Very respectful to authority	_____	_____
121. Will believe anyone	_____	_____
122. Wants everyone to like him	_____	_____
123. Will confide in anyone	_____	_____
124. Wants everyone's love	_____	_____
125. Warm	_____	_____
126. Well thought of	_____	_____
127. Wants to be led	_____	_____
128. Loves everyone	_____	_____

PEER RELATIONS CATEGORIES

1. Check the category that best describes the way you were at age 13.
  1. EXTREMELY HIGH - OUTSTANDING PEER RELATIONS. One of the top girls in class, an outstanding leader, best-liked child in class, by both girls and boys, best accepted by other children.
  2. EXTREMELY HIGH - SUPERIOR PEER RELATIONS. One of the most popular members of class, a strong leader, highly accepted by other children, well liked by both boys and girls.
  3. HIGH ACCEPTANCE AMONG PEERS. Liked by most of the other children, one of first chosen on playground, has many friends, accepted by most of the children.
  4. MODERATE ACCEPTANCE AMONG PEERS. Chosen about the middle by other children, a follower, but others like her, generally accepted; liked, but not to a high extent, not overly popular but other children think she's O.K.
  5. LOW PEER RELATIONS. Merely tolerated, ignored by others, but not rejected, accepted by some, rejected by others, no close friends; not rejected but often overlooked, accepted by younger children, but not by own age group.
  6. REJECTED GENERALLY BY PEERS. Rejected by most other children, picked on, teased, blamed for everything, others don't want her on their side, pushed out of group activities.
  7. REJECTED ENTIRELY BY PEERS. Actively disliked, laughed at, made a fool of, scapegoat, rejected by all children, both boys and girls, never included in any group activities.
  
2. Was the rating you chose characteristic of you before age 13? After age 13? If the answer to either of these questions is "no", please describe the way you were below, and pick the category that best describes you at each of these times.

## APPENDIX B

### THE EIGHT FACTOR ANALYSES PERFORMED ON THE IPM DATA

The first six factors generated by each of the eight factor analyses, with their defining items, and with the proportion of the variance accounted for by each factor, will be presented below. In order to be considered a defining item, an item had to meet either of the following two sets of criteria:

1) The loading of the item on the factor is at least .40, and its loading on any other factor is not more than .25.

2) The loading of the item on the factor is at least .65, and its loading on any other factor is not more than .40.

Items meeting the first criteria are listed without parentheses; items meeting the second criteria are listed in parentheses. When the number of defining items for a factor is very small, additional items with high loadings on the factor will also be listed.

The Factor Analysis of the Daughters' Responses to Those  
Items Concerning Their Mothers' Attitudes Towards Them

Factor #1: General Positive - Affection, Acceptance, Nurturance, Respect

Defining Items:

Item #	Item	Loading
(7)	(can't stand)	(-.67)
8	takes good care when necessary	.89
13	is mean with	-.62
14	lives	.92
27	hates	-.80
(35)	(thinks highly of)	(.68)
38	likes	.75
(52)	(is kind to)	(.72)

% Variance Accounted for: 15.5%

Factor #2: Absence of Tearing Down, Deception, and Distortion

## Defining Items:

Item#	Item	Loading
(36)	(deceives)	(-.68)
39	view (of daughter) con- tains no major distortions	.41
(43)	(belittles)	(-.65)
45	doesn't make a clown of	.76

% Variance Accounted for: 8.5%

Factor #3: Lets Daughter Be Herself

## Defining Items:

Item #	Item	Loading
(20)	(lets be self)	(.67)
33	lets be	.79

## Additional Items with High Loadings:

23	rarely makes contradictory demands on	.62
30	expects too much of	-.54
40	readily forgives	.48

% Variance Accounted for: 6.5%

Factor #4: Satisfaction with - Respect For

## Defining Items:

Item #	Item	Loading
6	is type of daughter mother wanted	.79
(53)	feels (daughter) shows good sense	(.72)

## Additional Items with High Loadings:

11	respects opinions	.45
19	rarely finds fault	.45
37	is hopeful about (daughter's) future	.62

% Variance Accounted For: 5.6%

Factor #5: Fights with, Irritating, Critical

## Defining Items:

Item #	Item	Loading
16	fights with	.72
24	gets on nerves	.63

## Additional Items with High Loadings:

17	torments	.46
19	rarely finds fault	-.49
25	mocks	.40
46	bewilders	.58

% Variance Accounted For: 5.4%

Factor #6: Interest in Daughter's Thoughts and Motives

## Defining Items:

Item #	Item	Loading
(5)	(takes seriously)	(.74)
28	always analyzes	.57

## Additional Items with High Loadings:

1	understands	.54
11	respects opinions	.40
21	couldn't care less	-.42
49	makes into puppet	-.60

% Variance Accounted For: 5.3%

The Factor Analysis of the Daughters' Responses to Those  
Items Concerning Their Attitudes Towards Their Mothers

Factor #1: General Positive - Affection, Acceptance, Respect

Defining Items:

Item #	Item	Loading
14	loves	.77
21	couldn't care less	-.75
27	hates	-.79
35	thinks highly of	.72
38	likes	.82

% Variance Accounted For: 9.7%

Factor #2: Openness and Respect

Item #	Item	Loading
22	confident of (mother's) ability to care for self	.76
26	honest with	.83

Additional Items with High Loadings:

46	bewilders	-.37
53	feels (mother) shows good sense	.43

% Variance Accounted For: 4.9%

Factor #3: Sadistic - Competitive

Defining Items:

Item #	Item	Loading
13	is mean with	.75
15	tries to outdo	.64

Additional Items with High Loadings:

9	wants to get away from	.43
29	treats like a machine	.41
42	it bitter towards	.50

% Variance Accounted For: 4.8%

Factor #4: Respect for Mother's Needs, Absence of Contempt

## Defining Items:

Item #	Item	Loading
5	takes (mother) seriously	.83

## Additional Items with High Loadings:

6	is type of mother daughter wanted	.40
17	torments	-.40
45	doesn't make a clown of	.57
46	bewilders	-.46

% Variance Accounted For: 4.6%

Factor #5: Admiration

## Defining Items:

Item #	Item	Loading
19 (37)	rarely finds fault with (hopeful about (mother's) future)	.47 (.73)

## Additional Items with High Loadings:

11	respects opinions	.57
53	feels (mother) shows good sense	.49

% Variance Accounted For: 4.5%

Factor #6: Low Autonomy Vis-A-Vis Mother: Absence of Intense Hostility

## Defining Items:

Item #	Item	Loading
47	don't humiliate	.80
51	owe everything to	.47

## Additional Items with High Loadings:

7	can't stand	-.44
44	am detached from	-.49
45	don't make a clown of	.53

% Variance Accounted For: 4.4%

The Factor Analysis of the Daughters' Responses to Those Items  
Concerning Their Mothers' Attitudes Towards Themselves

Factor #1: General Positive - Self Acceptance

Defining Items:

Item #	Item	Loading
13	is mean with	-.70
33	lets self be	.75

Additional Items with High Loadings:

22	confident in ability to care for self	.55
25	mocks	-.59
34	rarely makes self feel guilty	.47
38	likes	.67
40	readily forgives	.40
52	is kind to	.43

% Variance Accounted For: 7.9%

Factor #2: Self-Dislike; Self-Contempt

Defining Items:

Item #	Item	Loading
7	can't stand	.69
35	thinks highly of	-.65
43	belittles	.58

% Variance Accounted For: 7%

Factor #3: Self-Centered; Self-Preoccupied

Defining Items:

Item #	Item	Loading
12	makes self center of world	.56
31	always worrying about	.82
41	puts self on pedestal	.81
48	rarely feels sorry for	-.65

% Variance Accounted For: 6.5%

Factor #4: Self-Reliance

## Defining Items:

Item #	Item	Loading
1	understands	.40
2	doesn't make up own mind	-.69
18	takes responsibility for	.78

% Variance Accounted For: 5.3%

Factor #5: Self-Satisfaction

## Defining Items:

Item #	Item	Loading
(37)	(is hopeful about own future)	(.65)

## Additional Items with High Loadings:

6	is type of person she wanted to be	.58
8	takes good care of self when necessary	.64
32	can face up to own conflicts	.55
52	is kind to	.42

% Variance Accounted For: 5.1%

Factor #6: Alienation From Self; Self-Dislike

## Defining Items:

Item #	Item	Loading
(46)	(bewilders)	(.76)
53	feels shows good sense	-.47

## Additional Items with High Loadings:

24	gets on own nerves	.51
29	treats like a machine	.48
44	is detached from	.49
49	makes into a puppet	.40

% Variance Accounted For: 4.9%

The Factor Analysis of the Daughters' Responses to Those  
Items Concerning Their Attitudes Towards Themselves

Factor #1: General Positive - Self-Acceptance; Absence of Confusion

Defining Items:

Item #	Item	Loading
3	wrapped up in	-.43
39	view of self contains no major distortions	.79
46	bewilders	-.51
(47)	(doesn't humiliate)	(.68)

% Variance Accounted For: 6.6%

Factor #2: Self-Hatred

Item #	Item	Loading
(7)	(can't stand)	(.67)
9	wants to get away from	.46
14	loves	-.60
27	hates	.85

% Variance Accounted For: 6.4%

Factor #3: Self-Satisfaction; Absence of Self-Criticism

Defining Items:

Item #	Item	Loading
19	rarely finds fault with	.60
28	always analyzing	-.62
34	rarely makes self feel guilty	.72

% Variance Accounted For: 5.7%

Factor #4: Respect and Admiration for Self

Defining Items:

Item #	Item	Loading
1	understands	.81
5	takes seriously	.66
11	respects own opinions	.78

% Variance Accounted For: 5.6%

Factor #5: Kind to Self; Responsible for Self

## Defining Items:

Item #	Item	Loading
8	takes good care of when necessary	.87
(18)	(takes responsibility for)	(.69)

## Additional Items with High Loadings

52	is kind to	.56
----	------------	-----

% Variance Accounted For: 5.5%

Factor #6: Self-Confident; Self-Accepting

## Defining Items:

Item #	Item	Loading
22	is confident in ability to take care of	.69
(29)	(treats like a machine)	(-.70)
(32)	(can face own conflicts)	(.67)
53	feels shows good sense	.71

% Variance Accounted For: 5.4%

The Factor Analysis of the Mothers' Responses to Those Items  
Concerning Their Daughters' Attitudes Towards Them

Factor #1: Hostility; Tearing Down

Defining Items:

Item #	Item	Loading
(5)	(takes seriously)	(-.71)
13	is mean with	.58
43	belittles	.88

% Variance Accounted For: 7%

Factor #2: Respect for Mother's Competence and Independence

Defining Items:

Item #	Item	Loading
2	doesn't make up (mother's) mind for her	.82
22	confident (mother) can take care of herself	.53
(53)	(feels shows good sense)	(.74)

% Variance Accounted For: 6.9%

Factor #3: Satisfaction; Idealization; Absence of Detachment

Defining Items:

Item #	Item	Loading
(6)	(am type of mother daughter wanted)	(.65)
32	can face (mother's) conflicts	.57
33	lets be	.53
(41)	(puts on a pedestal)	(.70)
44	detached	-.40

% Variance Accounted For: 6.9%

Factor #4: Positive Feeling; Affection

Defining Items:

Item #	Item	Loading
7	can't stand	-.60

(27)	(hates)	(-.74)
38	likes	.86

% Variance Accounted For: 6.8%

Factor #5: Absence of Irritation and Conflict

Defining Items:

Item #	Item	Loading
23	rarely makes contradictory demands on	.55
24	gets on nerves	-.82
34	rarely makes (mother) feel guilty	.41

% Variance Accounted For: 6.2%

Factor #6: Overinvolvement

Item #	Item	Loading
3	is wrapped up in	.77
12	makes (mother) center of world	.83
30	expects too much of	.55

% Variance Accounted For: 6.2%

The Factor Analysis of the Mothers' Responses to Those Items  
Concerning Their Attitudes Towards Their Daughters

Factor: 1: General Positive; Affection, Respect, Nurturance

Defining Items:

Item #	Item	Loading
8	takes good care of when necessary	.77
33	lets be	.52
35	thinks highly of	.97
38	likes	.97

% Variance Accounted For: 8.6%

Factor #2: Hostile-Exploitative

Defining Items:

Item #	Item	Loading
7	can't stand	.44
29	treats like a machine	.94
51	owes everything to	.77

% Variance Accounted For: 7.5%

Factor #3: Respect and Absence of Dissatisfaction

Defining Items:

Item #	Item	Loading
5	takes seriously	.53
22	confident (daughter) can care for self	.55
39	view of (daughter) contains no major distortions	.83
40	readily forgives	.78

% Variance Accounted For: 7.2%

Factor #4: Rejecting-Competitive

## Defining Items:

Item #	Item	Loading
21	couldn't care less about	.79

## Additional Items with High Loadings:

13	is mean with	.62
14	loves	-.63
15	tries to outdo	.45
44	detached	.58

% Variance Accounted For: 5.2%

Factor #5: Cruel; Tears Down

## Defining Items:

Item #	Item	Loading
43	belittles	.58
52	is kind to	-.90

## Additional Items with High Loadings:

Item #	Item	Loading
9	wants to get away from	.41
17	torments	.41
20	lets be self	-.49
42	is bitter towards	.58

% Variance Accounted For: 5.2%

Factor #6: Anxiously Preoccupied with Daughter

## Defining Items:

Item #	Item	Loading
3	is wrapped up in	.81
31	is always worrying about	.79
41	puts on pedestal	.41

% Variance Accounted For: 4.8%

The Factor Analysis of the Mothers' Responses to Those Items  
Concerning Their Daughters' Attitudes Towards Themselves

Factor #1: High Self-Esteem; Self-Confidence; Self-Satisfaction

Defining Items:

Item #	Item	Loading
2 (6)	doesn't make up own mind (is type of person she wanted to be)	-.55 (.76)
(22)	(is confident that she can care for herself)	(.79)
35	thinks highly of	.73
54	chief confident is	.49

% Variance Accounted For: 9.4%

Factor #2: Ability to Face and Accept Self

Defining Items:

Item #	Item	Loading
1	understands	.78
26	is honest with	.86

Additional Items with High Loadings:

32	can face own conflicts	.53
39	view (of self) contains no major distortions	.45
43	belittles	-.53
46	bewilders	-.53

% Variance Accounted For: 7.2%

Factor #3: Self-Dislike; Self-Punishment

Defining Items:

Item #	Item	Loading
36	deceives	.80
42	is bitter toward	.83

Additional Items with High Loadings:

9	wants to get away from	.51
13	is mean with	.48

52 is kind to -.41

% Variance Accounted For: 6.5%

Factor #4: Absence of Self-Criticism

Defining Items:

Item #	Item	Loading
19	rarely finds fault with	.87

Additional Items with High Loadings:

16	fights with	-.46
17	torments	-.59
40	readily forgives	.42
41	puts self on pedestal	.47

% Variance Accounted For: 5.9%

Factor #5: Kindness to and Respect for Self

Defining Items:

Item #	Item	Loading
8	takes good care of	
	(self) when necessary	.86
(11)	(respects own opinions)	(.67)
53	feels shows good sense	.65

% Variance Accounted For: 5.6%

Factor #6: Absence of Masochism

Defining Items:

Item #	Item	Loading
49	makes self into puppet	-.79

Additional Items with High Loadings:

13	is mean with	-.53
20	lets self be self	.43
27	hates	-.59
37	is hopeful about (own)	
	future	.48

% Variance Accounted For: 4.9%

The Factor Analysis of the Mothers' Responses to Those Items  
Concerning Their Attitudes Towards Themselves

Factor #1: High Self-Esteem; Self-Acceptance

Defining Items:

Item #	Item	Loading
20	lets self be self	.79
32	can face own conflicts	.49
35	thinks highly of	.84
(38)	(likes)	(.70)
46	bewilders	-.49
47	doesn't humiliate	.47

% Variance Accounted For: 8.1%

Factor #2: Self-Dissatisfaction; Self-Preoccupation

Defining Items:

Item #	Item	Loading
3	is wrapped up in	.59
28	is always analyzing	.52
30	expects too much of	.62
(36)	(deceives)	(.77)
(42)	(is bitter towards)	(.69)

% Variance Accounted For: 6.7%

Factor #3: Comfortable with Self

Defining Items

Item #	Item	Loading
9	wants to get away from	-.44
29	treats (self) like a machine	-.76
39	view (of self) contains no major distortions	.80

% Variance Accounted For: 5.9%

Factor #4: Self Love

## Defining Items:

Item #	Item	Loading
4	depends on	.64
14	loves	.82

## Additional Items with High Loadings:

1	understands	.45
10	is not afraid of	.41
43	belittles	-.54
52	is kind to	.44

% Variance Accounted For: 5.6%

Factor #5: Self-Satisfaction; Optimism

## Defining Items:

Item #	Item	Loading
(17)	(torments)	(-.70)
19	rarely finds fault with	.61
(37)	(is hopeful about own future)	(.73)

% Variance Accounted For: 5.3%

Factor #6: Respect For Self:

## Defining Items:

Item #	Item	Loading
5	takes (self) seriously	.84
11	respects (own) opinions	.76
18	takes responsibility for	.53

% Variance Accounted For: 5.0

## REFERENCES

- Bentler, P.M. The Interpersonal Checklist. In Oscar Buros (Ed.) The sixth mental measurement yearbook. Highland Park, New Jersey: The Gryphon Press, 1965. Pp 127-128.
- Blos, Peter. On adolescence: A psychoanalytic interpretation. New York: The Free Press, 1962.
- Blos, Peter. The second individuation process of adolescence. Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, 1967, 22, 162-186.
- Bob, S.R. An investigation of the relationship between identity status, cognitive style, and stress. Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1968.
- Borowitz, Gene. Character disorders in childhood and adolescence: Some consideration of the effects of sexual stimulation in infancy and childhood. In S.C. Feinstein, P.L. Giovacchini, & A.A. Miller (Eds.) Adolescent psychiatry: Volume I. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1971, Pp. 343-362.
- Bowlby, John. Attachment and loss. Volume I: Attachment. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1969.
- Bowlby, John. Attachment and loss. Volume II: Separation. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1973.
- Constantinople, Anne. An Eriksonian measure of personality development in college students. Developmental Psychology, 1969, 1 (4), 357-372.
- Cronbach, L. Analytic treatment of social perception scores. In Renato Tagiuri & Luigi Petrullo (Eds.) Person perception and interpersonal behavior. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1958. Pp. 353-379.
- Cronbach, L., & Gleser, G. Assessing similarity between profiles. Psychological Bulletin, 1953, 50, 456-473.
- Deitz, George. A comparison of delinquents with non-delinquents on self-concept, self-acceptance, and parental identification. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1969, 115 (2), 285-295.
- Dignan, Sister Mary Howard. Ego identity and maternal identification. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 1, 476-483.
- Douvan, E., & Adelson, J. The adolescent experience. New York: Wiley, 1966.

- Dymond, Rosalind. Interpersonal perception and marital happiness. Canadian Journal of Psychology, 1954, 8 (3), 164-171.
- Edwards, Allen L. Experimental design in psychological research. Rev. Ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.
- Edwards, Allen L. Statistical methods. 2nd. Ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.
- Erikson, Erik H. Childhood and society. 2nd Ed. New York: Norton & Company, Inc., 1963.
- Erikson, Erik H. Identity: Youth and crisis. New York: Norton & Company, Inc., 1968.
- Freud, Anna. Adolescence. In Joseph Weinreb (Ed.) Recent developments in psychoanalytic child therapy. New York: International Universities Press, 1960.
- Gage, N.L., & Cronbach, L.J. Conceptual and methodological problems in interpersonal perception. Psychological Review, 1966, 62, 411-423.
- Giovacchini, Peter L. Fantasy formation, ego defect, and identity problems. In S.C. Feinstein, P.L. Giovacchini, and A.A. Miller (Eds.) Adolescent psychiatry: Volume I. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1971, Pp. 329-342.
- Gump, Janice P. Sex role attitudes and psychological well being. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28 (2), 79-92.
- Hastorf, A.H., & Bender, I.E. A caution respecting the measurement of empathic ability. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1952, 47, 574-576.
- Hastorf, A.H., Bender, I.E., & Weintraub, D.J. The influence of response patterns on the "refined empathy score." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1955, 51, 341-343.
- Hauser, Stuart T. Black and white identity formation. New York: Wiley, 1971.
- Jacobson, Edith. The self and the object world. New York: International Universities Press, 1964.
- Josselyn, Irene M. The ego in adolescence. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 24, 223.
- Klein, Edward & Gould, Laurence. Alienation and identification in college women. Journal of Personality, 1969, 37, (3), 468-480.

- LaForge, R., & Suczek, R. The interpersonal dimension of personality: III. An interpersonal checklist. Journal of Personality, 1955, 24 (1), 94-112.
- Laing, R.D., Phillipson, H., & Lee, A.R. Interpersonal perception: A theory and a method of research. New York: Harper & Row, 1966.
- Lazowick, L.M. On the nature of identification. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1955, 51, 175-183.
- Leary, Timothy. Interpersonal diagnosis of personality: A functional theory and methodology for personality evaluation. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1957.
- Lindgren, H., & Robinson, J. An evaluation of Dymond's test of insight and empathy. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1953, 17, 172-176.
- Loveland, Nathene. The relation Rorschach: A technique for studying interaction. Journal of Nervous and Mental Diseases, 1967, 145, (2), 93-105.
- Mahler, Margaret S. On the significance of the normal separation-individuation phase with reference to research in symbiotic child psychosis. In M. Schur (Ed.), Drives, affects and behavior. 2nd. Ed. New York: International Universities Press, 1965, Pp. 161-169.
- Mahler, Margaret S. On human symbiosis and the vicissitudes of individuation, Volume I, Infantile psychosis. New York: International Universities Press, 1968.
- Mahler, Margaret S. A study of the separation-individuation process and its possible application to borderline phenomena in the psychoanalytic situation. Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, 1971, 26, 403-424.
- Mahler, Margaret S., & La Perriere, Kitty. Mother-child interaction during separation-individuation. Psychoanalytic Quarterly, 1965, 34, 483-498.
- Mahler, Margaret S., Pine, Fred, & Bergman, Anni. The psychological birth of the human infant. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1975.
- Marcia, J.E. Determination and construct validity of ego identity status. Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1964.
- Marcia, J.E. Development and validation of ego identity status. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 3, 551-559.
- Marcia, J.E. Ego identity status: Relationship to change in self-esteem, "general maladjustment," and authoritarianism. Journal of Personality, 1967, 35, (1), 118-133.

- Marcia, J.E., & Friedman, M. Ego identity status in college women. Journal of Personality, 1970, 38, (2), 249-262.
- Murphy, E., Silber, E., Coelho, G., Hamburg, D., & Greenberg, I. Development of autonomy and parent-child interaction in late adolescence. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1963, 33, 643-652.
- Mussen, P., & Distler, L. Masculinity, identification, and father-son relationships. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1959, 59, 350-356.
- Mussen, P., & Parker, A. Mother nurturance and girls' incidental imitative learning. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 1965, 2, 94-97.
- Nunnally, J.C. Psychometric theory. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.
- Orlofsky, J., Marcia, J., & Lesser, I. Ego identity status and the intimacy versus isolation crisis of young adulthood. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 27 (2), 211-219.
- Osgood, C.E., & Suci, G.J. A measure of relation determined by both mean differences and profile information. Psychological Bulletin, 1952, 49, 251-262.
- Podd, M., Marcia, J., & Rubin, B. The effects of ego identity and partner perception on a prisoner's dilemma game. Journal of Social Psychology, 1970, 82, 117-126.
- Roff, M., Sells, S.B., & Golden, M. Social adjustment and personality development in children. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1972.
- Schacter, Burt. Identity crisis and occupational processes: An intensive exploratory study of emotionally disturbed male adolescents. Child Welfare, 1968, 47, (1), 26-37.
- Schenkel, S., & Marcia, J. Attitudes toward premarital intercourse in determining ego identity status in college women. Journal of Personality, 1972, 40, 472-482.
- Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric statistics for the behavioral sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956.
- Stierlin, Helm. Separating parents and adolescents: A perspective on running away, schizophrenia, and waywardness. New York: Quadrangle, 1974.
- Stierlin, Helm, Levi, David, & Savard, Robert. Parental perceptions of separating children. Family Process, 1971, 10 (4), 411-427.

- Thompson, Sister M. St. George. Modifications in identity: A study of the socialization process during a sister formation program. Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1963.
- Todor, N., & Marcia, J. Ego identity status and response to conformity pressure in college women. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 26, (2), 287-294.
- Webster, Harold, Heist, P., & Williams, Phoebe. Value contrasts between family and college and the effect upon student development. Paper read at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Chicago, September 2, 1960.
- Wesmann, A., & Ricks, D. Mood and Personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966.