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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The present study was designed to extend the findings of a pilot study that examined the relationships between gifted children's perceptions of specific parental behaviors and their self-esteem (Enright & Ruzicka, 1989). This pilot study obtained a significant inverse relationship between gifted children's perceptions of maternal physical punishment and their self-esteem. Significant positive correlations were observed between gifted children's levels of self-esteem and their perceptions of their mothers as clear in their expectations of them, as likely to use principled discipline, and as supportive. The children's perceptions of fathers as likely to deprive them of privileges rather than use other forms of punishment was also positively associated with self-esteem at significant levels. Finally, gifted children's self-esteem scores increased significantly across grade levels (grades one through four).

The impetus for exploring the self-esteem levels of gifted children in the pilot and current studies involved a search for an answer to the following questions: "Do gifted children have higher self-esteem levels than the general population of children?" and "What family factors can account for the differing levels of self-esteem in children?"

The present study represents an attempt to clarify the conflictual, apparently confounding, research which compares the self-esteem of gifted and nongifted children (Brody & Benbow, 1986). Olszewski-Kubilius, Kulieke & Krasney's (1988) review
suggested that small sample sizes contributed to the inconsistencies in the findings. Other investigators compared gifted children's self-esteem to normative group data rather than the study of nongifted subjects (Cornell & Grossberg, 1987; Tidwell, 1980). Inconsistent results may be attributable to the varying reliability and validity levels of the assessment devices utilized to assess self-esteem in gifted and nongifted children (Loeb & Jay, 1987). The present study employs a more adequate sample size than was used in the pilot study (Enright & Ruzicka, 1989), and it included a nongifted comparison sample. Like the pilot study, this study utilized the well-researched Coopersmith (1981) Self-Esteem Inventory (CSEI), as well as other reliable, valid self-report measures of family variables.

Schwartz (1987) demonstrated that Family Satisfaction Scale (Olson & Wilson, 1982) scores were a better predictor of the self-esteem of Jewish adolescents than were perceived parental behaviors. The present study tested these relationships with samples of gifted and nongifted sixth graders, assessing the relative contributions of family satisfaction and perceived parental behaviors (Schaefer, 1965a) on self-esteem for each group.

Children's perceptions of parental behaviors have been shown to be related more strongly to children's self-esteem than their parents' perceptions of the parent-child relationship (Demo, Small & Savin-Williams, 1987; Gecas, 1972; Gecas & Schwalbe, 1986; Landau, 1986). However, theoretical assumptions about the importance of the influences of parental behaviors and cognitions on the emotional development of the child are presented (Coopersmith, 1967; Cotton, 1983; Felson & Zielinski, 1989; Killeen, 1993; Maccoby, 1984; Mead, 1934; Sullivan, 1953), as are associated empirical findings.

The role of self-reported parental variables likely to contribute to the variance in
children's self-esteem is addressed. First, parents' perceptions of their performance as parents, generally considered the most important family role, have been shown to be related to their levels of self-esteem (Demo et al., 1987). Parenting self-esteem, or parental sense of competence (Gibaud-Wallston & Wandersman, 1978), is examined to indicate the extent to which parents' self-reports of perceived self-efficacy as a parent and the amount of satisfaction obtained from parenting (Johnson & Mash, 1989) account for the variance in children's self-esteem scores.

Second, the relationships between parents' perceptions of family satisfaction and their children's levels of self-esteem are considered. For example, when mothers were asked to indicate the extent of their son's happiness, most boys (90.9%) scoring in a high self-esteem group were judged by their mothers to be relatively happy, compared to 66.7% of boys scoring in a low self-esteem group (Coopersmith, 1967). High levels of father-reported family satisfaction among 140 kibbutz fathers were associated with perceptions of their families as encouraging the growth of their members (Margalit, Leyser & Avraham, 1989). Therefore, in the present study, parent-reported family satisfaction (Olson & Wilson, 1982) is examined to measure the extent to which it is predictive of their children's self-esteem.

Third, social-learning theory suggests that resultant from vicarious or observational learning, parent and child self-esteem are positively correlated (Bandura, 1977). Therefore, parents are asked to complete a self-esteem inventory (Coopersmith, 1981) to assess the extent to which parents' self-esteem scores predict their children's self-esteem scores.

Fourth, this study explores the relationships that exist between the children's set of variables and the parents' set of variables with the goal of better understanding the
magnitude of overlapping variance across sets of variables.

Finally, given the significant differences in the self-esteem scores of gifted children across grade levels in the pilot study (Enright & Ruzicka, 1989), this study holds grade level constant by assessing only sixth-grade subjects.

Background to the Problem

Research comparing the levels of self-esteem of gifted and nongifted children has been conflictual (Brody & Benbow, 1986). Part of the confusion created in determining the self-esteem of gifted children, relative to the general population of children, stems from the lax use of the terms "self-esteem" and "self-concept" in the literature. Authors have used the terms interchangeably (Dean, 1977; Loeb & Jay, 1987; Pope, McHale & Craighead, 1988; Trotter, 1971). This lack of clarity in construct definition has been identified as a prevalent problem in evaluating self-esteem (Franks & Dolan, 1982; Gilberts, 1983).


Researchers have further confused the self-esteem outcome data of gifted children by: a) comparing gifted respondents to normative group statistics rather than to another nongifted subject pool, and b) by using different assessment devices. For example, in a study of 1593 gifted high school students, respondents scored significantly higher on the
Piers-Harris Self-Concept Scale (PHSCS) (Piers & Harris, 1969) than a normative group for that test, but were nonsignificantly different on the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (CSEI) from a normative group (Tidwell, 1980).

Some researchers have reported that gifted children have higher self-esteem than nongifted children (Abdel-Kaveem, 1998; Cornell & Grossberg, 1987; Lehman & Erdwins, 1981), but others found no differences in self-esteem between groups (Bartell & Reynolds, 1986; Brody & Benbow, 1986; Chiu, 1990; Dean, 1977; McEwin & Cross, 1982). Still other investigators have reported that gifted children have lower self-esteem than their nongifted counterparts (Klein & Cantor, 1976; Trotter, 1971).

Given these differences in outcomes as pertains to self-esteem, researchers have sought to identify variables that mediate self-esteem. The family has been described as the "primary arena for socialization" (Maccoby, 1984, p. 318). The family is the place where a child's initial sense of self is formed through intimate, intensive interactions (Gecas & Schwalbe, 1986).

Once children have the cognitive capacity for role-taking, enabling them to see themselves as they imagine others see them, the self emerges out of symbolic interactions with others (Gecas & Schwalbe, 1986). Cooley's (1902) "looking glass self" connotes that our self-conceptions are essentially determined by how we imagine the significant others in our lives see us. Coopersmith (1967) asserted that three conditions were important in the development of high levels of self-esteem: parental acceptance of the child, parental enforcement of clearly defined limits, and parental respect and freedom for the child to engage in self-initiated behaviors within those limits.

Regarding gifted children, authors have similarly argued that social and emotional adjustment must be learned at home first (Braumbaugh & Roshco, 1959; Sebring, 1983).
Mutually supportive and open family interactions were seen as more important to a gifted child's self-esteem than were family activities or value orientations (Cornell & Grossberg, 1987). As mentioned, a pilot study found the following perceived behaviors to be related significantly to high levels of self-esteem in gifted children: low levels of maternal physical punishment (an inverse relationship), maternal consistency of expectations, maternal principled discipline, paternal deprivation of privileges, and a global dimension of maternal support (Enright & Ruzicka, 1989).

A child's perception of actual parental behavior may be more relevant to self-conceptions than actual parental behaviors (Gecas, 1972; Gecas & Schwalbe, 1986; Landau, 1986). Similarly, child-perceived parental behaviors may be related more strongly to children's adjustment than parents' actual behaviors (Schaefer, 1965a). Children's perceptions of parental behaviors have been shown to be related significantly to their parents' actual behaviors toward them (Bronson, Katten & Livson, 1959). In a pilot study by Devereux, Bronfenbrenner and Rodgers (1969), the authors concluded that their child subjects offered a more valid response set than their parents on questionnaires describing parent-child interactions because the parents' responses were skewed toward the norms of social desirability.

To date, only one study by Schwartz (1987) has been reported in which the predictive capacity of child-reported family satisfaction and that of child-perceived parental behaviors on children's self-esteem were compared. This study reported that for a sample of Jewish adolescents, family satisfaction scale scores significantly explained a larger proportion of the variance in self-esteem scores than did perceived parental behavior variables.

The present study was designed to compare the relative contributions of child-
perceived family satisfaction and child-perceived parental variables to the prediction of self-esteem among samples of gifted and nongifted sixth-graders. In addition, the investigator attempted to show what additional variance in children's self-esteem scores is accounted for by parents' reports of family satisfaction, parenting self-esteem (parental sense of competence), and the self-esteem of parents. No study has yet simultaneously assessed the impact of these variables on gifted and nongifted children's self-esteem.

Theoretical Basis of the Study

The theoretical basis of the present study is social learning theory. It is a broad approach to understanding human behavior that incorporates the principles of social, developmental, and cognitive psychology, as well as the principles of learning theory and experimental psychology (Baucom & Epstein, 1990; Peters & McMahon, 1988; Nichols, 1984).

There are three basic tenets of social-learning theory: (a) behavior is essentially controlled by its antecedents and consequences; (b) much of human behavior is learned through the imitation of observed models; and (c) learning and behavioral performance are commonly mediated by cognitive processes (Bandura, 1977).

The social-learning approach is based on the premise that, within the context of family interactions, family members typically interpret and evaluate each other's behaviors, and that subsequent emotional and behavioral responses will be influenced by these interpretations and evaluations (Epstein, Schlesinger & Dryden, 1988). The important roles of these cognitive factors in helping to bring about positive behavioral change in individuals and relationships, and in creating relationship distress have been increasingly recognized (Bandura, 1977; Epstein et al., 1988; Peters & McMahon, 1988).
Social-learning theory involves an integration of the concerns of information-processing theorists with the behavioral therapies (Rosenthal & Zimmerman, 1978). From the behavioral framework, cognitions and affect are seen as behaviors, subject to the same environmental events as are observable behaviors (Holtzworth-Munroe & Jacobson, 1991). Social-learning theorists posit that cognitive processes are determined by environmental stimuli which, in turn, act to change the environment in a reciprocal relationship (Rosenthal & Zimmerman, 1978). Family relationships are seen as both bidirectional and reciprocal, with each family member playing an important role in influencing the behavior of the others (DeV. Peters & McMahon, 1988). Transactional models similarly account for the transforming effects of parents, children and environments on each other (Killeen, 1993).

Bandura (1978) described psychological functioning as reciprocal determinism, a continuous reciprocal interaction between behavioral, cognitive, and environmental influences. Bandura (1977) explained that in the social-learning view of interaction, behavior, internal personal factors (such as self-perception), and environmental influences operate as "interlocking determinants" of each other (p. 346). In any given situation for any given person, the relative importance of these three factors fluctuates. Bandura (1978) added that an event can be a stimulus, a response, or a consequence depending on where one arbitrarily examines the interactional sequence of events.

Cognitive factors, such as perceptions, expectancies, and performance standards, have gained increased prominence in social-learning theory (Bandura, 1977). Concomitantly, Epstein et al. (1988) argued that beliefs, attributions and expectancies are the major cognitive variables to be considered when assessing family dysfunction. Parents influence their children's self-concepts by labeling their children's behaviors and
attributes, by communicating the importance of certain performances, and by specifying performance standards (Killeen, 1993). For some, when the "perceived self" and "ideal self" are alike, self-esteem is positive (Pope et al., 1988, p.42). As the "perceived self" and "ideal self" become more discrepant, self-esteem becomes more negative. While Rotter (1954) stressed the importance of defining situations objectively, he also argued that in defining the self, the subjective, psychological meaning of the stimulus is important. He also emphasized the individual's potential to interpret situations after having integrated and changed one's attitudes or responses as a function of experience without reacting solely to present stimuli.

The early social-psychological theorists most clearly described the development of the self. Cooley's (1902) concept of the "looking glass self" connotes that self-conceptions are essentially determined by how we imagine that others in our lives see us. Mead (1934) postulated that once the child becomes an object to oneself, the self is conceived through social interaction by talking to oneself in terms of the "generalized other." The "generalized other" was defined as an organized community or social group which gives the individual a sense of "unity of self" (p. 154). Mead (1934) spoke of the child experiencing and taking on the attitudes of the "generalized other." The "I" was defined as the spontaneous, function-oriented part of the self whereas the "me" was construed as the reflective, evaluative part of the self. The object of self, the "me," is the part of the self that holds the most relevance for the study of self-esteem.

Sullivan (1953) advanced the notion of the "significant other" and specified that the "other" being referred to in a child's life was primarily the mother, or mothering one. However, his definition of "significant other" was inclusive of parents, family, or any other important regulators of a developing child's anxiety. "Reflected appraisal" is the
phrase commonly referred to in describing the self's incorporation of social influences.

Focus of the Present Study

The emphasis of the present study is on interpretive and evaluative cognitions that gifted and nongifted children make about their families, and on what predictions can be made about their levels of self-esteem by knowing these cognitions. Secondarily, the evaluative cognitions of parents are assessed to examine their predictability to children's self-esteem scores and their relatedness to family variables.

Self-esteem seems to be a primary factor in a child's healthy social-emotional adjustment (Pope et al., 1988). High self-esteem, which involves a realistic assessment of one's shortcomings without being too self-critical, can be a motivator that helps a child avoid future psychological problems. Low self-esteem, conversely, was associated with several childhood disorders (American Psychiatric Association, 1987).

Research has indicated that high self-esteem is characteristic of productive versus non-productive individuals in academic, creative, and leadership activities (Gilmor, 1974). Gifted children's cognitive abilities have been adequately tested. However, comparatively little consideration has been given to their levels of social and emotional adjustments (Cornell & Grossberg, 1987; Klein & Cantor, 1976). Much of the research which has compared the self-esteem levels of gifted versus nongifted has been methodologically flawed or inconsistent, so as to make comparisons difficult to understand. This study was designed to eliminate several of the methodological problems by utilizing an adequate sample size, by including a nongifted sample rather than reference normative group scores of nongifted children, and by utilizing a reliable, valid self-esteem assessment device (the CSEI by Coopersmith, 1981).
Perhaps by clarifying the quality of gifted children's self-esteem as a group, in comparison to the general population of children, parents, educators, and therapists will be able to address their social and emotional needs more sensitively.

The present study involves exploring the relative associations between and predictive contributions of child-perceived family satisfaction, child-perceived parental behaviors, and parent-reported parenting self-esteem (parental sense of competence), parent-reported family satisfaction, and the self-esteem of parents to the self-esteem scores of sixth-grade children. The data also allows for evaluating these issues across groups of children, gifted and nongifted. Again, no research data exist which directly answer these questions.

As of yet, only the relatedness of gifted children's perceived parental behaviors and their levels of self-esteem have been addressed in a pilot study (Enright & Ruzicka, 1989). The instrument utilized to measure perceived parental behaviors in this study is the Children's Reports of Parental Behavior Inventory (Schaefer, 1965a). This instrument is viewed as a more reliable and valid measure than the Parents Practices Questionnaire (Devereux et al., 1969) used to measure this construct in the pilot study (Enright & Ruzicka, 1989). This study provides a more complete view of the impact that family factors have on self-esteem than the pilot study by adding the input of parents' cognitions about their parent-child interactions and themselves. It also indicates whether these relationships vary across groups of gifted versus nongifted children.

Although holding the variable of grade level constant limits the generalizability of these findings, doing so controls for variability in self-esteem scores due to age that was observed in the pilot study (Enright & Ruzicka, 1989).

Selecting sixth graders to study focuses on children in the middle-to-late childhood
or preadolescent stage of development. The perceived appraisals of parents continue to have significant impact on children's self-esteem at this stage of development (Cotton, 1983; Dickstein & Posner, 1978; Gecas, Calonico & Thomas, 1974; Maccoby, 1984). Parental effects are stronger on children in earlier years (Felson & Zielinski, 1989), and younger children tend to imitate their parents more than older children (Gecas et al., 1974). As children move into adolescence, social acceptance by peers and teachers becomes increasingly important (Gecas et al., 1974; Pope et al., 1988). Self-esteem was shown to be significantly related to feelings toward parents and best friends for both eighth graders and eleventh graders (O'Donnell, 1976). However, feelings toward parents demonstrated a stronger relationship in eighth grade respondents.

In contrast, the age of ten-to-seventeen year old subjects in one study did not affect the relationship between respondents' perceptions of parental behavior and their levels of self-esteem (Demo et al., 1987). This finding is consistent with a review of the self-esteem literature which reported no consistent trend in levels of self-esteem across age (Wylie, 1979).

Gender differences in self-esteem scores across means and standard deviations are generally minimal (Coopersmith, 1981). When gender differences are obtained, females are as likely as males to evidence higher self-esteem (Killeen, 1993; Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974; Major, Barr, Zubek, & Babey, 1999; Nielsen & Metha, 1994). This similarity in self-esteem was observed in the preponderance of studies reporting boys and girls self-esteem score means among gifted and nongifted children. Consequently, the results of female and male self-esteem scores will be reported and a test of mean differences will be performed, however, gender was not included as a predictor of children's self-esteem.
Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study is to assess the relatedness and predictability of several family variables — child-perceived family satisfaction, child-perceived parental behaviors, parent-reported parenting self-esteem (parental sense of competence), parent-reported family satisfaction, and the self-esteem of parents—on overall self-esteem scores across groups of gifted and nongifted sixth graders.

Analyses were also conducted to explore the relationships that exist between children's perceptions of their family, parents, and themselves and their parents' perceptions of their family, parenting, and themselves.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1

It is hypothesized that among gifted sixth-grade children, higher levels of self-esteem will be significantly related to their perceptions of higher levels of family satisfaction and maternal acceptance, lower levels of maternal psychological control and maternal lax discipline, higher levels of paternal acceptance, lower levels of paternal psychological control and paternal lax discipline, and to higher levels of their mothers' self-esteem, mothers' perceptions of family satisfaction, and mothers' parenting self-esteem, and higher levels of their fathers' self-esteem, fathers' perceptions of family satisfaction, and fathers' parenting self-esteem.

Hypothesis 2

It is hypothesized that among nongifted sixth-grade children, higher levels of self-esteem will be significantly related to their perceptions of higher levels of family...
satisfaction and maternal acceptance, lower levels of maternal psychological control and maternal lax discipline, higher levels of paternal acceptance, lower levels of paternal psychological control and paternal lax discipline, and to higher levels of their mothers' self-esteem, mothers' perceptions of family satisfaction, and mothers' parenting self-esteem, and higher levels of their fathers' self-esteem, fathers' perceptions of family satisfaction, and fathers' parenting self-esteem.

Hypothesis 3

It is hypothesized that gifted and nongifted sixth-grade children's perceptions of high levels of family satisfaction and maternal acceptance, low levels of child-perceived maternal psychological control and maternal lax discipline, high levels of child-perceived paternal acceptance, low levels of child-perceived paternal psychological control and paternal lax discipline, and high levels of their mothers' self-esteem, mothers' perceptions of family satisfaction, and mothers' parenting self-esteem, and high levels of their fathers' self-esteem, fathers' perceptions of family satisfaction, and fathers' parenting self-esteem will explain greater variance in children's self-esteem scores than group identity, gifted versus nongifted.

Definition of Terms

The following terms were pertinent to this study:

1) Self-esteem: It is defined as "a personal judgment of worthiness that is expressed in the attitudes the individual holds toward him[her] self" (Coopersmith, 1967, p. 5). Self-esteem, one dimension of self-concept, refers to valuative assessments made about the descriptive self-perceptions, collectively referred to as the self-concept
(Samuels, 1977; Beane & Lipka, 1980; Pope et al., 1988). For the purpose of this study, self-esteem will be defined as the total score on the CSEI (Coopersmith, 1981) for both children and parents.

2) Self-concept: A global descriptor for perceptions one holds about oneself with regard to several dimensions of self (Beane & Lipka, 1980). Under the construct of self-concept, body self, social self, cognitive self, and self-esteem have been included (Samuels, 1977).

3) Family satisfaction: The overall set of evaluative beliefs which describe how a family member feels about one's family relationships, judged against the normative expectations of a family (Olson & Wilson, 1982). For the purpose of this study, family satisfaction will be defined as the total score on the Family Satisfaction Scale (FSS) (Olson & Wilson, 1982).

4) Children's perceived parental behavior: The extent to which children view their parents as accepting versus rejecting, as fostering psychological autonomy versus psychological control, and as establishing firm control versus lax control (Schaefer, 1965a). For the purpose of this study, children's perceptions of parental behavior will be defined as total scores of the three factors on both the Mother's and Father's forms of the CRPBI: Acceptance/Rejection, Psychological Autonomy/Psychological Control, and Firm/Lax Control (Schaefer, 1965a).

5) Parenting self-esteem: Perceived self-efficacy as a parent and the amount of self-reported satisfaction obtained from parenting (Johnson & Mash, 1989). Parenting self-esteem was earlier defined as parental sense of competence (Gibaud-Wallston & Wandersman, 1978) which assesses parents' self-reports of their skill/knowledge and value/comfort derived from parenting. The definition of "parenting self-esteem" is to
be differentiated from the "self-esteem" of participating parents as previously defined in this section. The former defines parents' beliefs about their abilities as parents and the self-reported satisfaction parenting provides. The latter defines the reported self-worth that the participating parents believe about themselves in general. For the purpose of this study, "parenting self-esteem" will be defined as the overall self-esteem score on the PSOC scale calculated from the sum of the parenting self-efficacy and parenting satisfaction factor scores (Johnson & Mash, 1989).

6) Giftedness: It is defined as "competence which is distinctively above average in one or more domains of ability" (Gagne, 1985, p. 108). These domains were identified as intellectual ability, creative and productive thinking skills, and psychomotor abilities. In the present study, the focus will be on the intellectual abilities of gifted children, as identified by educational professionals using multiple criteria to signify exceptional academic ability. In New Jersey schools, from where all participants were solicited, there is no uniformity across school districts concerning the identification of gifted students. Therefore, the definition of gifted participants in this study is a composite of school and program criteria for entry into gifted programs as below identified.

Three of four school districts used a criterion of admitting students into their gifted program if they had an intelligence test score of 130 or greater and one district admitted students with intelligence scores of 125 or greater. The intelligence tests utilized differed across school districts and two school districts made exceptions for this cutoff score. These two districts required superior performance on their other admissions criteria and one district allowed for a lower intelligence test score (IQ=120+) if a student came from a disadvantaged home or was learning English as a
second language.

Three of four school districts' criteria included achievement scores in their selection process. One district required scores in the top three percent of their school district's grade level, one in the top five percent, and another in the top 15 percent. All four school districts utilized a teacher rating and/or nomination procedure as part of the gifted identification process. One school district made getting "All A's for three years" a weighted score in their matrix scoring system. Another school district used a matrix scoring system requiring a student to reach a cumulative cutoff score comprising ratings of each criterion to be qualified for acceptance into their gifted program.

Finally, gifted students from a weekend-gifted program were solicited for this study. Students were accepted into this program if their GPA was in the top five percent of their school district's grade level or the student scored in the top five percent on their school district's standardized tests, and the student was identified as gifted by their school district, by a recognized gifted identification scoring system, or by prior participation in a gifted program.

Limitations

Even though the present thesis sought to eliminate several methodological flaws of previous research efforts in this field, the following limitations to generalizability of this study's results are noted:

1. Information about the respondents was primarily derived from self-reported data. One of the inherent problems associated with self-report data is the possibility of response-set bias. An effort was made to assess and control for the effects of response-set bias by
including test items from: the Children's Social Desirability Questionnaire (Crandall, Crandall & Katkovsky, 1965), the Self-Monitoring Scale (Snyder, 1974), the Agreement Response Scale (Couch & Keniston, 1960), and the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960).

2. The sample was limited to gifted and nongifted respondents from the New York metropolitan area.

3. Respondents selection was not completely random from a theoretical pool of all sixth graders in the metropolitan area since only those children who were granted school and parental permission to participate in the study, and who appropriately completed the assessment protocols, were included in this study.

4. Respondents were aware of their participation in the study which may alter their responses to protocols.

5. Assignment of respondents to gifted and nongifted status in their educational programs was made by the participants' parents and educational professionals before the experimental control criteria for group assignment was imposed. This leaves the opportunity for unaccounted-for variance within-groups. For instance, children who may qualify for admission to gifted classes or programs may choose not to be identified as such. These students, if they chose to participate, would be assigned to the nongifted group.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Chapter Two includes a review of empirical literature related to the topics of
giftedness and self-esteem, giftedness and self-concept, children's perceptions of parental
behaviors and self-esteem, family satisfaction and the self, parenting self-esteem (parental
sense of competence), and parental and child self-esteem. Each section is summarized
and designed to clarify the nature and purpose of the hypotheses.

Giftedness and Self-Esteem

A classic study of 1500 gifted children demonstrated better social and emotional
adjustment among gifted children than their nongifted counterparts (Terman, 1925).
Subsequent other studies (Hollingsworth, 1926; Terman & Oden, 1947) and a review of
gifted children (Strang, 1960) have helped perpetuate what Cornell (1983) would say is
an overidealized stereotype of gifted children.

More recent studies that compared the self-esteem scores of a group of gifted
children to a nongifted sample (or a normative group mean score) yielded differing
results. No differences in self-esteem scores on the CSEI, short form, were observed
between gifted and nongifted fourth and fifth grade children (Bartell & Reynolds, 1986;
Chiu, 1990). Similar results were obtained between gifted and nongifted children, grades
five through eight (McEwin & Cross, 1982), using a seven-item Self-Esteem Inventory
(Rosenberg, 1965). The authors indicated, however, that some subjects from the "non-labeled" comparison group may have been gifted in that subjects were randomly selected from all students in all schools tested.

Another study found no significant differences between gifted and nongifted adolescents on an eight-item self-esteem scale developed by the investigators (Brody & Benbow, 1986). Mean age of this gifted sample was 13.7. However, the "comparison group" was tested two and one-half years later when they were between the ages of 14 and 15 years old.

Dean (1977) reported nonsignificant differences in self-esteem scores as measured by the CSEI between gifted seventh and eighth grade subjects and Coopersmith's (1967) standardization sample. A similar study, comparing the CSEI scores of gifted tenth graders against those of a norm group showed no significant difference in scores (Tidwell, 1980).

The above results, while compromised by methodological problems and differences, suggest that no significant differences between gifted and nongifted children exist on self-esteem indices. Gifted children, like their nongifted counterparts, may be straddled with learning disabilities, social-emotional disorders, and physical impairments (McDowell, 1984). In fact, authors have argued that the highly gifted, those with IQ's of 150 and higher, have a tendency toward low self-esteem by virtue of their "mental gifts" creating greater social differences (Johnson, 1981; Powell & Haden, 1984) and a tendency to develop an overly-demanding ideal self (Powell & Haden, 1984; Ross, 1964;). The pilot study (Enright & Ruzicka, 1989) obtained high variability in self-esteem scores among gifted children, grades one through four, supporting the view that gifted children can suffer from feelings of unworthiness (Bracken, 1980; Cornell, 1983;

One study of gifted sixth-graders observed that on a scale of perfectionism, 33% were identified as nonperfectionistic, 41% as a healthy perfectionistic type, and 25% as dysfunctionally perfectionistic (Parker, 1997). The self-esteem scores of the healthy perfectionistic types were significantly higher than those of the other two groups.

In a study sampling the self-esteem scores of 3,800 children, aged 8 to 13, Trotter (1971) reported that children with high intelligence scores rated themselves as having significantly lower CSEI self-esteem scores when compared against the scores of average-intelligence children. Investigators placed subjects scoring above the 90th percentile on a group intelligence test in the high intelligence group, and placed subjects who scored between the 40th and 60th percentiles in the average intelligence group. Australian girls in grades seven through nine (81 gifted and 77 nongifted) completed the CSEI (Lea-Wood & Clunies-Ross, 1995). Nongifted girls at each grade level obtained significantly higher self-esteem scores than gifted girls. Klein and Cantor (1976) similarly showed that a higher percentage of their gifted subjects, kindergartners through fourth graders, fell within their low self-esteem group than did their nongifted subjects. These subjects were administered the CSEI and the Piers-Harris Self-Concept Scale (PHSCS, Piers & Harris, 1969).

There is some recent research that finds that gifted children's self-esteem tests higher than nongifted subjects. One study determined that 112 academically gifted and nongifted adolescents, grades nine through twelve, differed significantly on a self-esteem index whereby gifted adolescents evidenced higher self-esteem scores than nongifted adolescents (Nail, 1998). Another study of children labeled as gifted indicated that the gifted group scored higher on a self-esteem scale than their nongifted peers (Abdel-

Gifted and nongifted high school students from Australia, ranging in age from 12-15 years, completed a questionnaire designed to measure decision-making style (Ball, Mann & Stamm, 1994). A six-item self-esteem subscale showed that gifted high school students reported significantly higher levels of self-esteem as a decision-maker than their nongifted counterparts.

**Giftedness and Self-Concept**

While employing a self-concept questionnaire from the Attitude Toward School Questionnaire, Bracken (1980) did not find significant differences in the self-concept ratings of gifted children \( M_{\text{age}}=9.8; SD=1.9 \) and nongifted elementary school children (no other demographics offered). Another study obtained nonsignificant differences between gifted and nongifted fourth through seventh graders on the PHSCS (Karnes & Wherry, 1981). When the authors judged the self-concept scores of their gifted subjects against those of a normative group (grades 4 through 12), the gifted subjects' scores were significantly higher.

One comparison study of gifted children versus high-achieving \( IQ_M=118.18; \) range 109 to 124) fourth through sixth graders observed that gifted subjects scored significantly lower than the high-achieving sample on the PHSCS (Coleman & Fults,
1982). The authors were quick to point out that, on average, the comparatively lower scores of their gifted subjects still "far exceeded" the PHSCS standardization sample mean (Piers & Harris, 1969).

While another investigation yielded nonsignificant PHSCS score differences between gifted and nongifted boys, aged 9 to 12, similar-aged gifted girls scored significantly higher on the PHSCS than nongifted female agemates (Loeb & Jay, 1987).

Gifted Israeli fourth through eighth graders scored significantly higher on Fitts' (1965) Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (TSCS) than same-aged nongifted Israelis (Milgram & Milgram, 1976).

A large number of gifted (N=786) and nongifted (N=328) second- and third-graders completed a test measuring academic self-concept, social self-concept and global self-worth (Cornell, Delcourt, Goldberg & Bland, 1992). Results revealed nonsignificant score differences in global self-worth and social self-concept, but significantly higher academic self-concept scores among gifted students.

In summary, the review of studies comparing the levels of self-esteem and self-concept among gifted versus nongifted children shows conflicting results. The majority of studies yield nonsignificant results between gifted and nongifted children's self-esteem scores. Next, there were a number of studies showing that gifted children obtain higher levels of self-esteem and self-concept scores than nongifted peers. Finally, there were four studies that found the opposite results, namely that gifted children scored lower levels of self-esteem and self-concept in comparison to children not identified as gifted.

Children's Perceptions of Parental Behaviors and Self-Esteem

In addition to research which related a child's behavior to observer-reported
parental behaviors, a research trend has been established that focuses on that portion of
the variance in which a child's perception of his/her parents accounts for the child's
behavior (Goldin, 1969). For example, 1,367 high school seniors' perceptions of how
their parents would evaluate them (as a student, as a friend, as a son/daughter, and in
general) were significantly predictive of their own self-evaluations (Hoelter, 1984).
There was a trend for this predictor variable to be more influential for males than females
in this study.

Goldin's (1969) review of children's reports of parental behavior reported that
Schaefer (1965b) had demonstrated that three orthogonal factors of children's reports of
parental behavior explained this variance. The factors included Acceptance versus
Rejection, Psychological Autonomy versus Psychological Control, and Firm versus Lax
Control. These factors very closely mirror Coopersmith's (1967) research identifying
parental acceptance, parental respect and freedom to engage in self-initiated behaviors,
and parental enforcement of clearly defined limits as leading to high levels of self-esteem
in children.

The following literature review of perceived parental behaviors, as they relate to
children's self-esteem, is broken-down into three sections: the child's report of perceived
parental acceptance versus rejection; the child's perceived use of psychological control
techniques versus parental autonomy granting; and the child's reports of parental use of
lax versus firm discipline. In this study, the variable perceived Psychological
Control/Autonomy is understood as the degree to which parents are perceived by children
as attempting to control them through covert, psychological methods which inhibit the
individuation process. The variable Lax/Firm Discipline is understood as the degree to
which children perceive parents as exercising more lax discipline.
Perceived Parental Acceptance/Rejection and Self-Esteem

One of the earliest studies in the area of perceived parental support and its relationship to the social-emotional adjustment of children comes from Stott (1939). Stott questioned 1,855 adolescents whose test responses showed that the self-reported adequacy of their own personal adjustments was significantly correlated with a family-life factor conceived of as "confidence, affection and companionability" (p. 157).

In a landmark study of the self-esteem of 85 white males, aged 10-12, Coopersmith (1967) separated the subjects into three groups (Low, Medium and High) based upon their scores on a Self-Esteem Inventory (SEI). In addition to the SEI administration, the boys completed a self-report questionnaire concerning their perceptions of parental attitudes and practices.

One of the response categories Coopersmith (1967) employed to assess perceived parental acceptance was the extent to which children sees themselves as agreeing with the views of other family members. The responses were presumed to indicate levels of perceived family agreement, and, consequently, the degrees of perceived cohesiveness, support, and exchange between family members. Results showed a significant difference between groups wherein 100% of the boys with high subjective self-esteem, 58.8% of boys with medium self-esteem, and 56.7% of boys with low self-esteem reported generally agreeing with the views of other members of their families. One gauge of a child's perception of maternal acceptance was the extent to which he saw his mother as acquainted with his friends. The more familiar the mother appeared to be with her son's friends, the more accepting of him she was seen to be. A significant difference between groups was observed, namely that 100% of boys with high subjective self-esteem, 94.1%
of boys with medium self-esteem, and 64.5% of boys with low self-esteem reported their mothers knew all or most of their friends.

In a study of 5,024 high school students, Rosenberg (1965) addressed the impact childrearing practices had on self-esteem. He found that parental indifference is highly correlated negatively with self-esteem. However, he also found the converse to be true as well, children, who perceived their parents as demonstrating parental interest, scored significantly higher on a self-esteem inventory than parents perceived as indifferent to their children.

A similar study demonstrated a significant, positive relationship in 44 undergraduates \(M = 18\) years old between a measure of self-acceptance and perceptions of their parents as loving (Medinnus, 1965). Significant, negative relationships were also seen between self-acceptance and perceptions of both parents as neglectful and rejecting.

A series of studies (Gecas, 1971; Gecas, 1972; Gecas, Thomas & Weigart, 1970; Gecas & Schwalbe, 1986) showed that significant, positive relationships exist between perceived parental support and self-esteem among adolescents. The studies had in common the administration of Osgood's (1962; 1964) Semantic Differential and a version of the Bronfenbrenner Parent Behavior Questionnaire (Rodgers, 1966). The former test employs a three-item subscale of Self-Worth while the latter measure assesses perceived parental support, control, and punishment.

Gecas, Thomas and Weigert's (1970) study of 399 high school boys \(M = 16\) years old showed that perceived parental support is positively related to self-esteem in Puerto Rican and Anglo-American families. Gecas' (1971) study obtained similar results among 620 boys and girls, "mostly" aged 16 and 17. However, he noted that the relationship between perceived parental support and self-esteem was stronger for girls than boys, that
perceived maternal support had a stronger effect on self-esteem than perceived paternal support, and that the influence of parental support is stronger for the same-sex child. Of interest, the relationship between perceived parental support and self-esteem was stronger among middle-class respondents.

By assessing the responses of 598 sixteen- and seventeen-year-olds, Gecas (1972) again observed a significant relationship between perceived parental support and self-esteem. But, in this study, he demonstrated that the positive relationship between parental support and adolescents' self-esteem varies considerably with social context. The relationship is strongest in adult contexts (family, classroom, and adults) and either weak or non-significant in the peer contexts (friends and opposite sex). In other words, the influence of perceived parental support was most noticeable when adolescents considered themselves in the context of their family and weakest in the context of a group of friends. Girls were observed to have a slightly stronger relationship between support and self-esteem in the adult contexts.

In the final study, Gecas and Schwalbe (1986) obtained data from 128 families that had at least one adolescent in the family between the ages of 17 and 19. In addition to the children's perceptions of parental behavior, this study also elicited parents' perceptions of three dimensions of parental behavior (support, control/autonomy, and participation) by use of the Parent Attitude Research Instrument (Bell & Schaefer, 1965). It was found that parents' reports of parental behavior were not as strongly related to their children's self-esteem as their children's reports of parental behavior were, although paternal self-reported support was significantly related to children's self-esteem. Boys' perceptions of parental support were significantly related to their self-esteem levels. For girls, perceptions of maternal, but not paternal, support were significantly related to self-
esteen.

While attending a family-oriented educational session at Cornell University, 139 parent-adolescent dyads (60% were mother-child) agreed to complete parent-child interaction scales and Rosenberg's (1979) Self-Esteem Scale (Demo et al., 1987). Adolescents ranged in age from 10 to 17 years (M = 13.4 years). Results of this study demonstrated nonsignificant relationships between the adolescents' perceptions of parental support and their levels of self-esteem. When boys and girls' responses were analyzed separately, only girls' perceptions of parental support showed a modestly significant correlation to self-esteem.

One reason for the relative lack of association observed between adolescents' perceptions of parental support and self-esteem may be found in the idiosyncratic nature of the parent-child communication scales developed for this investigation. When the variable "parent-child communication" was entered into a regression equation predicting adolescent self-esteem, the effect of the variable "perceived parental support" was negligible. The communication scale may contain items frequently assessed by other measures of perceived parental support. Similar to the Gecas and Schwalbe (1986) results, the findings of Demo et al. (1987) were that adolescents' perceptions of parent-child interactions were more strongly correlated with self-esteem than were parental reports. These findings further corroborated Gecas and Schwalbe's (1986) results that boys were more strongly influenced by parent-child interactions than girls.

While Gowe (1980) did not assess parents' self-reports of parent-child behavior, 123 fifth- and sixth-graders in this study did complete the SEI (Coopersmith, 1967) and the Cornell Parent Behavior Description (Rodgers, 1966). Like Gecas and Schwalbe (1986), Gowe demonstrated significant relationships between perceptions of parental
support and self-esteem in boys. Among girls, perceptions of maternal support and self-esteem were related significantly, but perceptions of paternal support were not.

Stronger correlations between perceptions of parental acceptance and self-esteem for boys than girls were also noted by Kawash, Kerr and Clewes (1985). These researchers tested 126 fifth- and sixth-grade children using shortened versions of the Child's Report of Parental Behavior Inventory (CRPBI, Schaefer, 1965a) and the CSEI (Coopersmith, 1967).

Other studies have shown significant, positive relationships between children's perceptions of parental acceptance/support and self-esteem among children (Litovsky & Dusek, 1985), adolescents (Hoelter & Harper, 1987), gifted children (Enright & Ruzicka, 1989), and children from low-income families (Killeen, 1993; Peterson, Southworth & Peters, 1983). Comparable results were obtained utilizing a self-concept assessment device with children, aged 7 to 15 (Graybill, 1978).

A creatively constructed research design was employed with 467 fifth- and sixth-grade children from Australia in testing their perceptions of family cohesion, family types, self-esteem, and self-concept (Cooper, Holman, & Braithwaite, 1983). A pictorial measure of family cohesion was used, where each child rated family relationships from "two-parent cohesive" to "isolated child" family types, moving from higher to lower levels of family cohesion, respectively. The authors inferred that higher levels of parental acceptance and support were perceived by a child in the more cohesive diagrams. As expected, the "two-parent cohesive" family type was associated significantly more often with high levels of self-esteem and self-concept than was the "isolated child" family type.

A research design which sought to examine both the effects of perceived parental support on self-esteem and the effects of self-esteem on perceived parental support was
conducted by Felson and Zielinski (1989). An adaptation of Rosenberg’s Self-Esteem Scale (1965) and a perceived-parental-support questionnaire constructed for this investigation were completed by 338 students from grades four through seven.

Participants' responses showed a significant relationship between girls' levels of self-esteem and their perceptions: (a) that they can communicate with their parents; (b) of parental affection and non-critical interactions; and (c) that their sibling(s) is(are) not more favored by their parents. Both boys' and girls' levels of self-esteem were related significantly to perceptions of being praised by their parents. Perceived-parental-support variables explained more than three times as much variance in change of self-esteem scores for girls than for boys. The effects of self-esteem on perceived parental support were similar in magnitude to the effects of perceived parental support on self-esteem.

To summarize the findings on the relationship between children's perceptions of parental support and self-esteem, a significant amount of variance in children's self-esteem seems to be reliably accounted for by their perceptions of parental support. It appears that, by and large, children perceive their parents as similarly supportive, and the effect of this on self-esteem is relatively similar for boys and girls. However, this perception may be somewhat more influential for girls' self-esteem than boys'. There may also be a stronger association between same-sexed parent-child relationships when it comes to perceived parental support and self-esteem. Finally, there is evidence to suggest that it is the perception of parental support which has more consequence for the self-esteem of the children studied here than the parents' actual supportive behaviors (Demo et al., 1987; Felson & Zielinski, 1989; Gecas, 1971, 1972; Gecas et al., 1970; Gecas & Schwalbe, 1986; Schaefer, 1965a).
Perceived Parental Psychological Control/Psychological Autonomy and Self-Esteem

One of Coopersmith's (1967) three major findings is that parents need to provide respect and latitude for their children to engage in independent activities within clearly defined and enforced limits. However, the only source of his data was mothers' perceptions of their own parental beliefs and practices. Because of the importance and relevance of his study to the present thesis, his findings regarding parental autonomy and self-esteem are presented here.

Overall, the mothers of children with high self-esteem were significantly more likely to endorse democratic parental statements than were the mothers of children with low self-esteem (Coopersmith, 1967). Yet, when it came to training their child to be independent, there was a clear trend for mothers of children with medium self-esteem levels to indicate their endorsement of dependency-inducing statements more so than the mothers of children with either high or low self-esteem. Interestingly, Coopersmith interpreted this finding as indicating that overprotective parents foster the development of self-doubt in their children by limiting their abilities to explore and confront their doubts. The children's self-doubts are purportedly demonstrated by their medium self-esteem levels, rather than decidedly low or high self-evaluations (Coopersmith, 1967).

Using a 64-item variation of the CRPBI (Cross, 1969), significant, inverse relationships between perceptions of parental use of psychological control techniques (the polar opposite of parental autonomy) and children's levels of self-esteem among fifth- and sixth-grade children were obtained (Kawash et al., 1985). Perceptions of parental psychological control were shown to be particularly important for girls. Litovsky and
Dusek (1985) found the same significant relationship using a subject pool of 130 children in grades seven through nine. However, no significant differences were noted between sexes.

Child-perceived psychological control by parents was significantly and negatively associated with children's levels of self-esteem (Demo et al., 1987). This association was stronger for parent-son than for parent-daughter relationships. Participants in this study were 139 parent-adolescent dyads, where the children ranged in age from 10 to 17 (M=13.4 years).

A significant relationship was observed between a two-item perceived parental autonomy subscale of the modified Cornell Parent Behavior Description (Rodgers, 1966) and self-esteem scores of fifth and sixth grade males (Growe, 1980). Female subjects at the same grade levels did not demonstrate this relationship. Boys reported perceptions of their fathers as granting significantly less autonomy than did the girls in this study.

Adolescents' perceptions of parental psychological control and self-worth were shown to be not significantly related among three of four parent-adolescent pairings [daughter-mother, daughter-father, son-mother] (Gecas & Schwalbe, 1986). However, boys' perceptions of their fathers' use of psychological control techniques were significantly and positively related to boys' levels of self-esteem. Participants in this study were 128 parents and their adolescent children, aged 17 to 19. The researchers selected items from the Cornell Parent Behavior measure (Rodgers, 1966) to tap adolescent-perceived parental control versus autonomy and the Semantic Differential Test (Osgood, 1962; 1964) to gauge adolescents' self-worth.

A significant, positive relationship was found between perceived maternal-demanding behavior and children's self-esteem (Peterson et al., 1983). The Demanding
dimension of a perceived parental behavior questionnaire (Devereaux, Bronfenbrenner & Suci, 1962) had been judged to be similar to the Psychological Control versus Autonomy Granting dimension of the CRPBI (Goldin, 1969). Participants were 2,194 fifth and sixth graders. It was thought by the authors that demanding maternal behavior might communicate confidence in the child's capacity to understand, become self-responsible, and problem-solve effectively.

When researchers looked at the relationship between children’s perceptions of parental behavior and their levels of self-esteem in clinical and nonclinical adolescents, aged 13 to 17, the clinical sample of adolescents ($N=30$) consistently showed no relationship between perceptions of parental behaviors and self-esteem (Nielsen & Metha, 1994). For the nonclinical sample ($N=119$), 9 of 16 correlation coefficients were significantly and inversely related, pointing to an association between adolescents' perceptions of parental use of psychological control and their levels of self-esteem, primarily in parental-daughter relationships. The lack of association in clinical subjects' perceived psychological control by parents and their corresponding self-esteem scores was attributed to the small sample size ($N=30$), and heterogeneity of settings from which the sample was obtained (Nielsen & Metha, 1994).

A significant, inverse relationship was observed between child-perceived psychological control by parents and self-concept scores of the 52 children tested, aged seven to fifteen, (Graybill, 1978). Significant, inverse relationships were also noted between children's responses to some scales of the Psychological Control dimension of the CRPBI (Schaefer, 1965) and their self-concept scores (Crase, Foss & Colbert, 1981). Subjects were 172 fifth and sixth graders.

With step-wise regression analysis, Hill (1988) demonstrated that 100 ninth- and
twelfth-grade females' perceptions of greater amounts of parental autonomy accounted for a significant amount of variance in respondents' self-descriptions of personality adjustment. Among these participants, the adolescents' perceptions of maternal, not paternal, autonomy-granting were the primary determinant of their self-described personality adjustment. In general, the younger the respondent, the stronger was the effect of perceived parental autonomy-granting on personality adjustment.

To summarize, a significant, positive association seems to be reliably demonstrated between child-perceived parental autonomy-granting and negative associations between child-perceived parental use of psychological control techniques, and the child's self-evaluations. Basically, respondents were rating both parents similarly along the psychological control/psychological autonomy dimension.

Sons' and daughters' perceptions of their parents' use of psychological control techniques seem to have equivalent impacts on their self-evaluations. However, there is some evidence to suggest that the perceptions of a child's same-sexed parent concerning psychological control techniques will be more influential than those of the opposite-sexed parent's perceived use of psychological control techniques, on the child's self-evaluation. Finally, one study observed that the effect of perceived parental psychological control techniques on self-evaluation was stronger among younger subjects (Hill, 1988).

**Perceived Parental Lax/Firm Discipline and Self-Esteem**

Coopersmith's (1967) final major finding is that parental enforcement of clearly defined limits leads to high levels of self-esteem in children. Specifically, preadolescent boys with high self-esteem were more likely than boys with low self-esteem to perceive their parents as: (a) valuing the meeting of high standards as opposed to valuing personal
enjoyment; (b) firm, clear and demanding without appearing rigid or restrictive; and (c) administering deserved punishment. Boys with low self-esteem were more likely to perceive their mother as the parent who administers disciplinary action.

Child-perceived maternal punishment was negatively associated with boys' and girls' self-esteem (Growe, 1980). No association between perceived paternal punishment and self-esteem was demonstrated by these fifth- and sixth-grade respondents.

The finding of perceived maternal, not paternal, punishing behaviors being negatively and significantly correlated with children's self-esteem was replicated by Enright and Ruzicka's (1989) pilot study. In this study, perceived maternal punishment showed the strongest correlation (inversely related) to respondents' self-esteem scores. Similar to Coopersmith's (1967) results, fathers' perceived use of deprivation of privileges to punish was positively associated with self-esteem among this small group of subjects (N=13), aged six to ten.

Peterson et al. (1983) looked only at perceived maternal behavior, but likewise reported significant, inverse relationships between perceived punishment and self-esteem across all three sets of his low-income samples. Respondents were 2,194 fifth- and sixth-grade students.

Kawash et al. (1985) reported that child-perceived parental use of lax versus firm discipline was nonsignificantly predictive of their self-esteem. However, when separated from girls' responses, boys' perceptions of parental discipline were significantly related to self-esteem scores. Surprisingly, the authors reported that child-perceived lax discipline, in contrast to firm discipline, was positively associated with the highest levels of self-esteem among boys. Compared to respondents' perceptions of parental support and
autonomy, perceived parental lax discipline was least predictive of self-esteem among the 126 fifth- and sixth-grade participants. Of note, the discipline factor utilized in this study was an abridged version of Schaefer's (1965a) CRPI.

In comparing psychiatric subjects, aged 13 to 17, with non-clinical subjects, aged 14 to 17, Nielsen and Metha (1994) observed that the two groups had differing relationships between perceived parental discipline and self-esteem. The non-clinical group showed significant, positive associations between high levels of perceived lax discipline and self-esteem among opposite-sexed parent-child dyads (mother-son; father-daughter). An unexpected result was the positive correlation between perceived maternal discipline, but not paternal discipline, and self-esteem among the boys. No significant relationships were found between perceptions of parental discipline and self-esteem among the clinical (psychiatric) group. A lack of statistical power because of small sample sizes (N=13 males; 17 females) and heterogeneity of respondents among this clinical group were offered by the authors as explanations for the nonsignificant results.

A study of 130 seventh through ninth graders yielded nonsignificant correlations between child-perceived parental lax discipline and self-esteem (Litovskry and Dusek, 1985). Graybill (1978) also observed a nonsignificant relationship between perceptions of parental firm discipline and a measure of self-concept in his subject pool of 52 children, aged seven to fifteen. This author hypothesized that perceived firm discipline by parents exists as a curvilinear relationship with children's self-esteem, thereby explaining the nonsignificant association obtained. As asserted, self-esteem may be higher when parents are perceived as consistent, yet flexible, in allowing rule deviations under special circumstances and lower when parents are perceived as either lax or overly strict in their discipline. Consistent with this theory, a team of researchers associated
juvenile delinquency with lax, inconsistent, or overly strict parental discipline that highlighted the use of physical punishment rather than reasoning (Patterson, Barsyshe & Ramsey, 1989).

When parents were directly questioned about their uses of discipline, researchers revealed that 83% of parents of "non-problem" male adolescents used talking and reasoning as the main forms of discipline in comparison to 13% of parents of "problem" male adolescents (Kahn & Fua, 1995). Similar results were shown by 90% of parents of "non-problem" female adolescents who used talking and reasoning as the main form of discipline, in contrast to only 37.5% of parents of "problem" female adolescents.

Physical punishment as the main form of discipline was used by 29% of parents of "non-problem" adolescent males, 60% of parents of "problem" adolescent males, 4.5% of parents of "non-problem" adolescent females, and 37.5% of parents of "problem" adolescent females. "Non-problem" adolescents' levels of self-esteem were significantly higher than those of "problem" adolescents. Subjects were 76 children of immigrants, aged 15 to 16, from Samoan, Tongan, or Australian parents.

In associated research, two retrospective studies addressed the relationship between college students' recollections of parental discipline techniques used when they were children and current levels of self-esteem (Gussman & Harder, 1990; Joubert, 1991). One study demonstrated that men with high levels of self-esteem were more likely than men with low self-esteem to describe their mothers as having been fair and less verbally abusive growing up (Joubert, 1991). No correlation between recollections of fathers' discipline and self-esteem was noted. Women with high self-esteem were more likely than women with low self-esteem to recall their mothers as having been fair, and both parents as using more praise and less verbal abuse.
The second study found that college students' (N=20 men; 20 women) recollections of both parents using high amounts of punishment were related significantly to dissatisfaction with self (Gussman & Harder, 1990). Recollections of fathers' use of corporal and verbal punishment were significantly associated with dissatisfaction with self. Memories of fathers' use of verbal rewards were correlated significantly with high levels of self-esteem. When mothers were recalled as using high frequencies of material rewards, a significant relationship to dissatisfaction with self was observed.

In summary, children's perceptions of parental discipline were associated with high levels of self-esteem when parents were seen as setting high standards, as firm, clear, fair and demanding without being seen as rigid or unduly strict. By review of the literature, the perceived use of milder, more positive modes of punishment and discipline by parents appears to be related to higher levels of self-esteem in children.

Perceptions of mothers as the primary punishing or disciplining agent tend to be correlated with low self-esteem in children, especially in boys. Conversely, perceptions of fathers' use of milder forms of discipline were shown to be positively related to children's self-esteem. The self-esteem of boys, more than girls, seems to be influenced by perceptions of parental discipline and punishment. Perceptions of lax versus firm discipline by parents, in comparison to perceptions of parental support and autonomy-granting, were generally least predictive of children's self-esteem.

**Family Satisfaction and the Self**

In the arena of parent-child relationships among children of divorced parents, several authors have emphasized the need for more research on the quality of family interactions (Hess & Camara, 1979; Hetherington, Cox & Cox, 1978; Kanoy,
Cunningham, White & Adams, 1984). They observed that children's perceptions of change in the quality, versus quantity, of their parent-child relationships had a stronger impact on emotional adjustment to divorce.

Not surprisingly, there is little research that directly explores the association between children's perceptions of family satisfaction and their levels of self-esteem. Despite this, the area appears both intuitively and empirically promising to explore.

The most relevant study obtained self-concept scores from 255 Jewish adolescents, aged 11 to 18. The scores were significantly higher for those adolescents reporting greater levels of family satisfaction (Schwartz, 1987). Interestingly, the perception of an accepting father was the strongest predictor of high levels of family satisfaction, followed closely by an accepting mother. Family satisfaction scores were a better predictor of self-concept scores than were adolescents' perceptions of parental acceptance, autonomy granting, and limit setting.

As part of Coopersmith's (1967) comprehensive study of 85 males, aged 10-12, respondents' mothers were asked to indicate their perceptions of the extent of their son's happiness as shown by his actions. Most boys scoring in the high self-esteem group (90.9%) were judged by their mothers to be relatively happy, as compared to boys in the low self-esteem group (66.7%). These ratings, while apparently divergent between groups, yielded nonsignificant differences. However, no child-perceived family satisfaction responses were elicited by the investigator.

In a study of 467 fifth- and sixth-graders, children were grouped into five family types based on a pictorial measure of family cohesion (Cooper et al., 1983). The family types included "two-parent cohesive," "one-parent cohesive," "parent coalition," "divided," and "isolated child," listed in order of more-to-less family cohesion. Children
from two-parent and one-parent cohesive families reported more family happiness and
fun than children from the other family types based on a questionnaire developed for this
study. Although the relationships between both self-esteem and self-concept scores with
family satisfaction scores were not tested directly, it is noteworthy that children from
two- and one-parent cohesive families scored significantly higher on measures of self-
esteeem and self-concept than did children from the other family types.

Garg (1992) asked 150 undergraduates, "How much satisfaction do you get from
your family?" as part of a survey. Significant, positive associations were observed
between respondents' emotional, general, and nonacademic self-concepts and reported
family satisfaction.

Associated studies have demonstrated significant, positive correlations between
child-perceived family satisfaction and "better" parent-adolescent communication (Barnes
& Olson, 1985) and achievement in gifted boys (Green, Fine & Tollefson, 1988). Adult
subjects have shown positive, significant associations between their perceptions of family
satisfaction and perceived wellness (Ragheb, 1993) as well as with measures of
subjective well-being (Okun & Stock, 1987).

Conversely, when levels of family satisfaction were measured among 140 kibbutz
fathers, those who reported the highest levels of family satisfaction were most likely to
see their families as encouraging the growth of its members (Margalit et al., 1989). This
cluster of fathers was distinguished from fathers who perceived their families as either
disorganized and noncohesive, conflict-avoidant, or recreation- avoidant.

Overall, higher levels of family satisfaction reported by family members, in
general, and by the children reported here, in particular, seem to translate into improved
parent-child relationships and a healthier emotional adjustment for children. Schwartz
(1987) found that adolescents' reports of family satisfaction were a stronger predictor of their self-concept scores than were adolescent perceptions of parental acceptance, autonomy-granting, and limit-setting. However, no studies have been reported that test the predictive power of family satisfaction scores on self-esteem scores using gifted and nongifted children.

**Parenting Self-Esteem and the Self**

The family has been described as the "primary arena for socialization" (Maccoby, 1984, p. 318). The role of self-reported parental variables likely to explain the variance in children's self-esteem will be addressed here.

Children's self-esteem is more strongly correlated with their own perceptions than with parents' perceptions of the parent-child relationship (Demo et al., 1987; Gecas & Schwalbe, 1986). However, theoretical assumptions and research findings are presented to highlight parenting influences, both behaviorally and cognitively, on a child's self. While not a major focus of the present thesis nor in the majority of research studies related to children's self-esteem, it is important to realize that there exists an increasing awareness and study of the impact that children's behavior has on the behavior and self-esteem of parents. As has been stated, family relationships are bidirectionally and reciprocally influenced, with each family member playing an important role in influencing the behavior of the other (DeV. Peters & McMahon, 1988; Finken & Amato, 1993; Killeen, 1993).

In her review of parent and family management training, Wells (1994) made several key points. First, United States families tend to be hierarchically structured with the majority of power and authority being assumed by parents. Second, parents are
presumed to have moral, legal and ethical responsibilities to care for their children. Third, parents are believed to have greater capacities for making reasoned judgments and utilizing self-control to change behavior patterns than are children. Finally, "mutually interrelated family influence processes" dictate that parental influences on a child's behavior will feed back and create changes in parental behavior (p. 254).

Coopersmith (1967) asserted that parental acceptance of a child, parental enforcement of clearly defined limits, and parental respect and freedom for a child were important antecedents of high levels of self-esteem in children.

In a meta-analytic study of the efficaciousness of Gordon's (1970) Parent Effectiveness Training, it was determined that such training did indeed produce significant, positive effects on parents' knowledge of parental skills, parents' self-esteem levels, their children's self-esteem and behavior, and parental behavior, in order of effect size (Cedar & Levant, 1990).

Not only do parental behaviors play a significant role in the emotional development of children, but parent cognitions seem to influence family processes. Family members typically will actively interpret and evaluate each other's behaviors, and subsequent emotional and behavioral responses will be influenced by these interpretations and evaluations (Epstein et al., 1988). The importance of studying parental cognitions in and of themselves (Goodnow, 1988) and in relation to parent-child relationships (Johnson & Mash, 1989; MacPhee, Fritz & Miller-Heyl, 1996) has been asserted. Symbolicinteraction theory suggests that children's self-esteem develops as a function of parents' reflected appraisals of children's self-worth which occurs during parent-child interaction (Gecas & Schwalbe, 1986; Mead, 1934).

Parents' perceptions of their performances as parents, generally considered the most
important family role, are related to their levels of self-esteem (Demo et al., 1987). Parenting self-esteem is said to comprise perceived self-efficacy as a parent and the amount of self-reported satisfaction obtained from parenting (Johnson & Mash, 1989).

Parenting self-esteem was earlier defined as parental sense of competence (Gibaud-Wallston & Wandersman, 1978). Parental sense of competence involved assessments of parents' self-reports of their "skill/knowledge" as parents and "value/comfort" from parenting. These authors developed the Parental Sense of Competence Scale (PSOC) in 1978 to measure the two aforementioned domains of parenting. The "skill/knowledge" domain will be designated here as "parenting self-efficacy," and the "value/comfort" domain will be referred to as "parenting satisfaction" based on a subsequent factor-analytic study of the PSOC (Johnson & Mash, 1989).

Parenting self-esteem, or parental sense of competence, measures have allowed for discrimination between parents of hyperactive and control-group children, between high and low levels of reported parental stress, and between specific parental perceptions of child behaviors (Mash & Johnson, 1983). For parents of hyperactive children, mothers' and fathers' total parenting self-esteem scores (the sum of parenting self-efficacy and parental satisfaction factor scores) were significantly correlated. In the control group, only mothers' and fathers' self-efficacy factor scores were significantly related, but not their ratings of parental satisfaction. Generally speaking, the relationships between parenting self-esteem and parent-perceived child problems were stronger for mothers than fathers. The factor scores tapping parental satisfaction were more strongly related to parent-perceived child problems than were the factor scores of parental self-efficacy.

A study of the impact of group parent training on parenting self-esteem showed a significant increase in parental perceptions of their parenting self-efficacy from
pretreatment to a three-month follow up (Pisterman, Firestone, McGrath, Goodman, Webster, Mallory & Goffin, 1992). No similar changes were observed in the control group. A significant increase in parental satisfaction was also observed from pretreatment to follow up. The control group showed a much smaller, although significant, improvement in parental satisfaction. Changes in parenting self-efficacy and parental satisfaction were positively and significantly correlated. These changes were also related significantly to parental perceptions of improvements in children's behavior. The respondents were parents of children (mean age was four years old) who had a clinical diagnosis of Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder.

A later study found a significant effect of parent training on maternal (parenting) self-esteem (Anastopoulas, Shelton, DuPaul & Guevremont, 1993) as measured by a modified version of the Parenting Sense of Competence Scale [PSOC] (Johnson & Mash, 1989). This study assessed the mothers of hyperactive children, aged 6 to 11 years, in their parent functioning and noted significant increases in parenting self-esteem from pre- to posttreatment. Concomitant decreases in ADHD symptomatology were observed during this time period.

Research designed to provide psychometric, normative and validity information for the PSOC (Gibaud-Wallston & Wandersman, 1978) tested 297 parents of "normal" four to nine-year-olds (Johnson & Mash, 1989). They were administered the PSOC and the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) (Achenbach & Edelbrock, 1983). Results revealed that overall parenting self-esteem scores were significantly and inversely correlated with both CBCL scales, Internalizing and Externalizing. The parental satisfaction factor of the PSOC was significantly and negatively associated with both CBCL scale scores. The parenting self-efficacy factor showed the same significant correlations, but only with
Externalizing scale scores of the CBCL. For mothers, total parenting self-esteem scores significantly and negatively correlated with both scale scores of the CBCL. But, only mothers' satisfaction scores, not self-efficacy scores, from the PSOC showed negative, significant association with the CBCL scale scores. For fathers, total parenting self-esteem scores, as well as both factor scores of the PSOC, were significantly and inversely related to both CBCL scale scores. Significant correlations were obtained for mother-father pairs on total parenting self-esteem scores and both satisfaction and self-efficacy factors. Fathers scored significantly higher than mothers on total parenting self-esteem scores and on the parenting satisfaction factor. No significant differences between parents were seen on the parenting self-efficacy factor.

The PSOC scale (Gibaud-Wallston & Wandersman, 1978) discriminated between levels of reported paternal role competence (as measured by PSOC total parenting self-esteem scores) for 79 experienced and 93 inexperienced fathers (Ferketich & Mercer, 1995). Experienced fathers reported significantly higher paternal-role-competence scores than did inexperienced fathers, but only during the early postpartum period (during the spouse's hospitalization). No significant differences between fathers in paternal-role-competence were noted at one, four, or eight months after birth. However, for both groups of fathers one-month mean paternal-role-competence scores were significantly lower than four- and eight-month mean scores.

Parents' reports of parenting competence were significantly correlated with parents' reports of two child-rearing practices -- a positive relationship with limit setting and an inverse relationship with harsh punishment (MacPhee et al., 1996). These relationships held across all three sets of American Indian, Hispanic and Anglo parents. Respondents were parents of guardians (N = 500) of two-to-five year olds referred to an early
intervention project geared to strengthen family functioning.

In sum, the behavioral and cognitive impact of parents on the development of children's self-esteem is supported theoretically as well as empirically. No research has yet been able to show direct empirical connections between parenting self-esteem (which comprises perceived self-efficacy as a parent and parental satisfaction) and children's self-esteem. Still, parenting self-esteem has shown a consistent inverse relationship to parents' perceptions of child problems, especially among parents with hyperactive children. Parenting self-esteem measures have been able to differentiate between parents of hyperactive children and a control group, between levels of parental stress, between parents who complete a parent training program and a control group of parents, between experienced and inexperienced fathers, and differences in child-rearing practices across diverse cultural groups. There is some evidence to suggest that the parental satisfaction factor is more closely related to the parent-child relationship than is the parental self-efficacy factor. Also, there appears to be congruence in maternal and paternal self-esteem scores.

Parental and Child Self-Esteem

Thus far, discussion has centered on research dealing with parenting self-esteem which is to be differentiated from the general self-esteem of parents. The former dimension describes self-efficacy in parenting and satisfaction that is derived from parenting. The latter dimension, the self-esteem of parents, is descriptive of the self-reported self-worth of parents. Attention will now focus on research concerning the self-esteem of parents as it relates to children's self-esteem.

Social-learning theory suggests that as a result of vicarious or observational
learning, parent and child self-esteem will be positively correlated (Bandura, 1977). However, in a study of 184 families with an adolescent, aged 14 to 18, significant, negative relationships were observed between parent and adolescent self-esteem (Openshaw, Thomas & Rollins, 1984). The reversal of expected outcomes from positive to negative correlations was explained by the authors as a methodological artifact.

Research on the impact of maternal self-esteem on 35 second graders and 38 eighth graders revealed that maternal self-esteem was significantly predictive of children's self-esteem across both grade levels (Landau, 1986).

Among 139 parent-adolescent dyads, in which the adolescents ranged in age from 10 to 17 years, parents' self-esteem was weakly correlated (r = .15), albeit significantly, to adolescents' self-esteem (Demo et al., 1987). Fifty-seven fathers and 82 mothers were tested.

A significant, inverse relationship was demonstrated between number of child problems reported by parents and parents' self-esteem (Finken & Amato, 1993). No significant differences between parents were observed for this relationship. Respondents were 1,624 married couples who had biological children 18 years of age or younger living in the household and had completed a seven-item questionnaire about the presence or absence of specific child problems and a parental self-esteem inventory.

Separate from the above discussion are the questions of whether the parents of gifted and nongifted children report the same or different levels of parenting self-esteem or general self-esteem. While research has not yet been done to directly answer these questions, parents who had a gifted child enrolled in kindergarten through sixth-grade showed tendencies of being more intelligent and self-sufficient than parents in the general population when tested on a self-report personality inventory (Fell, Dahlstrom & Winter,
Mothers tended to be more conscientious and self-controlled than women in the general population. Fathers tended to be more reserved, assertive and tense than men in the general population. Thirty-two mothers and 30 fathers completed the questionnaires.

The research focused on the general self-esteem of parents, as contrasted with parenting self-esteem, in relationship to children's self-esteem has yielded mixed results. While one study showed mothers' self-esteem to be significantly predictive of their children's self-esteem across second- and eighth-grade levels, two other studies showed either weak or inverse relationships between parents' self-esteem and children's self-esteem. These latter findings are consistent with studies that show children's self-esteem is correlated more strongly with their own perceptions than with their parents' perceptions of the parent-child relationship (Demo et al., 1987; Gecas & Schwalbe, 1986). The self-esteem of parents was also shown to be related inversely with the number of perceived child problems.

Finally, given reported differences in personality profiles of gifted versus nongifted parents, concomitant differences may be expected in the relationships between parenting self-esteem and children's self-esteem across gifted versus nongifted parents.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter describes the respondents and how they were chosen to participate in this study. The data collection procedures are outlined and the psychometric properties of the research instruments are detailed. Finally, the research design chosen, statistical procedures utilized, and the statistical analyses performed to test each hypothesis are discussed.

Respondents

Sixty-seven (67) sixth-graders and 113 of their parents/guardians, 59 mothers and 54 fathers, comprised the respondent sample. Thirty-three (33) sixth-graders were identified as gifted children, 11 boys and 22 girls, admitted to gifted programs at four elementary public schools or a weekend gifted program in Central and Northern New Jersey. Thirty-four (34) sixth graders, 24 boys and 10 girls, not classified as gifted, were chosen from the school districts above-mentioned as a comparison group.

Selection in this study was based upon accepting those gifted and nongifted respondents in sixth grade and their parents/guardians who signed the parental consent and child assent forms, and were willing to complete the required test protocols.
Return Rate

Twelve hundred fifty-three (1253) packets of parental solicitation letters, parental consent and child assent forms were mailed out to potential respondents. One thousand four (1004) packets were mailed to parents of sixth-graders from the above-mentioned four public school districts. Two hundred forty-nine (249) packets were also mailed to parents of sixth-grade gifted students participating in a weekend gifted program. The response rate is derived by dividing the number of families that were selected as participants (N=65) by the total number of packets mailed out (N=1253), or 5.2% return rate. Therefore, a highly selective sample was used to test the research hypotheses. However, a normally distributed dependent variable, child total self-esteem scores, would argue in favor of generalizing from these results.

Procedure

Initial contact with the schools was made by telephone to superintendents, principals, gifted teachers, and a gifted program director. Once permission was obtained to solicit the participation of sixth-graders and their parents from their respective schools, a packet containing a parental solicitation letter (see Appendix A), parental consent (see Appendix B) and child assent (see Appendix C) forms was mailed to parents.

For respondents obtained through public schools, a list of students was compiled from those who signed and returned parental consent and child assent forms. The researcher gave this list to a school representative who later assembled the students for group testing. Questionnaire instructions were read aloud to the students by the researcher and general questions were answered. Testing time for student participants was approximately 30 minutes, on average. The school representative assigned students
to gifted versus nongifted status and protocols were coded to identify that student. Parents were mailed general instructions (see Appendix D) for completing their self-administered questionnaires and a family information inventory (see Appendix E) that was coded to match their child’s test code. Parents and children were able to call the researcher with questions regarding their instructions. Testing time was approximated to be 25 minutes for the typical adult to complete. Parents then mailed completed protocols to the researcher.

For gifted program and home testing participants, students’ and parents’ test protocols were assigned matching codes before mailing them, along with general questionnaire instructions (see Appendix D). They were also able to call the researcher with any questions they might have with regard to completing the protocols. Special instructions were given to these parents and to the students whose parents were to allow their child to respond to the questionnaires confidentially.

For respondents from school districts which did not allow students to be tested at school, a school representative assigned the student to gifted versus nongifted status. Study protocols were then mailed to parents and students using the procedure described for gifted program participants.

**Instruments**

**Children’s Measures**

Child respondents were asked to complete the Family Satisfaction Scale (FSS) (Olson & Wilson, 1982), a modified version of the Children's Report of Parental Behavior Inventory (CRPBI) (Schaefer, 1965a; Margolies & Weintraub, 1977), the
Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory-School Form (CSEI) (Coopersmith, 1981), and a response-bias measure created from items from the following response-bias measures - Children's Social Desirability Questionnaire (CSDQ) (Crandall et al., 1965), the Agreement Response Scale (ARS) (Couch & Keniston, 1960), and the Self-Monitoring Scale (SMS) (Snyder, 1974).

**Family Satisfaction Scale (FSS)**

Created by (Olson & Wilson, 1982), this scale is a 14-item self-reported measure that assesses perceived family satisfaction on the dimensions of family cohesion and adaptability (see Appendix F). Participants are asked to respond to 14 statements pertaining to how satisfied they are with various aspects of their family lives. Statements are rated on a five-point scale with the following response options: (1) Dissatisfied; (2) Somewhat Dissatisfied; (3) Generally Satisfied; (4) Very Satisfied; and (5) Extremely Satisfied. A total score is obtained by summing the 14 items.

A principal components analysis revealed that when two factors were extracted, all but two of the 14 items loaded more than .40 on the first varimax rotated factor. Consequently, only one factor was retained for the FSS. Each item loaded above .50 on this factor. Therefore, the unidimensional total score was selected as most empirically valid, although there are subscales for satisfaction on cohesion and adaptability (Olson & Wilson, 1982).

The Cronbach alpha for the scale was .92, and the five-week, test-retest correlation coefficient for the total score was .75 (Olson & Wilson, 1982).
Child's Report of Parental Behavior Inventory (CRPBI)

This measure was designed to measure three orthogonal factors of children's perceptions of parental child-rearing behaviors: (a) Acceptance versus Rejection; (b) Psychological Control versus Psychological Autonomy; and (c) Lax versus Firm Discipline (Schaefer, 1965a). Use of an assessment device by which children measure perceived parental behavior is thought to have the greatest implications for their perceived self-esteem (Gecas, 1972). Researchers have pursued the hypothesis that children's perceptions of their parents' behaviors may be related more strongly to their own adjustment than their parents' actual behaviors (Schaefer, 1965a).

Children's perceptions of parental behavior have been shown to be significantly related to their parents' actual behavior toward the child (Bronson et al., 1959) and to their parents' reports of parent-child interactions (Andry, 1957). Devereux, Bronfenbrenner and Rodgers (1969) reported that positive correlations were obtained between parents' self-reports of parent practices and their children's responses on a previously conducted pilot study. In fact, the direction of the differences between the reports of parents and children indicated that parents were more likely than children to skew their responses toward social acceptability.

Three orthogonal factors were identified in the original 260-item form of the CRPBI (Schaefer, 1965b). A revised 56-item form of the CRPBI yielded similar factors when administered to children in grades four through six (Burger & Armentrout, 1971; Margolies & Weintraub, 1977). Numerous studies have yielded a similar factor structure (Armentrout & Burger, 1972; Burger, Armentrout & Rapfogel, 1973; Burger, Lamp & Rogers, 1975). The factors were replicable regardless of the gender of the parent or child.

The three bipolar factors identified are: (a) Acceptance versus Rejection, the
degree to which children perceived parents as accepting or rejecting; (b) Psychological Control versus Psychological Autonomy, the degree to which children perceived parents as attempting to control them through covert, psychological methods which inhibit the individuation process; and (c) Lax versus Firm Control, the degree to which children perceived parents as attempting to control them by overt, direct rule making, limit setting and enforcement.

The revised 56-item CRPBI that was administered to participants of this study (see Appendix G) consists of one 16-item scale and five 8-item scales and yields three factor scores (Burger & Armentrout, 1971; Margolies & Weintraub, 1977). The scales were chosen on the basis of having the highest scale reliability, variability and applicability to parental behavior (Schludermann & Schludermann, 1970). For each item, subjects indicated whether the description of parental behavior was "Like" (scored 3), "Somewhat Like" (scored 2), or "Not Like" (scored 1) their parents' behaviors. Participants completed both the maternal and paternal forms of the inventory, which are identical, except for pronouns, in order for the child to assess each parent's behavior separately. Scale scores were calculated by adding the scores on the items that comprise the scale and dividing this total by the number of items in a given scale. Factor scores were obtained by summing the items that loaded highest on each factor (Armentrout & Burger, 1972). The direction of scoring was reversed for two scales (Rejection and Hostile Detachment) which loaded negatively on the Acceptance versus Rejection factor.

The scales which described the Acceptance versus Rejection factor for the original version of the CRPBI (Schaefer, 1965b) were Acceptance, Childcenteredness, Rejection, Positive Involvement, Acceptance of Individuation, and Hostile Detachment. Scales describing the Psychological Control versus Psychological Autonomy factor were
Possessiveness, Intrusiveness, Control through Guilt, Hostile Control, and Instilling Persistent Anxiety. Scales defining the Lax versus Firm Control factor were Inconsistent Discipline, Nonenforcement, Lax Discipline, and Extreme Autonomy. High scores were in the direction of greater acceptance, greater psychological control, and more lax control (Armentrout & Burger, 1972).

Test-retest coefficients range have been reported to range from .66 to .92 for a one-week interval and from .77 to .93 for a five-week interval, for mother and father (Margolies & Weintraub, 1977). Reliabilities of the individual scales of the CRPBI have ranged from .38 to .94, with a median internal-consistency reliability of .76 (Granite, 1985). Median reliabilities of groups of scales have been reported on love, .84, hostility, .78, autonomy, .69, and control, .66 (Schaefer, 1965a). The three factors have been shown to extract anywhere from 64 to 72 percent of the total variance (Schaefer, 1965b; Schludermann & Schludermann, 1970; Schludermann & Schludermann, 1971).

**Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (School Form) [CSEI]**

Developed by Coopersmith (1981), this is a 58-item self-report scale designed to measure self-esteem in children (see Appendix H). Respondents indicate whether each sentence item is "Like Me" or "Unlike Me" by marking their responses on the test protocol. The test is comprised of four subscales: General Self, Social Self-Peers, Home-Parents, and School-Academic. Test-retest reliability was originally reported to be .88 for 30 fifth-grade children over a five-week interval and .70 for a different sample of 56 children over a three-year interval (Coopersmith, 1967). Drummond, McIntire, and Ryan (1977) reported test-retest reliability coefficients which ranged from a low of .38 for fourth grade subjects to a high of .74 for ninth graders. A single coefficient of .69
was reported for subjects in grades two and three. The sample population included 59 children from grades 2 through 12 over the course of a school year. Kokenes (1978) utilized the CSEI to do ten factor analyses with over 7600 children, grades four through eight. Her results provided evidence for the construct validity of the subscales of self-esteem previously proposed (Coopersmith, 1967). Evidence supporting the concurrent validity of the CSEI was offered by Simon (1972) who reported a positive relationship between CSEI scores and self-perceptions of popularity among a sample of 129 sixth graders.

**Children's Social Desirability Questionnaire (CSDQ)**

This questionnaire is a 48-item scale designed by Crandall et al. (1965) to measure the extent to which children wish to present themselves in a socially acceptable manner. The four items from the scale having the highest factor loadings were combined with eight items selected from two other response-bias measures, the Agreement Response Scale (ARS) (Couch & Keniston, 1960) and the Self-Monitoring Scale (SMS) (Snyder, 1974) to form the response-bias inventory used in the present study (see Appendix I). A balance of socially prescribed and socially unacceptable behaviors was included to minimize the possibility of acquiescence response set.

The CSDQ was modeled after the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960). Twenty CSDQ items taken from the Marlowe-Crowne scale were rephrased in simpler language for children. The remaining items were constructed to sample an array of typical childhood social experiences. The test was normed on 956 students across grades three through six, eight, ten and twelve. Corrected split-half (odd-even) reliability coefficients calculated for subsamples of boys and girls at various grade
levels ranged from .82 to .95. The test-retest reliability coefficient at one month was .85 for a subsample of boys and girls. Data indicated that girls scored higher than boys on social desirability items (Crandall et al., 1965; Shriberg, 1974). In addition, test-retest coefficients on a modified version of the CSDQ were considerably more stable among girls than among boys (Shriberg, 1974). Crandall et al. (1965) reported significant correlations between CSDQ scores and the Good Impressions scale of the California Personality Inventory. Landau (1986) obtained a significant correlation between social desirability, as measured by the CSDQ, and self-esteem among second-grade respondents. This relationship was not significant among eighth-grade testees.

**Agreement Response Scale (ARS)**

This scale was designed by Couch and Keniston (1960) to measure acquiescence, or agreeing response set, which is thought to have considerable influence on many psychological test scores. It is defined as a "tendency to agree (or disagree) with test items regardless of their content" (p. 151). Unless controlled for, acquiescence may contaminate the effect size of predictor variables.

The complete ARS scale produced a split-half reliability coefficient of .86 and correlated .79 with a larger pool of 360 items. The four items from the version of the ARS used here were those having the highest correlations with the total ARS score. Items were also selected on the basis of having high factor loadings for a dimension labeled "Agreement Response Scale," item relevance and readability for preadolescent children, and were balanced in number of items scored positively and negatively (Couch & Keniston, 1960).
Self-Monitoring Scale (SMS)

Designed by Snyder (1974), this scale was designed to assess the extent to which individuals will self-monitor their expressive behaviors and self-presentations. The value of measuring nonverbal expressive behavior is that it is thought to be under less voluntary control than verbal behavior, thereby yielding a truer, more valid, description of a person's self. Self-monitoring involves the ability to self-observe and self-control for the purpose of adjusting one's behavior toward social appropriateness in response to situational cues. The self-monitoring person is sensitive to situational cues that suggest which expressions or self-presentations are socially appropriate. In contrast, people who have not learned self-monitoring skills will not concern themselves with the appropriateness of their self-presentation or expressive behavior and will not attend to social-comparison information about how they express or present themselves (Snyder, 1974).

The investigator included four SMS items with high item-total correlations in the child response-bias measure used in the present study. Items were balanced in number scored positively and negatively, and were both relevant and readable for preadolescent children.

The SMS has a Kuder-Richardson 20 reliability of .70 and a one month test-retest reliability coefficient of .83 (Snyder, 1974). In a validation study of the SMS utilizing two extreme criterion groups, actors scored significantly higher self-monitoring scores on the SMS than Stanford University students (controls), while psychiatric ward patients scored significantly lower on the SMS than the same control group (Snyder, 1974). Snyder expected actors to have increased self-control over their expressive behavior and self-presentations and expected psychiatric patients to be less sensitive to contingencies
of social appropriateness.

The psychometric properties of the response bias measures used for this study are not available.

**Parental Measures**

Parent respondents were asked to complete a family information inventory, a modified version of the Parental Sense of Competence Scale (PSOC) (Gibaud-Wallston & Wandersman, 1978), the Family Satisfaction Scale (FSS) (Olson & Wilson, 1982), the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory-Adult Form (CSEI) (Coopersmith, 1981), and a response-bias measure created from items from the following response-bias measures -- the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MCSDS) (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960), the Agreement Response Scale (ARS) (Couch & Keniston, 1960), and the Self-Monitoring Scale (SMS) (Snyder, 1974).

**Family Satisfaction Scale (FSS)**

Designed by Olson and Wilson (1982), this 14-item self-reported scale assesses perceived family satisfaction on the dimensions of family cohesion and adaptability (see Appendix F). Participants are asked to respond to 14 statements pertaining to how satisfied they are with various aspects of their family lives. Statements are rated on a five-point scale having the following response options: (1) Dissatisfied; (2) Somewhat Dissatisfied; (3) Generally Satisfied; (4) Very Satisfied; and (5) Extremely Satisfied. A total score is obtained by summing the 14 items.

A principal components analysis revealed that when two factors were extracted, all but two of the 14 items loaded more than .40 on the first varimax rotated factor.
Consequently, only one factor was retained for the FSS, where each item loaded more than .50 on the first principal component. Therefore, the unidimensional total score was selected as most empirically valid, although there are subscales for satisfaction on cohesion and adaptability (Olson & Wilson, 1982).

The Cronbach alpha for the scale was .92, and the five-week, test-retest correlation coefficient for the total score was .75 (Olson & Wilson, 1982).

**Parental Sense of Competence Scale (PSOC)**

Developed by Gibaud-Wallston and Wandersman (1978), this 17-item self-report scale assesses self-esteem in the parenting situation. The factor structure of the PSOC was examined, and two dimensions of parenting self-esteem were evidenced, namely perceived self-efficacy as a parent and the satisfaction derived from parenting (Johnson & Mash, 1989).

Johnson and Mash (1989) provided normative data on the PSOC and examined its factor structure. Subjects were 297 parents from intact households that had children aged four-to-nine. No significant main effects were revealed for sex of the child, age of the child, SES or number of children in the household.

A principal components analysis using a two-factor solution showed that parenting satisfaction, the first factor, accounted for 23.6% of the variance in ratings (Johnson & Mash, 1989). Parenting self-efficacy, the second factor, accounted for 12.5% of the variance. When rotated to an oblique solution, correlations between the two factors were .22. In the factor analysis performed by these authors, item 17 was dropped from the test protocol since it failed to load above .40 on either factor. In addition, Item 8 loaded on the parenting satisfaction factor, not the parenting self-efficacy factor as reported by
Gibaud-Wallston and Wandersman (1978). This 16-item revised version of the PSOC was employed in this study (see Appendix J).

Each item is answered on a six-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly agree" (1) to "Strongly disagree" (6). Scoring is reversed for Items 1, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13, and 15 in order for higher scores to reflect greater parenting self-efficacy, satisfaction from parenting, and overall self-esteem in the parenting situation (Johnson & Mash, 1989). PSOC factor scores and total score were calculated by summing the nine items on the parenting satisfaction factor, the seven items on the parenting self-efficacy factor, and the 16 items comprising the total score. Mother and father versions of the PSOC differ only in the use of the word "mother" and "father" across items. Use of the word "infant" was changed to "child" to increase its appropriateness for use with parents of older children. Parents are asked to think only of the target child when completing the PSOC (Johnson & Mash, 1989).

Alpha coefficients of .80 for PSOC total score, .69 for parenting satisfaction, and .80 for parenting self-efficacy were obtained on a sample of 76 parents of infants utilizing the original 17-item version of the PSOC (Gibaud-Wallston & Wandersman, 1978). For the abridged version (16 items), an alpha coefficient of .79 was calculated for PSOC total score. The parenting satisfaction factor had an alpha coefficient of .75, and the parenting self-efficacy factor had an alpha coefficient of .76 (Johnson & Mash, 1989).

Gibaud-Wallston and Wandersman (1978) reported that mothers of infants scored significantly higher than fathers on the parenting self-efficacy factor. However, fathers achieved significantly higher PSOC total scores and parenting satisfaction scores than did mothers in the Johnson and Mash (1989) study. No significant differences were noted in parenting self-efficacy factor scores. Fathers' and mothers' PSOC scores were
significantly related in this study.

Significant inverse relationships between PSOC total scores and parents' reports of child problems were observed (Johnson & Mash, 1989). PSOC total scores were found to be unrelated to a social-desirability measure (Gibaud-Wallston & Wandersman, 1978).

For fathers, test-retest correlations at a six-week interval were .78 for PSOC total score, .69 for parenting satisfaction, and .73 for parenting self-efficacy. Mothers in this study demonstrated six-week, test-retest correlations of .80 for PSOC total score, .82 for parenting satisfaction, and .74 for parenting self-efficacy (Gibaud-Wallston & Wandersman, 1978).

**Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (Adult Form) [CSEI]**

This 25-item self-report scale (see Appendix H) designed by Coopersmith (1981) to measure evaluative attitudes adults hold toward the self. The Adult Form, adapted from the School Short Form, was intended for subjects age 16 and older. Words such as "school" and "parents" were changed to "work" and "family" to make the scale relevant for adults. The Adult Form was normed on college students (N=226) with a mean age of 21.5 (S.D.=3.5). Correlations of .80 or greater were reported between the Adult Form and the School Short Form for three samples of high school and college students (Coopersmith, 1981). The test-retest reliability and internal consistency of an earlier adult form of the CSEI was tested on 103 college students (64 males and 39 females) (Bedeian, Teague & Zmud, 1977). The test-retest reliability coefficient over a five-week interval was .80 for males and .82 for females. The KR-20 reliability coefficients ranged from .67 to .75. The data support the stability and internal consistency of the CSEI for use with adults.
Participants indicate whether each sentence item is "Like Me" or "Unlike Me." A total self-esteem score is derived by summing all negative items answered "Unlike Me" and all positive items answered "Like Me," then multiplying the result by four. High scores correspond to high self-esteem (Coopersmith, 1981).

**Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MCSDS)**

Designed by Crowne and Marlowe (1960), this 33-item scale measures a subject's need to "obtain approval by responding in a culturally appropriate and acceptable manner" (p. 353). Strahan and Gerbasi (1972) performed a principal components analysis on this scale and formed two 10-item social desirability scales, each having balanced numbers of positively and negatively scored items to control for possible acquiescence set. The first component accounted for 13% of the total variance and the range of absolute loadings for the 20 items selected was .28 to .54 with a mean of .42. For this version of the MCSDS [M-C 1(10)] Kuder-Richardson formula 20 reliability coefficients were .70, .66, .61, and .59 across samples of university males, university females, college females, and British males, respectively. The authors suggested that the M-C 1(10) had higher reliability coefficients than the M-C 2(10). Finally, Strahan and Gerbasi (1972) obtained correlations between M-C 1(10) and the MCSDS in the .80s and .90s. To match the number of social desirability items administered to the child participants, four items were selected on the basis of having high factor loadings to the overall score. The four items were combined with eight items from two other response-bias measures described below, the Agreement Response Scale (ARS) (Couch & Keniston, 1960) and the Self-Monitoring Scale (SMS) (Snyder, 1974) to form the response-bias inventory used in the present study (see Appendix K).
Agreement Response Scale (ARS)

The same four items of the ARS (Couch & Keniston, 1960) that were administered to the children were used for the parents' response-bias measure. Items were selected on the basis of having high factor loadings for a dimension labeled "Agreement Response Scale," item relevance, and were balanced in number of items scored positively and negatively.

Self-Monitoring Scale (SMS)

The same four items of the SMS (Snyder, 1974) that were administered to child respondents were used with parents. These items were combined with eight items from two other response-bias measures to form the parent response-bias inventory (see Appendix K). Item selection was based on high item-total correlations with the entire SMS scale, item relevance, and balance in number of items scored positively and negatively.

The psychometric properties of the response-bias measures used in this study are not available.

Design

An ex-post facto, quasi-experimental design was used to assess the degree of relatedness between fourteen research variables and children's self-esteem scores. This design was similarly chosen to determine the variance explained by the same research variables with the criterion variable, children's levels of self-esteem. This design is most appropriate since direct control over the research variables is not possible. The fourteen
research variables are: (a) child-perceived family satisfaction, as measured by total FSS scores; (b) children's perceptions of three maternal and three paternal behaviors, as measured by CRPBI variable means; (c) group identity, as measured by gifted versus nongifted status; (d) parent self-reported parenting self-esteem, as measured by total PSOC scale scores; (e) parents' reports of family satisfaction, as measured by total FSS scores; and (f) the parents' reports of their self-esteem, as measured by total CSEI scores (Adult form). The dependent or criterion variable was the child participants' levels of self-esteem, as measured by total CSEI scores (School form).

Statistical Analyses

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyze the data for this study. Frequency distributions of the demographic variables are presented, as are the variable means and standard deviations of the research and criterion variables. The group identity status variable, indicating whether a child was assigned to the gifted or nongifted group, was dummy-coded (gifted=1, nongifted=2). This allowed the researcher to carry out statistical procedures with categorical (group identity) and continuous (self-esteem, for example) variables. Statistical techniques used included a Chi-square analysis of the demographic variables, a one-way multivariate analysis of variance, Pearson product-moment correlation analyses, partial-correlation analyses, hierarchical multiple regression analyses, and canonical correlation analyses.

Frequency distributions and Chi-square analyses were used to present the characteristics of the gifted and nongifted samples across demographic variables and to assess the similarities and differences across sample groups. Relative equivalency between groups was expected among demographic variables.
A one-way multivariate analysis of variance was used to determine significant differences between gifted and nongifted children's total self-esteem score means and research variable means. This analysis assessed the similarities and differences of the variables across gifted and nongifted sample groups. Relative equivalency between groups was expected among the research variables.

**Hypothesis 1 and 2**

According to these hypotheses, the fourteen research (independent) variables will be related significantly to the dependent variable, children's total self-esteem scores across gifted and nongifted sample groups. A Pearson product-moment correlation analysis was used for each group (gifted and nongifted) to show the size and valence of the correlation coefficients between children's total self-esteem scores, the correlates, and the response-bias measures. A partial correlation analysis was used to indicate the size and valence of the correlations between children's self-esteem scores and child-perceived research variables for each group (gifted and nongifted), controlling for the effects of the child's response-bias measures.

**Hypothesis 3**

According to the hypothesis, the predictor variables would explain significantly greater variance in children's total self-esteem scores than group status as gifted versus nongifted. Hierarchical multiple regression analyses was used to test whether group status as gifted or nongifted (coded numerically as "1" or "2", respectively), total FSS scores (both child- and parent-reported), CRPBI variable means, total PSOC scores, and total CSEI scores (Adult form) predict total CSEI scores (School form) after first entering
child response-bias measures into the regression equation. It is important for this study that the relative contributions of all predictor variables to the variability in children’s self-esteem scores be assessed after determining the variance in children’s self-esteem scores explained by the response-bias measures.

Additional Analyses

Two canonical correlation analyses were performed to assess the degree of relatedness between child and mother variables, and between child and father variables. Results from a Pearson product-moment correlational analysis and a hierarchical multiple regression analysis of the response-bias measures are also presented.

Table 1 provides an overall view of the hypothesized results. It shows that, prior to hypothesis testing, demographic and research variable means were not expected to differ significantly across gifted and nongifted sample groups. For Hypotheses 1 and 2, research variables were expected to correlate significantly with the dependent variable -- gifted and nongifted children’s self-esteem. The child-perceived research variables were expected to remain significantly related with children’s self-esteem scores as partial correlations when the effects of children’s response-bias tendencies were controlled statistically.

Table 1 illustrates the expected results of the hierarchical multiple regression analyses tested in Hypothesis 3. At Step 1, entry of the response-bias measures statistically controls for their effects on children’s self-esteem levels as “error variance” (Kirk, 1982). Then, at Step 2, the child-perceived and parent-reported variables were hypothesized to explain greater variance in the criterion variable, children’s self-esteem scores, than the group status variable (gifted versus nongifted).
### Table 1

**Hypothesized Table of Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variables</th>
<th>Research Variables</th>
<th>Hypothesis One</th>
<th>Hypothesis Two</th>
<th>Hypothesis Three</th>
<th>Canonical Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zero-Order</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Zero-Order</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dep. variable</td>
<td>dv</td>
<td>dv</td>
<td>dv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Self-Esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Fam Satisf</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch Parent Accept</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch Psych Control</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch Lax Discipline</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Self-Est.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Fam Sat.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting Self-Est.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted v. Nongifted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Step 2**: Social Desirability Agreement Response Self-Monitoring
- **Step 3**: Mother Father

Large number of correlational analyses increases the probability of significant coefficient by chance; response-bias measures' psychometric properties not available.
Finally, Table 1 shows the expected outcomes of canonical correlation analyses that explored the degree of relatedness between three child and three maternal variables. The degree of association between the same child and paternal variables was examined in the second canonical analysis.

**Determination of Sample Size (Power Analysis)**

To determine the sample size needed to perform the multiple regression analysis, a power analysis was performed (Cohen & Cohen, 1983). Power is defined as the probability of rejecting a null hypothesis when it is false (Cohen, 1992). The following formula uses a conventional statistical significance level for alpha (.05), a conventional, or medium, effect size of 0.30 ($R^2$), a conventional power level of .80, or $\mu = 18.34$, and $\psi$, or number of independent variables, to compute sample size (Cohen & Cohen, 1983).

\[
\hat{f}^2 = \frac{R^2}{1-R^2} = \frac{.30}{1-.30} = .428
\]

\[
N = \frac{\mu}{\hat{f}^2} + \psi + 1 = \frac{18.34}{.4286} + 14 + 1 = 42.79 + 14 + 1 = 58 \text{ subjects}
\]

It was thus determined that 58 subjects were needed to meet the minimum specified power level of .80, given an effect size of .30, an alpha level of .05, and 14 independent variables.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS OF THE STUDY

The present study was designed to assess the relationships between several family variables -- child-perceived family satisfaction, child-perceived parental behaviors, parent-reported parenting self-esteem (parental sense of competence), parent-reported family satisfaction, and the self-esteem of parents -- and overall self-esteem scores among groups of gifted and nongifted sixth-graders. Second, the study was intended to examine the predictive contributions of the same family variables to the self-esteem scores of gifted and nongifted sixth-grade sample groups. Analyses were also conducted to explore the relationships that exist between children's perceptions of their families, parents, and themselves and their parents' perceptions of their families, parenting, and themselves.

This chapter presents an analysis of demographic and research variables, hypothesis testing, additional analyses, and a summary of the findings of the study.

**Analysis of the Demographic and Research Variables**

**Demographic Variables**

Frequency distributions of each demographic variable are presented to assess the similarities and differences across gifted and nongifted sample groups. Chi-square
analyses are provided to show whether there are significance differences between sample groups for each demographic variable. Relative equivalency across groups was expected among demographic variables prior to performing additional statistical analyses.

Table 2 shows the frequency distributions of respondents' genders across gifted and nongifted samples. By chi-square analysis, there were significantly more females than males in the gifted group and more males than females in the nongifted group (chi-square=9.23, df=1, p=.00).

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Gifted</th>
<th>Nongifted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\chi^2=9.23$, df=1, p=.00

Table 3 presents frequency distributions of the child participants' age levels across gifted and nongifted samples. The Chi-square test indicated that there was no significant group difference on age. While the number of eleven- and twelve-year-olds were roughly similar across groups, there were more missing cases in the nongifted group because there were more parents not responding in the nongifted group.

Table 4 shows the frequency distributions of the child participants' birth orders across gifted and nongifted samples. The two samples did not differ significantly on this
Table 3

**Frequency Distribution of Child Age by Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gifted n</th>
<th>Gifted %</th>
<th>Nongifted n</th>
<th>Nongifted %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 Year Olds</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Year Olds</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. χ²=.34, df=1, p=.56*

Table 4

**Frequency Distribution of Child Birth Order by Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birth Order</th>
<th>Gifted n</th>
<th>Gifted %</th>
<th>Nongifted n</th>
<th>Nongifted %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First-borns</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second-borns</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third-borns</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. χ²=1.40, df=2, p=.49*

variable. Across both groups, most child respondents were first-borns. There were twice the number of second-borns in the gifted than nongifted group, although there were
similar numbers of third-borns. There were more missing cases of this variable in the nongifted group since their parents did not respond.

Table 5 presents the frequency distributions of the child respondents' number of siblings across gifted and nongifted samples. The gifted sample group did not have any respondents who were only-children. There were six missing cases. The differences in number of siblings between the gifted and nongifted samples was significant (chi-square=8.35, df=3, p=.04). There were significantly more siblings reported among families of gifted participants. Among nongifted participants, there were five families indicating that their child was an only-child and there were six families that failed to respond to this item.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Siblings</th>
<th>Gifted Group</th>
<th>Nongifted Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \( \chi^2=8.35, \ df=3, \ p=.04 \)

Two cells have expected frequencies less than 5.0.
Tables 6 and 7 show the frequency distributions of the parents' races across gifted and nongifted sample groups. Table 6 indicates that the mothers of both the gifted and the nongifted children were overwhelmingly Caucasian (90.9% and 85.3%, respectively). The two groups did not differ significantly on race of mothers. Table 7 shows that the fathers of gifted and nongifted samples for whom racial identity information was available were also overwhelmingly Caucasian (90.9% and 73.5%, respectively). The two samples did not differ significantly with regard to fathers' racial identities. There were more missing data among the nongifted samples for both mothers and fathers, but missing data are not included in the Chi-square tests. It is noteworthy that few parents from racial minority groups participated.

Table 8 shows the frequency distributions of mothers' ethnic backgrounds across samples of gifted and nongifted groups. There were no significant differences between gifted and nongifted samples as a function of mothers' ethnic identities. More than 70% of the mothers from both groups failed to respond to this item. It is likely that most mothers failed to identify their ethnic background because of the wording of the test protocol item which asked parents to respond to requests for both racial and ethnic background information. Most mothers tended to respond with racial or ethnic information, but not both.

Table 9 shows the frequency distributions of fathers' ethnic backgrounds across gifted and nongifted samples. There were no significant differences in fathers' ethnic identities between the gifted and nongifted groups. Similar to the responses of mothers to the test protocol item which asked parents to respond to requests for both racial and ethnic background information, more than half of the fathers from both groups failed to respond with both racial and ethnic information.
Table 6

Frequency Distribution of Mothers' Race by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mothers' Race</th>
<th>Gifted</th>
<th></th>
<th>Nongifted</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>85.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $\chi^2=.29$, df=1, p=.59
Two cells have expected frequencies less than 5.0.

Table 7

Frequency Distribution of Fathers' Race by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fathers' Race</th>
<th>Gifted</th>
<th></th>
<th>Nongifted</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>73.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $\chi^2=.51$, df=1, p=.47
Two cells have expected frequencies less than 5.0.
Table 8

Frequency Distribution of Mothers' Ethnic Background by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mothers' Ethnicity</th>
<th>Gifted</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Nongifted</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \(\chi^2=12.45, df=9, p=.19\)

Twenty cells have expected frequencies less than 5.0.
Table 9

Frequency Distribution of Fathers' Ethnic Background by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fathers' Ethnicity</th>
<th>Gifted</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Nongifted</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-Saxon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraqi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\chi^2=9.51$, df=9, p=.39
Twenty cells have expected frequencies less than 5.0.
Overall, parent participants were of diverse ethnic backgrounds and only slightly higher percentages were of either Irish or Italian descent than from other ethnic groups.

Table 10 presents the frequency distributions of mothers' religious backgrounds across gifted and nongifted samples. There was no significant difference in mothers' religious backgrounds between the gifted and nongifted groups. Catholics were the highest represented religion among mothers of both gifted and nongifted groups.

Table 11 shows the frequency distributions of fathers' religious background across gifted and nongifted sample groups. Just as for mothers' reports of their religious backgrounds, there was no significant difference between gifted and nongifted sample groups regarding fathers' religious backgrounds and Catholics were the most represented religion among fathers.

Table 12 presents frequency distributions of parents' marital status among the gifted and nongifted samples. By far, most parents from both groups reported their marital status as married. However, the two groups differed significantly on this variable (chi-square=6.19, df=2, p=.04). The proportion of parents in the gifted group who were married was greater than that in the nongifted group.

Table 13 shows the frequency distributions of parents' reports of their child's custodial status across gifted and nongifted sample groups. Consistent with parents' reports of their marital status, most children in both groups were living with both parents. But, there were significantly more children from the nongifted sample group that were residing in maternal-custody living arrangements than children in the gifted sample group (chi-square=7.50, df=1, p=.01).

Table 14 presents the frequency distributions of parents' reports of their income levels across gifted and nongifted samples. Overall, family income levels of both groups
Table 10

Frequency Distribution of Mothers' Religious Background by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mothers' Religion</th>
<th>Gifted</th>
<th></th>
<th>Group</th>
<th></th>
<th>Nongifted</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mormon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Orth. Catholic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist/Agnostic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $\chi^2 = 8.00, \text{df}=7, g=33$

Twelve cells have expected frequencies less than 5.0.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fathers' Religion</th>
<th>Gifted n</th>
<th>Gifted %</th>
<th>Nongifted n</th>
<th>Nongifted %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mormon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist/Agnostic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\chi^2=3.18$, df=6, p=.78
Ten cells have expected frequencies less than 5.0.
Table 12

Frequency Distribution of Parents' Marital Status by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gifted  n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Nongifted n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $\chi^2=6.19, \text{df}=2, p=.04$

Four cells have expected frequencies less than 5.0.

Table 13

Frequency Distribution of Child Custody Status by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Custody Status</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gifted  n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Nongifted n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Parents</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Custody</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $\chi^2=7.50, \text{df}=1, p=.01$

Two cells have expected frequencies less than 5.0.
Table 14

Frequency Distribution of Family Income Levels by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Levels</th>
<th>Gifted n</th>
<th>Gifted %</th>
<th>Nongifted n</th>
<th>Nongifted %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$15-29K</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30-44K</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$45-59K</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60-74K</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75-89K</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$90+ K</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $\chi^2 = 7.50, df=5, p=.19$
Ten cells have expected frequencies less than 5.0.

were most frequently reported as being at or above $90,000. There was no significant difference in levels of income between gifted and nongifted sample groups.

Research Variables

Table 15 shows children's self-esteem and child-perceived family and parental behavior variable means and standard deviations across gifted and nongifted sample groups. The results of a one-way multivariate analysis of variance are presented to determine significant differences in children's total self-esteem score means and both child-reported and parent-reported variable means across gifted and nongifted sample
Table 15

Child Self-Esteem and Child-Perceived Family and Parental Behavior Variables by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variable</th>
<th>Gifted (n=27)</th>
<th>Nongifted (n=23)</th>
<th>F(a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>child's self-esteem</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>80.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family satisfaction</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acceptance by mother</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psychological control by mother</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lax discipline by mother</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acceptance by father</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>61.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psychological control by father</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lax discipline of father</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p<.05

Multivariate F(14,35) = 1.12, p = .37

(a) univariate F statistics, df = 1 and 48
Table 16

*Children's Self-Esteem by Gender and Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Male M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Female M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gifted</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>79.50</td>
<td>15.03</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>87.05</td>
<td>9.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nongifted</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>80.24</td>
<td>12.29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>82.00</td>
<td>8.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>12.91</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>85.84</td>
<td>9.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

groups separately. The analysis of variance results for the combined groups indicated that there was a trend toward significance for female child-respondents' self-esteem scores to be higher than male child-respondents' self-esteem scores ($F (1,48) = 3.35, \ p = .07$). There were no significant gender differences in children's self-esteem scores for either the gifted or nongifted groups separately. It is noteworthy that the mean self-esteem score of gifted girls is more than five points higher than the mean self-esteem scores of gifted boys and both nongifted girls and boys.

Table 17 presents parent-reported self-esteem, family satisfaction, and parenting self-esteem variable means and standard deviations in the gifted and nongifted samples. The results of a one-way multivariate analysis of variance are also presented to determine significant differences between the groups with respect to the mean scores of parent-reported self-esteem, family satisfaction, and parenting self-esteem. The multivariate analysis of variance indicated that group differences were not significant ($F (14,35) = 1.12, \ p = .37$). None of the univariate tests of parent-reported variables across gifted and nongifted samples in this analysis was significant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variable</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gifted (n=27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mother's self-esteem</td>
<td>80.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mother's family satisfaction</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mother's parenting self-esteem</td>
<td>75.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>father's self-esteem</td>
<td>83.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>father's family satisfaction</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>father's parenting self-esteem</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p<.05

Multivariate F(14,35) = 1.12, p = .37

(a) univariate F statistics, df = 1 and 48
Thus, overall the multivariate test of research variable mean differences between gifted and nongifted samples was not significant, nor were any of the individual univariate tests of mean score differences for any of the research variable means. There was a trend for female child-respondents to have higher self-esteem scores than male child-respondents, although this difference was not significant. These preliminary analyses revealed relative equivalency of the research variables across gifted and nongifted sample groups as expected. Subsequent analyses of the research variables can focus more on the impact of the independent variables on the dependent variables.

Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis 1

According to the first research hypothesis, higher levels of self-esteem among gifted sixth-grade children will be related significantly to higher levels of perceived family satisfaction and maternal acceptance, lower maternal psychological control and maternal lax discipline, higher paternal acceptance, lower paternal psychological control and paternal lax discipline, higher levels of maternal self-esteem, family satisfaction scores, and parenting self-esteem, and higher levels of paternal self-esteem, family satisfaction, and parenting self-esteem. Table 18 presents the Pearson product-moment correlations between children's self-esteem and these variables for the gifted and nongifted samples separately.

The results of the correlational analysis for the gifted sample partially support the first hypothesis. The data in Table 18 indicate that gifted children's total self-esteem scores were significantly and positively correlated with their perceptions of family satisfaction ($r = .60, p = .00$), maternal acceptance ($r = .48, p = .01$), and paternal
Table 18

Pearson Correlates of Children’s Self-Esteem by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Gifted</th>
<th></th>
<th>Nongifted</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family satisfaction</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acceptance by mom</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psych. control by mom</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lax discipline from mom</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acceptance by dad</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psych. control by dad</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lax discipline from dad</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-esteem</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family satisfaction</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parenting self-esteem</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Father Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-esteem</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family satisfaction</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parenting self-esteem</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
** p < .01
*** p < .001
acceptance ($r = .39, p = .04$). A significant inverse relationship was obtained between gifted children's self-esteem scores and their perceptions of paternal use of psychological control techniques ($r = -.40, p = .04$).

None of the parental variables was related significantly to children's self-esteem in the gifted sample. It is important to mention that the large number of correlational analyses performed increases the probability that one or more correlates may emerge as significant by chance (Cohen & Cohen, 1983; Norusis, 1987).

**Hypothesis 2**

According to the second research hypothesis, higher levels of self-esteem among nongifted sixth-grade children will be related significantly to higher levels of perceived family satisfaction and maternal acceptance, lower maternal psychological control and maternal lax discipline, higher paternal acceptance, lower paternal psychological control and paternal lax discipline, higher levels of maternal self-esteem, family satisfaction scores, and parenting self-esteem, and higher levels of paternal self-esteem, family satisfaction, and parenting self-esteem.

Table 18 shows that the results of the correlational analysis for the nongifted sample partially support the second hypothesis. Among the child-perceived variables, self-esteem scores were related significantly and positively to perceived family satisfaction ($r = .72, p = .00$). Self-esteem levels were related significantly and inversely to the child's perception of psychological control by father ($r = -.41, p = .05$). As in the gifted sample group, none of the parental variables was related significantly to children's levels of self-esteem in the nongifted sample group. It is important to mention that the large number of correlational analyses performed increases the probability that one or
more correlates may emerge as significant by chance (Cohen & Cohen, 1983; Norusis, 1987).

**Response-Bias Measures and Children's Self-Esteem Across Gifted and Nongifted Samples**

The present study included response-bias measures for the child, mother, and father to assess their relationships with and impact on children's self-esteem scores. The response-bias measures utilized in the present study assessed the social desirability, agreement response, and self-monitoring tendencies of the respondents.

Table 19 presents the correlations between these response-bias measures and scores on the dependent variable, child's self-esteem, within both the gifted and nongifted samples. The data in Table 19 indicate that gifted children's self-esteem scores were correlated positively and significantly with their social desirability scores ($r = .60$, $p = .00$) and their agreement response scores ($r = .39$, $p = .04$). In the nongifted children's sample, none of the three response-bias measures was related significantly to self-esteem scores. Among mothers from the gifted sample, maternal agreement response scores were related inversely and significantly to children's self-esteem scores ($r = -.53$, $p = .00$). None of the other parent-reported response-bias measures was significantly associated with children's self-esteem scores. It is important to keep in mind that the psychometric properties of the response-bias measures used in the present study are not available.
Table 19

Pearson Correlations between Child’s Self-Esteem and Response-Bias Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response-Bias Measure</th>
<th>Gifted</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Nongifted</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social desirability</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.60***</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agreement response</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-monitoring</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social desirability</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agreement response</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-.53**</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-monitoring</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Father Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social desirability</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agreement response</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-monitoring</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
**p < .01
***p < .001
Partial Correlations between Children’s Self-Esteem and the Child Correlates

Across Gifted and Nongifted Samples, Controlling for Response Bias

In view of the significant correlations observed between some of the child response-bias measures and children’s self-esteem scores in the gifted sample, the correlations between the child-perceived variables and children’s self-esteem scores were run again as partial correlations. These partial correlations are presented in Table 20.

Partial correlation coefficients describe the relationship between two variables while statistically holding constant the effects of one or more additional variables (Stevens, 1996). The children’s response-bias measures served as a means to statistically control for their social desirability, agreement response, and self-monitoring tendencies as "error variance" (Kirk, 1982) in order to derive a more accurate assessment of the associations between the child-perceived variables and children’s self-esteem scores. The three child response-bias variables—social desirability, agreement-response, and self-monitoring—were entered separately into the partial-correlation equation. The parent-reported variables were not included in the partial correlation analysis because it would be inappropriate to control for the effects of children’s response-bias measures on the relationships between parent-reported variables and children’s self-esteem scores.

Table 20 results show that the partial correlations are generally similar to the zero-order correlations presented in Table 18. However, in several cases a small change in the magnitude of the correlation was sufficient to change the correlation from non-significant to significant or vice versa.

Among the gifted sample, the partial correlation between children's self-esteem scores and child-perceived family satisfaction, while still significant, was significantly reduced in magnitude ($r = .49, p = .01$). This was also true of the partial correlation
Table 20

Partial Correlations between Children's Self-Esteem and Child-Perceived Variables by Group, Controlling for Children’s Response-Bias Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gifted</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nongifted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family satisfaction</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.74***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acceptance by mom</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psych. control by mom</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lax discipline from mom</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acceptance by dad</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psych. control by dad</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-.50**</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lax discipline from dad</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
** p < .01
*** p < .001
between self-esteem scores and child-perceived maternal acceptance ($r = .41, p = .04$).
The relationship between children's self-esteem scores and perceived paternal acceptance scores, significant as a zero-order correlation, was not significant as a partial correlation. The partial correlation between gifted children's self-esteem scores and their perceptions of their fathers' use of psychological control techniques was significant in a negative direction ($r = -.50, p = .01$). None of the other child-perceived variables evidenced significant partial correlations with children's self-esteem scores.

Among the nongifted sample, the partial correlation between self-esteem scores and family satisfaction scores ($r = .74, p = .00$) remained significant in a positive direction. The relationship between children's self-esteem scores and perceived paternal psychological control, significant as a zero-order correlation ($r = -.41, p = .05$), was no longer significant as a partial correlation. None of the other child-perceived variables evidenced significant partial correlations with children's self-esteem scores. It is important to point out that the changes in the magnitudes of the correlation coefficients as a result of partialing out the effects of children's response-bias tendencies are based on a response-bias measure for which no psychometric properties are available.

**Hypothesis 3**

According to the third research hypothesis, gifted and nongifted sixth-grade children's higher family satisfaction and maternal acceptance scores, lower levels of maternal psychological control and maternal lax discipline scores, higher child-perceived paternal acceptance scores, lower paternal psychological control and paternal lax discipline scores, higher levels of their mothers' self-esteem scores, family satisfaction scores, and parenting self-esteem scores, and higher levels of their fathers' self-esteem
scores, family satisfaction scores, and parenting self-esteem scores will explain greater variance in children's self-esteem scores than group identity.

To address this hypothesis, a hierarchical multiple regression analysis was carried out on the pooled sample of participants from gifted and nongifted samples. A hierarchical multiple regression analysis was chosen to address this hypothesis because children's response-bias measures are entered into the regression equation first. By entry of the response-bias measures at the first step, this "error variance" (Kirk, 1982) can be controlled statistically before the unique contribution of the predictor variables to the explanation of children's self-esteem levels is measured.

Table 21 presents the summary of this two-step regression analysis. It shows that at the first step with the child response-bias measures entered into the regression equation, adjusted $R^2 = .24$, $R^2_{\text{change}} = .29$, and $F_{\text{change}} (3,46) = 6.19$, $p = .00$. Therefore, the child response-bias measures collectively account for a significant amount of the variance (24%) in children's self-esteem scores.

At the second step of the regression, the child and parent predictor variables were entered. At the second step of the regression analysis, adjusted $R^2 = .60$, $R^2_{\text{change}} = .45$, and $F_{\text{change}} (14,32) = 3.90$, $p = .00$. Therefore, the predictor variables account for a significant amount of the variance (45%) in children's self-esteem scores beyond the variance accounted for by children's response-bias measures (24%).

Table 21 results also show that of the 45% of variance accounted for by the predictor variables at the second step of the regression equation, the child-perceived and parent-reported predictor variables collectively account for a significant amount of that variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .41$, $F_{\text{change}} (13,33) = 3.42$, $p = .00$) in children's self-esteem scores. Children's group status as gifted or nongifted did account for a significant amount
Table 21

Hierarchical Regression of Children's Gifted/Nongifted Status and Child and Parent Predictors on Children's Self-Esteem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R²adj.</th>
<th>R²ch</th>
<th>Fch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>response-bias variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>child social desirability</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>8.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>child agreement response</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>4.67*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>child self-monitoring</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>child/parent predictor variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>3.90**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>gifted vs. nongifted</td>
<td>-5.92</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>4.85*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>child/parent perceived variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>3.42**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>child perceptions of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>family satisfaction</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>4.35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>acceptance by mom</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>psych. control by mom</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lax discipline-mom</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>acceptance by dad</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>psych. control by dad</td>
<td>-.64</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lax discipline-dad</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>maternal perceptions of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>self-esteem</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>5.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>family satisfaction</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>parenting self-esteem</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>paternal perceptions of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>self-esteem</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>family satisfaction</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>parenting self-esteem</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05  ** p<.01  *** p<.001
of variance ($\text{R}^2_{\text{change}} = .04$, $F_{\text{change}} (1,32) = 4.85$, $p = .03$) in children’s self-esteem, but the percentage was much less than the child-perceived and parent-reported variables collectively. Therefore, the child-perceived and parent-reported variables explained more variance in children’s self-esteem scores (41%) than did children’s group status (4%).

However, this regression analysis provides only partial support for the third hypothesis because none of the individual predictor variables explained greater variance in children’s self-esteem scores than children’s group status as gifted or nongifted. Table 21 shows that at the second step of the regression equation, significant amounts of variance in children’s self-esteem scores are accounted for by maternal self-esteem scores ($\text{R}^2_{\text{change}} = .04$, $F_{\text{change}} (1, 32) = 5.04$, $p = .03$), children’s group status as gifted or nongifted ($\text{R}^2_{\text{change}} = .04$, $F_{\text{change}} (1,32) = 4.85$, $p = .03$), and child-perceived family satisfaction scores ($\text{R}^2_{\text{change}} = .04$, $F_{\text{change}} (1,32) = 4.35$, $p = .04$). Each of these significant predictors accounted for approximately 4% of the variance in children's self-esteem scores beyond that variance accounted for by children’s response-bias measures at the first step of the analysis.

Additional Analyses

Response-Bias Analysis

Response-bias measures were included in the multiple regression analysis to assess their abilities to account for variance in the criterion variable—children’s self-esteem. The response-bias measures assess the social desirability, agreement response, and self-monitoring tendencies of the respondents. The purpose of their inclusion in the regression analysis was to control for these tendencies statistically as “error variance” (Kirk, 1982) and thereby obtain a more accurate assessment of the predictive impact that
the research variables had on the criterion variable—children's self-esteem. However, there is no reliability or validity information available for the response-bias measures used in the present study.

Table 21 shows that a significant amount of the variability in children's self-esteem scores is accounted for by the response-bias measures (24%). More specifically, two of the three response-bias measures, children's social desirability scores ($R^2_{change} = .13$, $F_{change} (1,46) = 8.21, p = .01$) and children's agreement response scores ($R^2_{change} = .07$, $F_{change} (1,46) = 4.67, p = .04$) accounted for significant amounts of the variance in children's self-esteem scores. Children's self-monitoring scores failed to account for a significant amount of the variance in children's self-esteem scores.

Therefore, children's tendencies to present themselves in a socially acceptable manner and to agree (or disagree) to test items regardless of their content are significant predictors of their levels of self-esteem for this sample.

**Relationships between Child and Parental Variables**

As previously stated, family relationships are bidirectionally and reciprocally influenced, with each family member playing an important role in influencing the behavior of the other (DeV. Peters & McMahon, 1988; Finken & Amato, 1993; Killeen, 1993). Also, "mutually interrelated family influence processes" dictate that parental influences on a child's behavior will feed back and create changes in parental behavior (Wells, 1994, p. 254). The question often arises as to whether or not discrepancies in research findings may be attributable to differences in the sources of the data. In the present study, data were available from both children and their parents. In the cases of
self-esteem and family satisfaction, both children and their parents provided their perceptions of the same constructs.

Two canonical correlation analyses were conducted to assess the degree of relatedness across children’s and parents’ variables. The canonical analyses were run twice to balance the number of child-perceived variables and parent-reported variables being correlated. While it is theoretically possible to perform canonical correlation analyses with unequal numbers of variables in the two variable sets (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1983), the version of SPSS utilized (SPSS, 1998) contains the constraint that the number of variables be equal across the two variable sets. Therefore, the analyses involved first examining child-perceived variables and mother-reported variables, and then assessing the relationships between child-perceived variables and father-reported variables. Because there were only three dimensions of parent-reported variables (parents’ self-esteem, perceived family satisfaction, and parenting self-esteem), the child-perceived variables selected for inclusion in the canonical analysis were children’s self-esteem, perceived family satisfaction, and perceived parental acceptance. Child-perceived parental acceptance was chosen instead of perceived parental psychological control or parental lax discipline because reviews of the parent-child literature show perceived parental acceptance to be more strongly related to both parent variables and the self-esteem literature.

The results of the first canonical correlation analysis are presented in Table 22. The child-perceived variables included in the analysis were children's self-esteem, child-perceived family satisfaction, and perceived maternal acceptance. The mother-reported variables included were maternal self-esteem, family satisfaction and parenting self-esteem. The first canonical correlation was ($r_c = .54$, $\chi^2(9) = 22.10$, $p = .01$) and
Table 22

Canonical Correlation Analysis of Child and Maternal Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Canonical Variate</th>
<th>Canonical Correlation</th>
<th>Percent of Variance</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Significance of $R_s$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>22.10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p<.01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Sets</th>
<th>Standard Canon. Coefficient</th>
<th>Canonical Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child variables:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-esteem</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family satisfaction</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acceptance by mother</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal variables:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-esteem</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family satisfaction</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parenting self-esteem</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
accounted for 29% of the shared variance in the first canonical pair. Subsequent chi-square tests of the remaining canonical variates were not statistically significant.

Analysis of the first canonical variate reveals that the children's variable with the highest canonical loading was child family satisfaction ($r = .83$), followed by child self-esteem ($r = .68$), and child-perceived maternal acceptance ($r = .11$). The maternal variable having the largest canonical loading was perceived family satisfaction ($r = .92$), followed by maternal self-esteem ($r = .38$) and mothers' parenting self-esteem ($r = .12$). Therefore, using a cutoff correlation of ($r = .50$) for interpretation, the first canonical variate indicates that there is a significant association between children's reports of high levels of family satisfaction and self-esteem and their mothers' reports of high levels of family satisfaction.

The results of the second canonical correlation analysis are presented in Table 23. The child-perceived variables included in the analysis were children's self-esteem, child-perceived family satisfaction, and perceived paternal acceptance. The father-reported variables included were paternal self-esteem, family satisfaction and parenting self-esteem. Chi-square tests of the canonical variates were not statistically significant. However, the first canonical correlation showed a trend toward significance ($r_c = .50$, $\chi^2(9) = 14.69$, $p = .10$) and accounted for 25% of the shared variance in the first canonical pair. It is noteworthy that both child-perceived family satisfaction ($r = .99$) and father-perceived family satisfaction ($r = .85$) had the highest canonical loadings on this canonical variate.
Table 23

Canonical Correlation Analysis of Child and Paternal Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Canonical Variate</th>
<th>Canonical Correlation</th>
<th>Percent of Variance</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Significance of $R_c$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>14.69</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Sets</th>
<th>Standard Canon. Coefficient</th>
<th>Canonical Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child variables:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-esteem</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family satisfaction</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acceptance by father</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal variables:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-esteem</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family satisfaction</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parenting self-esteem</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

In this chapter the results of the demographic characteristics of the respondents and the study hypotheses were presented. Additional analyses were performed to assess the impact that response-bias measures had on children’s self-esteem and to examine the relationships that exist between child and parent variables.

Table 24 provides a summary overview of the results. Contrary to expectations, four demographic variables differed significantly across gifted and nongifted sample groups. However, as expected, no differences in research variable means were observed prior to hypothesis testing. The summary look at Hypothesis 1 results displays the research variables that were significantly correlated with gifted children’s self-esteem levels. The partial correlation results show the changes in the direction of the magnitude of the correlation coefficients when gifted children’s response-bias tendencies were controlled statistically.

Hypothesis 2 results seen in Table 24 indicate that two research variables were significantly correlated with nongifted respondents’ self-esteem scores. Only child-perceived family satisfaction remained significantly associated with child self-esteem levels in the nongifted sample group once the partial correlation analysis controlled for their response-bias tendencies as “error variance” (Kirk, 1982). It is important to note that the large number of correlational analyses performed increases the likelihood that a correlation coefficient could emerge as significant by chance. Second, results of statistical procedures involving the response-bias measures should be assessed with the understanding that the psychometric properties of these measures are not available.

Table 24 shows that at Step 1 of the hierarchical regression analysis children’s response-bias measures accounted for 24% of the variance in their self-esteem scores.
Table 24  
Summary Table of Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variables</th>
<th>Research Variables</th>
<th>Hypothesis One</th>
<th>Hypothesis Two</th>
<th>Hypothesis Three</th>
<th>Canonical Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zero-Order</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Zero-Order</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: more gifted girls; more nongifted boys</td>
<td>Nobe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siblings: more in gifted sample</td>
<td>Ch Parent Accept</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>mother†</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status: more divorces in nongifted sample</td>
<td>Ch Psych Control</td>
<td>father</td>
<td>father†</td>
<td>father</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custody Status: more maternal custody in nongifted sample</td>
<td>Ch Lax Discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted v. Nongifted</td>
<td>Parental Self-Est.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parental Fam Sat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parenting Self-Est.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large number of correlational analyses increases the probability of significant coefficient by chance; response-bias measures' psychometric properties not available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Group&quot; significant only after response-bias measures entered; gifted girls M self-esteem higher and more gifted girls in gifted group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Children's social desirability and agreement-response scores were the strongest individual predictors of children's self-esteem scores. The research variables were entered at Step 2, and they accounted for 45% of the variance in children's self-esteem scores beyond that variance already accounted for by children's response-bias measures. Child family satisfaction, maternal self-esteem and group status as gifted or nongifted each accounted for 4% of the variance in children's self-esteem scores. However, children's group status was a significant predictor after the effects of child response-bias measures were taken into consideration statistically. In addition, gifted girls' mean self-esteem scores were more than five points higher than the mean self-esteem scores of gifted boys, and nongifted girls and boys. Plus, there were significantly more girls in the gifted sample group.

Finally, Table 24 results of canonical correlation analyses illustrate the significant relatedness of children's reports of high levels of self-esteem and family satisfaction with high levels of maternal reports of family satisfaction. While canonical analyses of children's and paternal variables did not produce significant findings, there was a trend toward significance for the first canonical correlation. Both child- and father-reported family satisfaction scores had the highest canonical loadings on this canonical variate.

Respondents were a highly selective sample group, representing five percent of the total number of families solicited for this study. There were significantly more females (66.7%) than males (33.3%) in the gifted sample group and more males (70.6%) than females (29.4%) in the nongifted sample group. All of the reported ages of the child respondents were either 11 or 12. This achieved the goal of wanting to control for differences in self-esteem scores attributable to age level.

Most of the child respondents were first-borns. While the gifted and nongifted
samples did not differ significantly on birth order, there were twice as many second-born children in the gifted sample group as there were in the nongifted group. The nongifted sample group had five reported cases that were "only-children" while the gifted group had no such cases. The gifted sample group had more siblings in their families overall, and this difference across groups was significant. Virtually all respondents were Caucasian, and only four families had a parent self-identified as Asian. Most parents (greater than 70% of the mothers and 54-80% of the fathers) failed to identify themselves ethnically, but this is likely attributable to the wording of the test protocol item. The item was open-ended and asked parents to identify both their racial and ethnic backgrounds. Beyond this, parents who did respond were of diverse ethnic backgrounds, with only slightly higher frequencies of Irish and Italian descents being represented in the overall sample in comparison to other ethnicities.

Most parents reported their religious backgrounds as Catholic, Protestant or Jewish, respectively. Most parent respondents reported their marital status as married. However, 97.0% of the gifted children had parents who were still married, compared to 64.7% of the nongifted children. This is reflected in the children's reports of custody as well. Most parents reported that their child lived with both parents. Only one of the children in the gifted group indicated that she was in a maternal-custody situation (3.1%), compared to eight in the nongifted group (23.5%). Also, one mother from the nongifted group identified herself as widowed. There were significant differences between the samples on marital status and custodial-living arrangements.

The majority of parents in the gifted group (72.7%) and the nongifted group (52.9%) indicated that their annual family incomes were at or above $90,000. Family incomes in the gifted group were more frequently reported in the higher income ranges
and family incomes in the nongifted group were more frequently reported in the lower income ranges. However, the differences were not statistically significant.

There were more instances of missing data in the nongifted group. This was somewhat related to the number of children from that group who came from divorced or widowed families. Those families were more likely to have data missing from one or both parents.

A preliminary examination of the research variables by means of a multivariate analysis of variance led to the conclusion that variable mean differences between gifted and nongifted samples were not significant, nor were any of the individual univariate tests of mean score differences for any of the research variable means. There was a trend for female child-respondents to have higher self-esteem scores than male child-respondents, although this difference was not significant. These preliminary analyses revealed relative equivalency of the research variables across gifted and nongifted sample groups as expected.

Hypotheses testing indicated partial support for the three hypotheses.

Among children from the gifted sample, perceptions of family satisfaction, maternal acceptance, and paternal acceptance were positively and significantly associated with child self-esteem. Gifted children’s perceived use of psychological-control techniques by their fathers was significantly and inversely associated with their self-esteem scores. None of the parent-reported variables was related significantly to child self-esteem scores in the gifted sample.

For the sample of nongifted children, child-perceived family satisfaction was positively and significantly related to their self-esteem levels. In addition, nongifted children’s perceived use of psychological-control techniques by their fathers was
significantly and inversely correlated with their self-esteem scores. None of the parent-reported variables was related significantly to child self-esteem scores in the nongifted sample. It is important to mention that the large number of correlational analyses performed increases the probability that one or more correlates may emerge as significant by chance (Cohen & Cohen, 1983; Norusis, 1987).

By partialing out the effects of children's response-bias measures on child-perceived variables and the dependent variable, children's levels of self-esteem, the relationships between children's self-esteem scores and both child family satisfaction and child-perceived maternal acceptance scores were significantly reduced in magnitude for the gifted sample. However, the relationships were still significant and positively-valenced. The previously significant relationship between child-perceived paternal acceptance and children's self-esteem scores failed to reach significance as a partial correlation in the gifted sample. Lastly, the significant and inverse association between child-perceived psychological control by the father and children's self-esteem in the gifted sample became stronger when the effects of the child-response bias measures were partialled out. The social desirability and agreement response tendencies of the gifted child sample were significantly correlated with their self-esteem scores.

Among the nongifted sample, when controlling for child response-bias tendencies, the significant relationship between child-perceived family satisfaction and their self-esteem scores remained virtually unchanged. The relationship between child-perceived psychological control by the father and child self-esteem was no longer significant. None of the child response-bias measures were significantly related to children's self-esteem scores among nongifted participants. It is important to keep in mind that the psychometric properties of the response-bias measures used in the present study are
The results of a hierarchical regression analysis partially supported the third hypothesis. Child-perceived and parent-reported predictor variables collectively did account for a significantly greater amount of the variance in child self-esteem scores (41%) than children’s group status alone (4%). However, none of the individual predictor variables explained a significantly greater amount of the variance in children’s self-esteem scores than did children’s group status as gifted or nongifted. Three of 14 predictor variables were significantly predictive of children’s self-esteem scores. Maternal self-esteem scores, child’s group status as gifted or nongifted, and child-perceived family satisfaction scores, in order of predictive strength, were significant predictors. Each accounted for approximately 4% of the variance in child self-esteem scores.

Additional analyses of child response-bias measures found that they explain a significant amount of the variability in children’s self-esteem scores (24%). Two of the three child response-bias measures, assessing social desirability and agreement-response tendencies, individually accounted for significant amounts of the variability in children’s self-esteem scores. Children’s self-monitoring scores failed to reach significance. However, it is important to keep in mind that the psychometric properties of the response-bias measures utilized in the present study were not available and the results of statistical procedures involving these measures should be analyzed accordingly.

Two canonical correlation analyses were conducted to explore the relationships between child and parent variables. The first canonical analysis examined the relationships between three child-perceived variables (self-esteem, family satisfaction and perceived maternal acceptance) and three mother-reported variables (self-esteem,
family satisfaction and parenting self-esteem). The second canonical analysis explored the relatedness of three child-perceived variables (self-esteem, family satisfaction and perceived paternal acceptance) with three father-reported variables (self-esteem, family satisfaction and parenting self-esteem). The results of the canonical analyses demonstrated that only the relationships between child and maternal variables were significant. The first of three canonical variates accounted for 29% of the shared variance in the child and maternal variable sets. Findings revealed that there is a significant association between children’s reports of high levels of family satisfaction and self-esteem and their mothers’ reports of high levels of family satisfaction. Subsequent chi-square tests of all other canonical variates were not statistically significant. It is noteworthy that, while no significant results were obtained by examining the canonical analyses between child and father variable sets, there was a trend toward significance for the first canonical correlation. In addition, both child-perceived family satisfaction and father-perceived family satisfaction had the highest canonical loadings on this canonical variate.

In summary, respondents were a highly selective group, representing five percent of the total number of families solicited for this study. Relative equivalency between gifted and nongifted samples was expected among the demographic and research variables. However, there were significantly more girls than boys in the gifted sample and more boys than girls in the nongifted sample. The gifted sample children had more siblings than the nongifted sample. The parents of the nongifted sample were more likely to report that they were divorced or widowed, and their child respondent was more likely to be living in a maternal-custody living arrangement.

There were no significant differences in research variable means between gifted
and nongifted sample groups. There was a trend for girls to have higher self-esteem scores than boys, although this difference was not significant.

Hypothesis testing provided partial support for all three hypotheses... Among gifted child participants, child-perceived family satisfaction, and both maternal and paternal acceptance were significantly related to their self-esteem scores. A significant, inverse relationship was demonstrated between gifted child-perceived use of psychological control techniques by their fathers and their self-esteem scores.

Among nongifted children, child-perceived family satisfaction was significantly related to their levels of self-esteem. A significant, inverse relationship was seen in nongifted children’s perceptions of psychological-control techniques used by their fathers and their self-esteem scores.

The social desirability and agreement-response tendencies of gifted child-respondents were significantly correlated with their levels of self-esteem. The response-bias tendencies of nongifted child participants were not significantly associated with their self-esteem scores. Consequently, partialing-out the effects of gifted children’s response-bias tendencies had a greater effect on the correlates of their self-esteem scores than on the correlates of nongifted children’s self-esteem scores.

In hierarchical regression analysis, the child-perceived and parent-reported variables accounted for a significantly greater amount of variance in children’s self-esteem scores (41%) than did children’s group status as gifted or nongifted alone (4%). However, none of the individual predictor variables explained significantly greater variance in children’s self-esteem scores than did children’s group status. Three significant predictors -- maternal self-esteem scores, children’s group status, and child-perceived family satisfaction -- each accounted for approximately four percent of the
variance in children's self-esteem scores.

Additional analyses showed child-response-bias variables explained a significant amount of the variance in children's self-esteem scores (24%), specifically, children's social desirability and agreement-response tendencies. Finally, significant relationships were observed between children's reports of high levels of family satisfaction and self-esteem and their mothers' reports of high levels of family satisfaction.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Restatement of the Problem

The present study was designed to assess the relationships between several family variables -- child-perceived family satisfaction, child-perceived parental behaviors, parent-reported parenting self-esteem (parental sense of competence), parent-reported family satisfaction, and the self-esteem of parents -- and overall self-esteem scores among groups of gifted and nongifted sixth-graders. Second, the study was intended to examine the predictive contributions of the same family variables to the self-esteem scores of gifted and nongifted sixth-grade sample groups. Analyses were also conducted to explore the relationships that exist between children's perceptions of their families, parents, and themselves and their parents' perceptions of their families, parenting and themselves.

Analysis of Demographic and Research Variables

Child respondents were asked to complete the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory—School Form (Coopersmith, 1981), the Family Satisfaction Scale (Olson & Wilson, 1982), a modified version of the Children's Report of Parental Behavior Inventory (Schaefer, 1965a; Margolies & Weintraub, 1977), and a response-bias measure created from items from the Children's Social Desirability Questionnaire (Crandall et al., 1965), the Agreement Response Scale (Couch & Keniston, 1960), and the Self-Monitoring Scale
Parents completed the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory-Adult Form (Coopersmith, 1981), the Family Satisfaction Scale (Olson & Wilson, 1982), a modified version of the Parental Sense of Competence Scale (Gibaud-Wallston & Wandersman, 1978; Johnson & Mash, 1989), a response-bias measure created from items from the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960), the Agreement Response Scale (Couch & Keniston, 1960), and the Self-Monitoring Scale (Snyder, 1974), and a family information inventory.

Demographic Variables

Analysis of demographic variables revealed that a selective group of families agreed to participate in this study as evidenced by the return rate (5.2%). A consistent response received from school officials, parents, and child participants was that the response demands of the present study were high. Beyond this, the questions asked of the respondents were of a personal nature.

All of the reported age levels of the child participants were either 11 or 12, achieving the goal of controlling for differences in self-esteem scores attributable to age level seen in the pilot study (Enright & Ruzicka, 1989). This was also important because it was an intent of the study to focus on the perceptions of children in middle-to-late childhood or the preadolescent stage of development. At this stage, the perceived appraisals of parents continue to have significant impact on children’s self-esteem (Cotton, 1983; Dickstein & Posner, 1978; Gecas et al., 1974; Maccoby, 1984). Parental influences on children’s perceptions are thought to be stronger on children at earlier stages of development (Felson & Zielinski, 1989).

Virtually all respondents were Caucasian. Asian parents were identified in only
four families. It is noteworthy that few parents from racial minority backgrounds participated as this limits the ability to generalize from these results to the general population of sixth-graders and their parents.

More than half of the parents responding to the family income question indicated that their family incomes were at or above $90,000. This limits the ability to generalize from these results to lower-income families.

**Research Variables**

Data analysis showed that the mean self-esteem scores of gifted and nongifted sixth-grade participants did not differ significantly. This finding is consistent with the results of many prior researchers (Bartell & Reynolds, 1986; Brody & Benbow, 1986; Chiu, 1990; Dean, 1977; McEwin & Cross, 1982; Tidwell, 1980). It is also consistent with similar research that compared the self-concept scores of gifted and nongifted children (Bracken, 1980; Cornell et al., 1992; Karnes & Wherry, 1981). The data argue for a removal of an overidealized stereotype of gifted children (Cornell, 1983). The pilot study (Enright & Ruzicka, 1989) did not compare gifted children's self-esteem scores with those of nongifted children, but found that both low and high self-esteem scores were self-reported by gifted child participants. The findings suggest that, despite demonstrated academic abilities, gifted children can suffer from feelings of unworthiness (Bracken, 1980; Cornell, 1983; Enright & Ruzicka, 1989; Johnson, 1981; McDowell, 1984; Ross, 1964). Other researchers focused on the effect that being in gifted classes may play in deflating self-esteem levels because gifted children's academic abilities are less likely to be viewed as above average by gifted peers, teachers of the gifted, and family members (Cornell et al., 1992). The present study was able to account for
significant amounts of variability in gifted children's self-esteem scores by using family variables as correlates and predictors.

There was a trend for girls' self-esteem scores to be higher than boys' scores, although this difference was not significant. Gender differences in self-esteem scores are generally minimal (Coopersmith, 1981). A review of the effects of gender on self-esteem scores concluded that females are as likely as males to evidence higher self-esteem levels when gender differences are obtained (Killeen, 1993; Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974; Major et al., 1999; Nielsen & Matha, 1994). This similarity in self-esteem scores across gender categories was observed in the majority of studies reviewed for this study that reported mean self-esteem scores for both girls and boys.

The present study was designed to find explanations in accounting for variability in gifted and nongifted children's self-esteem scores by using family variables as correlates and predictors. The two groups, gifted and nongifted children, did not differ significantly in their reports of family satisfaction, nor in their perceptions of their parents as accepting, as using psychological control techniques, or as using lax discipline. By way of literature review, it seems that this is the first time that these children's research variables were compared across gifted and nongifted children's groups.

This similarity across groups was observed in parents' variables as well. Both groups of parents reported equivalent levels of self-esteem, family satisfaction, and parenting self-esteem. To this researcher's knowledge, this is the first time that the relationships between parents' reports of self-esteem, family satisfaction, and parenting self-esteem were explored across gifted and nongifted sample groups. It is interesting that children's and parents' reports of these variables are relatively similar between the two groups. The magnitude of the variability accounted for in children's self-esteem
scores by these predictor variables (45%) and response-bias measures (24%) was impressively substantial.

The findings of each hypothesis will now be discussed.

**Hypothesis 1**

According to the first research hypothesis, higher levels of self-esteem among gifted sixth-grade children will be related significantly to higher levels of perceived family satisfaction and maternal acceptance, lower maternal psychological control and maternal lax discipline, higher paternal acceptance, lower paternal psychological control and paternal lax discipline, higher levels of maternal self-esteem, family satisfaction, and parenting self-esteem, and higher levels of paternal self-esteem, family satisfaction, and parenting self-esteem.

This hypothesis was partially supported by the results that gifted children’s perceptions of family satisfaction, and both maternal and paternal acceptance are positively and significantly related to their levels of self-esteem. Also, gifted children’s perceptions of paternal use of psychological control techniques were inversely and significantly related to their self-esteem levels.

No previous research studies emerged from a literature search that assessed the family satisfaction scores of gifted children. However, one researcher has reported a significant relationship between Jewish adolescents’ reports of family satisfaction and their self-concept scores (Schwartz, 1987). Schwartz found that adolescents’ family satisfaction scores were strong predictors of adolescents’ self-concept scores, followed closely by the adolescents’ perceptions of maternal acceptance. These findings were replicated in this study using a self-esteem measure and a sample of gifted sixth-graders.
Garg (1992) observed significant, positive associations between undergraduates' emotional, general and nonacademic self-concepts and self-reported family satisfaction.

Other studies show similar associations between family satisfaction and children's self-esteem. Cooper et al. (1983) found that certain family types ("two- and one-parent cohesive families") scored significantly higher on measures of self-esteem and self-concept, and reported higher levels of family happiness and fun than children from other family types ("parent coalition," "divided," "isolated"). "Better" parent-adolescent communication was positively related to child-reported family satisfaction (Barnes & Olson, 1985) as was achievement in gifted boys (Green et al., 1988), perceived wellness and family satisfaction (Ragheb, 1993), and measures of subjective well-being with family satisfaction in adults (Okun & Stock, 1987). These results are consistent with Killeen's (1993) finding that children's self-esteem is influenced by the affective component of parents' communications with them.

It is not surprising that gifted children's self-esteem was related to perceptions of their mothers as accepting. The pilot study (Enright & Ruzicka, 1989) demonstrated a positive correlation with perceptions of maternal support and gifted children's self-esteem. There is substantial literature on children not identified as gifted indicating that perceptions of maternal acceptance/support is a significant predictor of children's self-esteem and self-concept (Cooper et al., 1983; Coopersmith, 1967; Felson & Zielinski, 1989; Gecas, 1971; Gecas, 1972; Gecas & Schwalbe, 1986; Gecas et al., 1970; Graybill, 1978; Hoelter & Harper, 1984; Kawash et al., 1985; Litovsky & Dusek, 1985; Medinamus, 1965; Peterson et al., 1983; Rosenberg, 1965).

Gifted children's perceptions of paternal acceptance were significantly related to their levels of self-esteem despite not being significantly associated in the pilot study.
(Enright & Ruzicka, 1989). Still, this finding was consistent with a substantial number of outcome studies utilizing children not identified as gifted (Cooper et al., 1983; Coopersmith, 1967; Felson & Zielinski, 1989; Gecas, 1971; Gecas, 1972; Gecas & Schwalbe, 1986; Gecas et al., 1970; Graybill, 1978; Hoelter & Harper, 1984; Kawash et al., 1985; Litovsky & Dusek, 1985; Medinnus, 1965; Peterson et al., 1983; Rosenberg, 1965).

It was hypothesized that gifted children's perceptions of infrequent parental use of psychological control techniques would be significantly associated with higher levels of their self-esteem. In fact, gifted child-respondents’ perceptions of perceived paternal, not maternal, use of psychological control techniques were significantly and inversely related to their self-esteem scores.

In the pilot study (Enright & Ruzicka, 1989), correlations between gifted children's self-esteem scores and a demanding dimension of a perceived parental behavior questionnaire (Devereaux et al., 1962) were not significant. This dimension was judged to be equivalent to the psychological control/psychological autonomy dimension of the CRPBI (Goldin, 1969). Other studies were not found that validate or disconfirm this outcome with gifted children.

One of Coopersmith's (1967) three major findings is that parents need to provide respect and latitude for their children to engage in independent activities within clearly defined and enforced limits to foster high levels of self-esteem in their children. In this study, the variable of perceived psychological control/psychological autonomy is understood as the degree to which parents are interpreted as attempting to control them through covert, psychological methods that inhibit the individuation process.

In reviewing the outcomes of studies using samples of children not identified as
gifted, significant, inverse relationships were observed between children’s perceptions of psychological control by both parents and children’s self-esteem scores (Demo et al., 1987; Kawash et al., 1985; Litovsky & Dusek, 1985). Among a nonclinical sample group of adolescents, a significant, inverse relationship was obtained between their perceptions of parental psychological control and their levels of self-esteem, particularly for parent-daughter relationships (Nielsen & Metha, 1994). Comparable results were observed between child-perceived psychological control by parents and self-concept measures (Crase et al., 1981; Graybill, 1978). Hill (1988) obtained a significant, inverse relationship between ninth- and twelfth-grade females’ perceptions of parental psychological control and a measure assessing self-image.

Growe (1980) noted a significant, positive relationship between child-perceived psychological autonomy (the polar opposite of psychological control) and child self-esteem scores, but only among males, not females. A significant, positive relationship was also found between perceived maternal-demanding behavior and children's self-esteem levels in fifth- and sixth-graders (Peterson et al., 1983).

Given the above-mentioned literature review, a lack of sufficient statistical power may partially explain how the relationship between gifted child-participants’ perceptions of maternal use of psychological control and their self-esteem levels did not reach statistical significance in this study (Cohen & Cohen, 1983). The correlation coefficient for these variables was moderate in size ($r = -.34$). Increasing the number of respondents would be the most appropriate way to increase the statistical power of the correlational analyses since the effect size and power levels were pre-set at conventional levels. Increasing the power level in this manner increases the likelihood that the correlation coefficient would be found significant (Cohen & Cohen, 1983).
Gifted children's perceptions of parental use of lax versus firm discipline failed to be significantly related to their self-esteem scores as hypothesized. The pilot study (Enright & Ruzicka, 1989) found that maternal, not paternal, punishing behaviors were negatively and significantly correlated with gifted children's self-esteem. Fathers' perceived use of deprivation of privileges as a punishment technique was positively associated with self-esteem. However, the present study utilized a different measure of perceived parental behavior. The pilot study measure (Devereaux et al., 1962) assessed a punishment dimension of perceived parental behavior while the present study utilizes the CRPBI (Schaefer, 1965) which assesses lax versus firm discipline. The lax versus firm discipline variable of the CRPBI was the weakest of the factors identified in the modified version of the CRPBI (Margolies & Weintraub, 1977).

Coopersmith (1967) hypothesized that parental enforcement of clearly-defined limits leads to high levels of self-esteem in children. While Coopersmith's hypothesis was not supported by the self-reported perceptions of gifted children in this study, this hypothesis has not been previously addressed empirically with a sample of gifted children to this researcher's knowledge. Moreover, the result could be related to the weakness of the lax discipline factor structure mentioned above or to a lack of sufficient statistical power (Cohen & Cohen, 1983).

The present study's results are consistent with studies of children not identified as gifted. Two studies demonstrated nonsignificant results between lax versus firm discipline and self-esteem scores among fifth- and sixth-graders (Kawash et al., 1985) and among seventh through ninth-graders (Litovsky & Dusek, 1985). Graybill (1978) observed nonsignificant relationships between the lax versus firm discipline and self-concept scores in children, aged seven to fifteen. Graybill hypothesized that perhaps the
relationship between the child-perceived discipline dimension and self-concept was curvilinear. In this proposal, children with parents perceived to be consistent, yet flexible, in allowing rule deviations for unusual circumstances would evidence high self-concept scores. Alternatively, children with parents perceived to be lax in their discipline or overly harsh would be expected to show low self-concept scores. A team of researchers, for example, associated juvenile delinquency with lax or overly strict parental discipline (Patterson et al., 1989). However, a review of the scatterplots did not reveal a curvilinear trend between child-perceived maternal or paternal lax discipline scores and self-esteem scores among the present study’s gifted participants.

Perhaps the preponderance of girls in the present gifted sample helps account for the lack of association between perceived parental lax versus firm discipline and self-esteem. Kawash et al. (1985) suggested that boys’ and girls’ perceptions of parental discipline and punishment may have a greater influence on boys’ self-esteem scores.

It was hypothesized that high levels of parents’ self-esteem, perceptions of family satisfaction, and parenting self-esteem would be significantly related to high levels of gifted children’s self-esteem scores. However, none of these variables reached significance with gifted children’s self-esteem scores. A literature search did not produce results of any prior research that directly addressed these relationships with gifted children and their parents.

It has been mentioned that prior research points to a stronger association of child-perceived variables than parent-reported variables with children’s self-esteem scores (Demo et al., 1987; Gecas & Schwalbe, 1986). Consistent with this observation, several child-perceived variables were significantly related to children’s self-esteem scores while no parent-reported variables reached statistical significance with gifted children’s self-
Esteem scores.

Theoretically, the family has been described as the "primary arena for socialization" (Maccoby, 1984, p. 318). From a social learning perspective, it is important to be cognizant that family relationships are assumed to be bidirectionally and reciprocally influenced (Dev. Peters & McMahon, 1988; Finken & Amato, 1993; Killeen, 1993). It would be expected that parental influences on a child's behavior will provide feedback and create changes in parental behavior (Wells, 1994). In social learning theory terms, a child's behavior becomes, in part, both a consequence of previous parental behavior, and an antecedent to subsequent parental behavior (Bandura, 1977).

The importance of studying parental cognitions in and of themselves (Goodnow, 1988) and as they influence parent-child relationships (Johnson & Mash, 1989; MacPhee et al., 1996) has been asserted. Symbolic-interaction theory suggests that children's self-esteem develops as a function of parents' reflected appraisals of children's self-worth which occurs during parent-child interactions (Gecas & Schwalbe, 1986; Mead, 1934).

There are studies suggesting that parents' reports of their perceptions of family satisfaction, parenting self-esteem and self-esteem would be associated with their child's level of self-esteem. Coopersmith (1967) examined the responses of middle-childhood-aged boys and their mothers. He found that mothers who rated their sons as relatively happy were more likely to be from the high self-esteem sample group. Also, kibbutz fathers reporting higher levels of family satisfaction were most likely to see their families as encouraging the growth of the members (Margalit et al., 1989). Family members who report higher levels of family satisfaction are associated with improvements in parent-child relationships and a healthier emotional adjustment for the child (Barnes & Olson, 1985; Green et al., 1988; Okun & Stock, 1987; Ragheb, 1993). Despite this, parental
reports of family satisfaction were not significantly related to their children's self-esteem scores in the gifted sample.

Both mothers and fathers' parenting self-esteem scores were not significantly related to their child's self-esteem scores in the gifted sample. This was not anticipated given the significant number of related studies that seem to show an association between parental cognitions or behavior and their children's self-esteem or behavior. For instance, parents' perceptions of their performances as parents were positively related to their children's self-esteem (Demo et al., 1987). Improved parenting skills were shown to be significantly related to higher levels of children's self-esteem (Cedar & Levant, 1990). Parenting self-esteem measures parents' perceived self-efficacy and amount of satisfaction as a parent (Johnson & Mash, 1989). Increases in parenting self-esteem were reliably observed after parental skills training (Anastopoulos et al., 1993; Pisterman et al., 1992). High levels of parenting self-esteem scores were related to lower levels of child behavior problems (Anastopoulos et al., 1993; Johnson & Mash, 1989), higher levels of experience as fathers (Ferketich & Mercer, 1995), and healthier childrearing practices (MacPhee et al., 1996).

Studies have demonstrated a significant, inverse relationship between parents and children's self-esteem scores (Openshaw et al., 1984), a significant, positive relationship (Landau, 1986), and a weak correlation (r=.15), albeit significant, with adolescents' levels of self-esteem (Demo et al., 1987). The outcome studies mentioned were not a clear-cut endorsement of parental self-esteem being correlated with child self-esteem. It is, therefore, not surprising that the relationship between the two variables was not found to be significant in the gifted sample. However, since the correlation coefficient obtained between these two variables in the present study (r = .18) was greater than the above-
mentioned correlation coefficient, the lack of statistical significance obtained in this study could be related to a lack of sufficient statistical power (Cohen & Cohen, 1983).

**Response-Bias Tendencies and Correlates of Gifted Children's Self-Esteem**

Two of the three response-bias measures of the gifted child sample were significantly correlated with their self-esteem scores. In contrast, none of the response-bias measures of the nongifted sample were significantly related to their self-esteem scores. Gifted children's tendencies to present themselves in a socially acceptable manner and to agree (or disagree) to test items regardless of their content were significant correlates of their levels of self-esteem. Their self-reported tendencies to self-monitor their expressive behaviors and self-presentations were not found to be significantly related to their levels of self-esteem. A literature search for studies assessing the associations between these response-bias tendencies and self-esteem scores using a sample of gifted children did not produce results.

In view of the significant, positive correlations between two of three gifted children's response-bias scores and their self-esteem levels, a partial correlation analysis was performed between the correlates and children's self-esteem scores, controlling for their response-bias tendencies. This made several significant changes in the size of the correlation coefficients.

For the gifted sample, the partial correlation between child-perceived family satisfaction and their self-esteem scores was significantly reduced in magnitude. This was also true of the partial correlation between child-perceived maternal acceptance and their levels of self-esteem. Thus, there is evidence to indicate that some of the observed strength in associations between these variables can be explained in part by gifted
children's response-bias tendencies. The relationship between child-perceived paternal acceptance and self-esteem scores among the gifted sample, significant as a zero-order correlation, was not significant as a partial correlation. This suggests that gifted child respondents’ response-bias tendencies accounted for a significant amount of the relationship between these variables.

The inverse relationship between child-perceived psychological control by the father and levels of self-esteem among gifted child participants was found to be significantly stronger in magnitude as a partial correlation. Therefore, by controlling for the effects of gifted children's response-bias tendencies, gifted children's perceptions of their fathers as using psychological control techniques were shown to be even more highly significant and negatively associated with their levels of self-esteem. Other studies were not found that validate or disconfirm the impact that controlling for the effects of gifted children’s response-bias tendencies have on the above-mentioned correlates of gifted children’s self-esteem. It is important to keep in mind that the psychometric properties of the response-bias measures utilized in the present study were not available and the results of statistical procedures involving these measures should be analyzed accordingly.

**Hypothesis 2**

According to the second research hypothesis, higher levels of self-esteem among nongifted sixth-grade children will be related significantly to higher levels of perceived family satisfaction and maternal acceptance, lower maternal psychological control and maternal lax discipline, higher paternal acceptance, lower paternal psychological control and paternal lax discipline, higher levels of maternal self-esteem, family satisfaction, and
parenting self-esteem, and higher levels of paternal self-esteem, family satisfaction, and parenting self-esteem.

This hypothesis was partially supported by the results that nongifted children's perceptions of both family satisfaction and paternal use of psychological control techniques were significantly associated with nongifted children's self-esteem.

The highly significant correlation between nongifted children's self-esteem and their reports of family satisfaction was consistent with the findings of gifted respondents in this study. Schwartz (1987) similarly found that adolescents' reports of family satisfaction were a better predictor of self-concept scores than were adolescents' perceptions of parental behavior. Also, Garg (1992) demonstrated a positive, significant relationship between undergraduates' emotional, general, and nonacademic self-concepts and their self-reports of family satisfaction. Cooper et al. (1983) observed that certain family types ("two- and one parent cohesive families") scored significantly higher on measures of self-esteem and self-concept, and reported higher levels of family happiness and fun than children from other family types ("parent coalition," "divided," "isolated"). "Better" parent-adolescent communication was positively related to child-reported family satisfaction (Barnes & Olson, 1985), as was perceived wellness and family satisfaction (Ragheb, 1993), and measures of subjective well-being with family satisfaction in adults (Okun & Stock, 1987). These results are related to Killeen's (1993) finding that children's self-esteem is influenced by the affective component of parents' communications with them.

Unlike their gifted counterparts, there was no significant relationship demonstrated between nongifted children's perceptions of maternal or paternal acceptance and their levels of self-esteem. This was the least expected outcome of the study given the number
of research studies that have supported the significant association between children's perceptions of their parents as accepting and their high levels of self-esteem or self-concept (Cooper et al., 1983; Coopersmith, 1967; Felson & Zielinski, 1989; Gecas, 1971; Gecas, 1972; Gecas & Schwalbe, 1986; Gecas et al., 1970; Graybill, 1978; Hoelter & Harper, 1984; Kawash et al., 1985; Litovsky & Dusek, 1985; Medinnus, 1965; Peterson et al., 1983; Rosenberg, 1965). It seems most likely that a lack of statistical power accounts for the lack of significance between child-perceived parental acceptance and self-esteem scores in the nongifted sample. If the correlational analyses were repeated with a larger sample, statistical power would be increased as would the likelihood that the correlation coefficient would reach statistical significance (Cohen & Cohen, 1983).

Among nongifted participants, child-perceived paternal, not maternal, use of psychological control techniques was negatively and significantly associated with their levels of self-esteem. This outcome was consistent with the responses of children in the gifted sample. One of Coopersmith's (1967) three major findings is that parents need to provide respect and latitude for their children to engage in independent activities within clearly defined and enforced limits. In this study, the variable of perceived psychological control/psychological autonomy is understood as the degree to which parents are perceived as attempting to control them through covert, psychological methods that inhibit individuation processes.

This outcome was also expected since previous researchers have observed similar results. Significant, inverse relationships were found between children's perceptions of parental psychological control and their levels of self-esteem in fifth- and sixth-graders (Kawash et al., 1985), in grades seven through nine (Litovsky & Dusek, 1985), in children aged 10 to 17 (Demo et al., 1987), and in a nonclinical sample of adolescents
aged 13 to 17 (Nielsen & Metha, 1994). Similar relationships were shown between child-perceived parental psychological control and self-concept scores in children, aged seven to fifteen (Graybill, 1978) and in fifth- and sixth-graders (Crase et al., 1981). Hill (1988) obtained a significant, inverse relationship between ninth- and twelfth-grade females' perceptions of parental psychological control and a measure assessing self-image.

A significant, positive relationship was observed between a two-item perceived autonomy scale and the self-esteem scores of fifth- and sixth-graders (Growe, 1980). A significant, positive relationship was also found between perceived maternal-demanding behavior and children's self-esteem in fifth- and sixth-graders (Peterson et al., 1983). As previously mentioned, the demanding dimension of a perceived parental behavior questionnaire (Devereaux et al., 1962) was judged to be similar to the psychological control versus psychological autonomy dimension of the CRPBI (Goldin, 1969). It was thought that demanding maternal behavior might communicate confidence in the child's capacity to understand, become self-responsible, and problem-solve effectively.

Given the above-mentioned literature review, it is not clear why the relationship between nongifted child participants' perceptions of maternal use of psychological control and their self-esteem levels did not reach statistical significance in this study.

Nongifted children's perceptions of parental use of lax discipline failed to be significantly associated with their self-esteem levels as hypothesized. This finding is consistent with the responses of children in the gifted sample. As mentioned, the lax versus firm discipline factor of the CRPBI (Schaefer, 1965a) was the weakest of the factors identified in the modified version of the CRPBI (Margolies & Weintraub, 1977) and may help account for the lack of significant association between lax discipline and self-esteem levels in the nongifted sample. It is also possible that significant findings
could be obtained by repeating this correlational analysis with a larger sample size to increase the level of statistical power (Cohen & Cohen, 1983).

It was hypothesized that high levels of parents’ self-esteem, perceptions of family satisfaction, and parenting self-esteem would be significantly related to high levels of nongifted children’s self-esteem scores. However, none of these variables reached significance with nongifted children’s self-esteem scores. These findings are consistent with the responses of the parents and children in the gifted sample. A literature search did not produce results of any prior research that directly addressed these relationships with nongifted children and their parents. The same theoretical reasons and empirical studies reported on in the discussion of these variables with gifted respondents apply in the discussion of these variables for nongifted respondents. Prior studies have found a stronger association of child-perceived variables than parent-reported variables with children’s self-esteem scores (Gecas & Schwalbe, 1986; Demo et al., 1987). It is also possible that significant relatedness could be obtained between parents’ self-esteem, perceptions of family satisfaction, parenting self-esteem, and the dependent variable, nongifted children’s self-esteem scores, by repeating these analyses with a larger sample size to raise the level of statistical power (Cohen & Cohen, 1983).

**Response-Bias Tendencies and Correlates of Nongifted Children’s Self-Esteem**

Partial correlation analyses were conducted between the correlates and children’s self-esteem scores among nongifted participants, controlling for their response bias tendencies. None of the nongifted children’s response-bias measures was significantly correlated with their levels of self-esteem. It is, therefore, not surprising that with the effects of children’s response-bias tendencies partialed-out, nongifted children’s
perceptions of family satisfaction remained highly related to their levels of self-esteem. However, nongifted children’s perceptions of paternal use of psychological control techniques no longer reached significant levels of association with their self-esteem scores. It is instructive to note that nongifted children’s response-bias tendencies were only mildly explanatory in the relationship between these two variables because the zero-order correlation was -.41 and the partial correlation was -.39.

**Hypothesis 3**

According to the third research hypothesis, gifted and nongifted sixth-grade children’s higher family satisfaction and maternal acceptance scores, lower levels of child-perceived maternal psychological control and maternal lax discipline scores, higher child-perceived paternal acceptance scores, lower child-perceived paternal psychological control and paternal lax discipline scores, higher levels of their mothers’ self-esteem scores, family satisfaction scores, and parenting self-esteem scores, and higher levels of their fathers’ self-esteem scores, family satisfaction scores, and parenting self-esteem scores will explain greater variance in children’s self-esteem scores than group identity.

A hierarchical multiple regression analysis was carried out on the pooled sample of gifted and nongifted children in order to determine the unique contribution of the predictor variables to children’s self-esteem scores after first accounting for the variance in these scores by the three child response-bias measures.

The results show that the predictor variables account for a significant amount of the variance in children’s self-esteem scores (45%) beyond the variance accounted for by children’s response-bias measures (24%). Collectively, the child-perceived and parent-reported predictor variables explained a significantly greater amount of the variance in
children's self-esteem scores (41%) than did children's group status as gifted or nongifted (4%). In general, the importance of considering multivariate family influences, both child-perceived and parent-reported, among the factors that account for variance in gifted and nongifted children's levels of self-esteem is supported by this finding.

However, the regression analysis results provide only partial support for the third hypothesis because none of the individual predictor variables explained greater variance in children's levels of self-esteem than their group status. Individually, maternal self-esteem scores, children's group status as gifted or nongifted, and child-perceived family satisfaction scores were each significantly predictive of children's self-esteem scores. Each predictor accounted for approximately 4% of the variance in the criterion variable.

It is interesting that maternal levels of self-esteem were significantly predictive of children's self-esteem scores given that this variable was not significantly related to children's self-esteem scores in either the gifted or nongifted sample. Previous studies have demonstrated a significant, inverse relationship between parents and children's self-esteem scores (Openshaw et al., 1984), a significant, positive relationship (Landau, 1986), and another showed a weak correlation (r=.15), albeit significant, with adolescents' levels of self-esteem (Demo et al., 1987). These outcome studies do not demonstrate a well-established association between parents' and children's self-esteem.

Theoretically, family relationships are assumed to be bidirectionally and reciprocally influenced (Dev. Peters & McMahon, 1988; Finken & Amato, 1993; Killeen, 1993). Parental influences on a child's behavior are, therefore, expected to elicit changes in parental behaviors (Wells, 1994). Symbolic-interaction theorists have suggested that children's self-esteem develops as a function of parents' reflected appraisals of children's self-worth which occurs during parent-child interactions (Gecas & Schwalbe, 1986;
Mead, 1934). The significant, predictive power of mothers’ self-esteem on their child’s self-esteem scores is consistent with this theoretical model.

The predictive strength of child-perceived family satisfaction on children’s self-esteem scores was expected. Moreover, this variable was the strongest correlate of children’s self-esteem levels across both gifted and nongifted samples. A literature search failed to produce other studies that directly examined the predictive impact of child-perceived family satisfaction on children’s self-esteem scores using gifted and nongifted children. However, Schwartz (1987) found that family satisfaction scores were a better predictor of Jewish adolescents’ self-concept scores than were the adolescents’ perceptions of parents as accepting, using psychological control techniques, and using lax discipline.

Garg (1992) observed a significant, positive relationship between undergraduates’ family satisfaction scores and their self-concepts. Members of families rated as cohesive evidenced higher levels of self-esteem, self-concept, and family happiness and fun than less-cohesive family types (Cooper et al., 1983). Higher levels of family satisfaction have also been associated with “better” parent-adolescent communication (Barnes & Olson, 1985), higher achievement levels in gifted boys (Green et al., 1988), perceived wellness (Ragheb, 1993), and subjective well-being in adults (Okun & Stock, 1987). More globally, the affective quality of parents’ communications has been asserted as a moderating influence of children’s levels of self-esteem (Killeen, 1993).

It was expected that whether children were identified as gifted or not would not be as significant a predictor of their self-esteem levels as the other child-perceived and parent-reported variables presently being considered. Despite this, child respondents’ group status as gifted or nongifted did prove to be a significant predictor of their self-
Preliminary analyses of the research variables in the present study showed that there were no significant differences between gifted and nongifted children's self-esteem scores. However, children's group status as gifted or nongifted was a significant predictor of their levels of self-esteem after the effects of their response-bias tendencies were controlled for statistically. Therefore, these children's response-bias tendencies played a significant role in the prediction of their self-esteem scores by their group status as gifted or nongifted. It seems unlikely that children's assignments to a gifted or nongifted status would be affected by their response-bias tendencies and more likely that their self-esteem scores were influenced by their response-bias tendencies. The results of this study have also shown that it is the response-bias tendencies of gifted participants, not those of the nongifted, which correlated significantly with their self-esteem scores. It is important to keep in mind that the psychometric properties of the response-bias measures utilized in the present study were not available and the ability to generalize from these results is limited accordingly.

There are no known studies that directly address the predictive impact that a child being identified as gifted or not has on self-esteem levels. However, the majority of studies that assess children's levels of self-esteem using gifted and nongifted comparison groups have not demonstrated significant differences in self-esteem between groups. Gender differences in self-esteem scores may provide some of the explanation for children's group status being a significant predictor of their levels of self-esteem. Although not significant, there was a trend for girls' self-esteem scores to be higher than boys' scores ($F (1,48) = 3.35, p = .07$) among these respondents. Moreover, gifted girls' mean self-esteem score ($M = 87.05$) was at least five points higher than the mean self-
esteem scores of gifted boys and both nongifted girls and boys. Finally, there were significantly more girls than boys in the gifted sample. Therefore, the impact that gifted children's response-bias tendencies and gender may have had on their self-esteem scores helps explain the outcome that gifted and nongifted children's self-esteem levels were not significantly different, yet children's group status as gifted or nongifted was a significant predictor of their self-esteem scores.

It is somewhat surprising that children's perceptions of their parents as accepting, as using psychological control techniques, and as being lax in their discipline were not significant predictors of their self-esteem levels. As previously mentioned, there exists a substantial literature that attests to their relatedness to self-esteem. It seems most likely that the modest sample size afforded insufficient levels of statistical power for these variables' correlation coefficients to reach statistical significance (Cohen & Cohen, 1983).

A literature search failed to find previous research addressing the predictability of parent-reported family satisfaction and parenting self-esteem on children's self-esteem. Related studies already reported in this chapter suggest that these two parent-reported variables were likely to have been significant predictors of self-esteem. In addition, a canonical correlation analysis showed the significant relatedness of high levels of mother-reported family satisfaction with children's self-esteem scores and family satisfaction scores. A possible explanation for these variables failing to reach predictive significance may be found in the combination of many predictor variables and the modest sample size utilized when conducting the regression analysis. Both of these factors affect the predictive power of the test for significance as explained in Chapter III.
Additional Analysis

Two canonical correlation analyses were conducted to assess the degree of relatedness between child and parent variables. The canonical analyses were run twice to balance the number of child-perceived variables and parent-reported variables being correlated. While it is theoretically possible to perform canonical correlation analyses with unequal numbers of variables in the two variable sets (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1983), the version of SPSS utilized (SPSS, 1998) contained the constraint that the number of variables be equal across the two variable sets.

Therefore, the analyses involved first examining child-perceived variables and mother-reported variables, and then assessing the relationships between child-perceived variables and father-reported variables. Because there were only three dimensions of parent-reported variables (parents’ self-esteem, perceived family satisfaction, and parenting self-esteem), the child-perceived variables selected for inclusion in the canonical analyses were children’s self-esteem, perceived family satisfaction, and perceived parental acceptance. Child-perceived parental acceptance was chosen instead of perceived parental psychological control or parental lax discipline because reviews of the parent-child literature show perceived parental acceptance to be more strongly related to both parent variables and the self-esteem literature.

The results demonstrated a significant association between children who report high levels of family satisfaction and self-esteem and their mothers’ reports of high levels of family satisfaction. The first of three canonical variates accounted for 29% of the shared variance in the child and maternal variable sets. Chi-square analysis of all other canonical variates was not statistically significant. While no significant results were obtained by examining the canonical analyses between child and father variable sets,
there was a trend toward significance for the first canonical correlation. In addition, both child-perceived family satisfaction and father-perceived family satisfaction had the highest canonical loadings on this canonical variate.

It is interesting that the affective quality of family satisfaction was the dimension that most closely associated parents and children in these analyses. This seems consistent with a study where “cohesive family” types were identified and observed to report higher levels of family satisfaction than other family types (“divided”, “isolated”) (Cooper et al., 1983). In another study, fathers who reported the highest levels of family satisfaction saw their families as encouraging the growth of its members (Margalit et al., 1989).

The finding that children’s reports of high levels of self-esteem and mothers’ reports of family satisfaction are significantly related has some support in the literature. Coopersmith (1967) found that 90% of the boys judged by their mothers to be relatively happy scored in the high self-esteem group.

Killeen (1993) observed that children’s levels of self-esteem are influenced by the affective component of parents’ communications with them. This seems related to the finding of this study that children’s reports of high levels of self-esteem are significantly associated with mothers’ reports of high levels of family satisfaction.

A literature search did not reveal studies that were intended to assess the relatedness of children’s perceptions of parental acceptance with parents’ reports of self-esteem, family satisfaction, and parenting self-esteem. Also, no prior studies were found that were designed to determine the relatedness of either parents’ reports of parenting self-esteem or their levels of self-esteem with child-perceived self-esteem, family satisfaction or parental acceptance.

It was expected that parents’ reports of parenting self-esteem would show stronger
relatedness to children’s self-esteem scores and family satisfaction than parents’ reports of their self-esteem. Parents’ perceptions of their performance as parents have been shown to be positively related to their children’s levels of self-esteem (Demo et al., 1987). Parent effectiveness training (Gordon, 1970) has demonstrated that parental skills development and improvements in children’s self-esteem are related (Cedar & Levant, 1990). But, the outcome data related to parents’ and children’s self-esteem scores, on the other hand, have yielded inconsistent results. The data from the canonical correlation analyses of this study did not support the expectation that parenting self-esteem variables or parents’ levels of self-esteem would be significantly related to children’s levels of self-esteem and family satisfaction.

It is important to recognize that family relationships are bidirectional and reciprocally influenced (DeV. Peters & McMahon, 1988; Finken & Amato, 1993; Killeen, 1993). Consistent with this, the results suggest that children who are reporting high levels of family satisfaction and self-esteem are influential at least in their mothers’ positive evaluations of their family satisfaction. Therefore, it seems that family satisfaction is a strong determinant of parent-child relationships. In addition, given the bidirectional and mutually-influenced nature of parent-child relationships, it is important to appreciate the influence that children have on parents.

Summary

The present study was designed to first assess the relationships between several family variables — child-perceived family satisfaction, three child-perceived parental behaviors, parent-reported parenting self-esteem (parental sense of competence), parent-reported family satisfaction, and the self-esteem of parents -- and overall self-esteem
scores across groups of gifted and nongifted sixth-graders. Second, the present study was intended to examine the predictive contributions of the same family variables to the self-esteem scores of gifted and nongifted sixth-grade sample groups. Analyses were also conducted to explore the relationships that exist between children's perceptions of their families, parents, and themselves and their parents' perceptions of their families, parenting and themselves.

A major outcome of this study was addressed prior to testing the research hypotheses. The finding that gifted and nongifted sixth-graders' levels of self-esteem were not significantly different formed the underpinnings of the analyses that followed. Testing the hypotheses provided information about the strength of association between family factors and self-esteem levels in sixth-grade children across gifted and nongifted families beyond the inconsistent, limited information provided by the identification of these children as gifted or not. The findings of this study encourage researchers to continue exploring the impact of family variables on children's self-esteem for gifted and nongifted children.

It is true that children's status as gifted or nongifted was a significant predictor of children's self-esteem scores for this sample. However, preliminarily, there were no significant differences in children's mean self-esteem scores across gifted and nongifted sample groups. Moreover, children's group status as gifted or nongifted was a significant predictor of their levels of self-esteem only after controlling for the effects of children's response-bias tendencies statistically. In addition, there were significantly more females than males in the gifted group, and there was a trend toward significance for girls' self-esteem scores to be higher than boys' scores in this study. Gifted girls' mean self-esteem scores were more than five points higher than the mean self-esteem scores of gifted boys,
and both nongifted boys and girls. Therefore, the importance of group status as a significant predictor of children’s self-esteem scores may be that group status became a significant predictor mostly as a consequence of respondents’ response-bias tendencies and gender.

Prior to testing the research hypotheses, it was pointed out that these study participants were a highly selective sample of families as evidenced by the return rate (5.2%). All of the reported age levels of the child respondents were either 11 or 12, keeping the focus on the perceptions of children in middle-to-late childhood. Virtually all respondents were Caucasians. This limits the generalizability of the results cross-culturally and racially. Finally, the majority of parents indicated that their annual incomes were at or above $90,000. This factor limits the ability to generalize from these results to lower-income families.

In preliminary analyses, the research variable means did not differ significantly across gifted and nongifted samples. This allows the focus of the results to remain with the impact that the family research variables have on children’s levels of self-esteem.

The findings of this study provided partial support for all three research hypotheses. The results of all the statistical procedures highlight the prominence of child- and parent-reported family satisfaction as a significant correlate and predictor of children’s self-esteem. The reports of family satisfaction by parents and children were the most strongly associated aspect of the parent-child relationship in this investigation. Indications are that child reports of family satisfaction, more than parents’ reports, are more closely connected with their self-esteem levels.

The first two hypotheses involved exploring the relatedness of gifted and nongifted children’s perceptions of family and parental variables with their levels of self-esteem.
Among gifted children, perceptions of family satisfaction, maternal acceptance, and paternal acceptance were positively and significantly related to their self-esteem levels. Their perceptions of their fathers’ use of psychological control techniques were significantly and inversely associated with their self-esteem scores. No parent-reported variables were significantly correlated with children’s self-esteem levels. Therefore, children’s perceptions of their families were more closely associated with their self-esteem levels than were parents’ perceptions of their parenting self-esteem, family satisfaction and self-esteem levels.

When the effects of gifted children’s response-bias tendencies were partialled out, the relationship between gifted children’s perceptions of family satisfaction and their levels of self-esteem was significantly reduced in magnitude. This was also true of the relationship between gifted children’s perceptions of maternal and paternal acceptance and their self-esteem levels. Their perceptions of their fathers’ use of psychological control techniques continued to be inversely related to their levels of self-esteem at significant levels. Therefore, gifted children’s response-bias tendencies played a significant role in the observed relationships between these variables. Only gifted children’s response-bias measures, not those of nongifted child-respondents, were significantly related to their self-esteem scores. Perhaps, gifted participants were more likely than their nongifted counterparts to analyze the test protocols and then skew their responses toward what they perceived to be more socially desirable (Crandall et al., 1965). In addition, for reasons unknown, gifted respondents were more likely than nongifted respondents to either agree or disagree with test items and to disregard the content of the item (Couch & Keniston, 1960).

Among nongifted children, perceptions of family satisfaction were positively and
significantly related to their self-esteem levels. In addition, their perceptions of their fathers’ use of psychological control techniques were significantly and inversely associated with their self-esteem scores. No parent-reported variables were significantly correlated with children’s self-esteem levels in the nongifted sample. Again, nongifted child-respondents’ perceptions of their families were more closely associated with their self-esteem levels than were their parents’ perceptions of their parenting self-esteem, family satisfaction and self-esteem levels.

The least expected outcome of the study was the finding that nongifted children’s perceptions of maternal and paternal acceptance were not significantly related to their levels of self-esteem. Numerous prior studies have observed significant relatedness among these variables. It seems likely that this lack of significant association can best be accounted for by a lack of statistical power given the modest sample size used in the correlational analyses (Cohen & Cohen, 1983). In other words, repeating these analyses with a larger sample size increases the level of statistical power and hence the likelihood that the correlation coefficients would be found significant.

None of the nongifted children’s response-bias measures was significantly correlated with their levels of self-esteem. It is, therefore, not surprising that with the effects of children’s response-bias tendencies partialed-out, nongifted children’s perceptions of family satisfaction remained highly related to their levels of self-esteem. However, nongifted children’s perceptions of paternal use of psychological control techniques no longer reached significant levels of association with their self-esteem scores as a partial correlation. Still, the change in magnitude of the correlation coefficient was minimal.

Results from testing the third hypothesis show that the predictor variables account
for a significant amount of the variance in children's self-esteem scores (45%) beyond the variance accounted for by children's response-bias measures (24%). Collectively, the child-perceived and parent-reported predictor variables explained a significantly greater amount of the variance in children's self-esteem scores (41%) than did children's group status as gifted or nongifted (4%). In general, the importance of considering multivariate family influences, both child-perceived and parent-reported, among the factors that account for variance in gifted and nongifted children's levels of self-esteem is supported by this finding.

However, the regression analysis results provide only partial support for the third hypothesis because none of the individual predictor variables explained greater variance in children's levels of self-esteem than did their group status. Individually, maternal self-esteem scores, children's group status as gifted or nongifted, and child-perceived family satisfaction scores were each significantly predictive of children's self-esteem scores. Each predictor accounted for approximately 4% of the variance in the criterion variable.

It was not expected that a children's status as gifted or nongifted would be a significant predictor of their self-esteem levels. However, the importance of group status as a significant predictor of children's self-esteem scores may be that group status became a significant predictor mostly as a consequence of respondents' response-bias tendencies and gender.

Two canonical correlation analyses were conducted to assess the degree of relatedness between child and parent variables, once for child and maternal variables and once for child and paternal variables.

The findings from the canonical correlation analyses demonstrated a significant association between children who report high levels of family satisfaction and self-
esteem and their mothers' reports of high levels of family satisfaction. Chi-square analyses of all other canonical variates were not significant. There was a trend toward significance in the relationship between both child-perceived and paternal-reported family satisfaction.

It is important to recognize that family relationships are bidirectional and reciprocally influenced (DeV. Peters & McMahon, 1988; Finken & Amato, 1993; Killeen, 1993). Consequently, the results also suggest that children who are reporting high levels of family satisfaction and self-esteem are influential at least in their mothers' positive evaluations of their family satisfaction.

Therefore, it seems that family satisfaction is a strong determinant of parent-child relationships. In addition, given the bidirectional and mutually-influenced nature of parent-child relationships, it is important to appreciate the influence that children have on parents.

Implications of Response-Bias Tendencies

The child and parent response-bias measures assessed respondents' tendencies to present themselves in a socially acceptable manner (Crandall et al., 1965; Crowne & Marlowe, 1960), to agree (or disagree) with test items regardless of their content (Couch & Keniston, 1960), and to self-monitor their expressive behaviors and self-presentations (Snyder, 1974). The purpose of their inclusion in this research design was to statistically control for these response-bias tendencies statistically as "error variance" (Kirk, 1982) in order to derive a more accurate assessment of the correlational and predictive impact that the research variables had on the dependent variable—children's self-esteem scores.

A Pearson product-moment correlational analysis and a hierarchical multiple
regression analysis have shown that two of the three child response-bias measures were significantly related to and predictive of children’s levels of self-esteem. Specifically, gifted children’s response-bias tendencies to present themselves in a socially-acceptable manner (Crandall et al., 1965) and to agree (or disagree) with test items regardless of their content (Couch & Keniston, 1960) were significantly related to their levels of self-esteem. There was no significant relationship demonstrated between gifted children’s tendencies to self-monitor their expressive behaviors and self-presentations and their levels of self-esteem. Also, there were no significant associations between the response-bias tendencies of nongifted children and their self-esteem levels. However, it is important to keep in mind that the psychometric properties of the response-bias measures utilized in the present study were not available and the results of statistical procedures involving these measures should be interpreted with some caution.

The results of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis indicated that, collectively, the three response-bias measures accounted for a significant amount of the variance (24%) in gifted and nongifted children’s self-esteem scores. However, as mentioned, only children’s social desirability and agreement-response tendencies were significantly predictive of their self-esteem levels. Children’s tendencies to self-monitor their expressive behaviors and self-presentations were not significantly predictive of their self-esteem scores. Not knowing the psychometric properties of the response-bias measures used in the present study limits the ability to generalize about the impact that response-bias tendencies had on the results of the hierarchical regression analysis.

Based on the results from this sample of respondents, it is important to control for children’s social desirability and agreement response tendencies as "error variance" (Kirk, 1982) when investigating children’s self-esteem levels. Both social desirability
and agreement-response variables were entered at the first step of the regression equation, and each individually accounted for more variance in children’s self-esteem scores, 13% and 7%, respectively, than the other research variables. It appears to be especially important to statistically control for the influence of these two variables when exploring the factors that influence gifted children’s self-esteem scores.

The developers of the Children’s Social Desirability Questionnaire (Crandall et al., 1965) suggested that high levels of social desirability were indicative of children that were shy, withdrawn, lacking in self-confidence, and had a need for social approval and a low sense of personal worth. Crowne and Marlowe (1960) saw social desirability as an individual’s need for social approval. However, the present results showed a positive association between high levels of social desirability and self-esteem, particularly among gifted participants. Perhaps high levels of social desirability among gifted participants also reflects attempts to manipulate their self-esteem scores to present themselves in a favorable light. Therefore, some gifted participants’ true self-esteem levels could be lower than actually tested. But, it would also be suggestive of a need to be viewed as socially desirable by a “generalized other” (Mead, 1934), such as peers and teachers, and not just family members.

Alternatively, other researchers saw high levels of social desirability in a more favorable light. Holden and Fekken (1989) believed social desirability tests sensitivity in relations with others (considerateness, persistence, patience, integrity, careful behavior, and social courtesy). Kalliopuska (1992) observed that social desirability and self-reported willingness to help others were positively associated. Thus, high levels of social desirability might be indicative of social skills that are associated with high levels of self-esteem in children.
The agreement response-bias, or the tendency to agree with test items regardless of the content of the items, was associated with high levels of self-esteem in children, particularly gifted participants. In addition to using this response-bias tendency to control for it as “error variance” (Kirk, 1982), the agreement response was theorized to be a personality variable called “stimulus acceptance” or the inclination to admit stimuli into conscious awareness without censorship (Couch & Keniston, 1960). It is not clear why this personality characteristic would be associated with high levels of self-esteem among children in the gifted sample.

The implication here is that the self-esteem levels of gifted children more than their nongifted counterparts are more likely to be influenced by their tendencies to present themselves in a socially-desirable light and to agree with test items regardless of their content. However, having response-bias measures with acceptable levels of reliability and validity would increase the confidence in these findings.

**Practical Implications of the Study**

A practical implication of the study is that researchers, teachers, counselors, and family members can be encouraged to take into account multivariate influences on children’s levels of self-esteem. Second, they can be cautioned to discontinue what Cornell (1983) called an "overidealized stereotyping" of gifted children. The lack of significant differences in levels of self-esteem observed across the samples of gifted and nongifted children help validate other researchers' findings that gifted children, like peers not identified as gifted, can suffer from feelings of unworthiness (Bracken, 1980; Cornell, 1983; Enright & Ruzicka, 1989; Johnson, 1981; McDowell, 1984; Powell & Haden, 1984; Ross, 1964) or be dysfunctionally perfectionistic in their thinking (Parker, 1997).
A third implication of the significant findings in this study is for researchers, teachers, counselors, and parents to consider both children’s perceptions and parents’ reports of the family and parental variables examined here as potential determinants of the self-esteem levels of gifted and nongifted sixth-graders. The findings of this study point to the psychological importance of focusing on affective family-systems variables like child- and parent-reports of family satisfaction in understanding children’s levels of self-esteem. Researchers have previously emphasized the need for more studies which investigate the quality of family interactions and their impact on children’s emotional health (Hess & Camara, 1979; Hetherington et al., 1978; Kanoy et al., 1984).

The importance of gifted children’s views of their levels of family satisfaction, of the degree to which they see their mothers and fathers as accepting of them, and of their fathers as infrequently using psychological control techniques that inhibit autonomy is affirmed by these findings. For children not identified as gifted, their views pertaining to their levels of family satisfaction and of their fathers’ infrequent use of psychological control techniques proved to be worthy of continued consideration in relationship to their levels of self-esteem. The results partially validate Coopersmith’s (1967) findings that three conditions were important in the development of high levels of self-esteem: parental acceptance of the child, parental enforcement of clearly-defined limits, and parental respect and freedom for the child to engage in self-initiated behaviors within those limits.

The condition that parental enforcement of clearly-defined limits leads to high levels of self-esteem was not supported by these findings. However, it seems relevant to restate three points associated with this finding. First, the factor of the CRPBI measure (Schaefer, 1965a) used to measure child-perceived lax versus firm discipline was found
to be the weakest of the three CRPBI factors (Margolies & Weintraub, 1977). Second, the relationship between this lax versus firm discipline factor and self-esteem may be curvilinear (Graybill, 1978). Specifically, it may be that children who perceive their parents as overly lax or overly firm in their discipline are more likely to evidence low levels of self-esteem. Third, Coopersmith's (1967) study found that mother's reports, not children's perceptions, of parental enforcement of clearly-defined limits leads to high levels of self-esteem.

There is reason for researchers or professionals interacting with the families of sixth-graders to consider parents' reports of family satisfaction and mothers' reports of self-esteem to be important areas to explore in understanding and improving the emotional health of these children and their families.

The importance of how family members interpret and evaluate each other's behaviors, and how the subsequent emotional and behavioral responses of parents and children are affected by these interpretations and evaluations (Epstein et al., 1988) is highlighted by the significant results reported in this study. Similarly, the findings remind professionals and family members alike of the "mutually interrelated family influence processes" that reciprocally feed back and create changes in child and parent cognitions, affect, and behaviors (Wells, 1994, p. 254). This assertion is most clearly seen in the results of the canonical analyses.

Overall, the literature related to gifted children is more heavily focused on their academic and cognitive abilities. There are significantly fewer studies that address the social-emotional needs of gifted children. The findings of this study suggest that continued focus on the nonacademic self-esteem levels of gifted children is warranted.

Finally, the results of this study strongly suggest that researchers, professionals,
and family member should consider the impact that social desirability and agreement-response tendencies have on the self-reports of children's self-esteem levels, especially for gifted children.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Further investigation of these results is warranted, perhaps to explore the behavior patterns associated with the self-reported perceptions of sixth-graders and their parents investigated in this study. Research results that compare the concordant or discordant nature of both self-report and behavioral indices of the variables under investigation would strengthen the validity of the interpretations of the results.

Much of the literature regarding children's levels of self-esteem has not utilized multivariate designs. Many research studies of children's self-esteem have been correlational in nature. Multivariate outcomes both provide a better context in which to view individual variables under research consideration and lend themselves to family assessments and formulations of family interventions. A review of the literature associated with children's self-esteem shows that outcome studies investigating both child and parent responses are few, leaving professionals and family members without a broader-based perspective on their functioning and emotional health. For example, studies that simultaneously consider the impact of parents' behaviors or evaluations on children's self-esteem levels and the influence of children's behaviors or evaluations on parents' self-esteem levels or parenting self-esteem levels (parental sense of competence) would provide that broad perspective that the self-esteem literature presently lacks.

Investigation into how similar or dissimilar children perceive each parent and how similar or dissimilar parents view themselves may be a promising avenue of exploration
into children's levels of self-esteem. A casual review of the data set revealed that children who perceived either parent significantly less positively than the other frequently had below-average self-esteem scores. Likewise, when one parent reported levels of self-esteem, family satisfaction or parenting self-esteem noticeably below the other parent, their children's self-esteem scores were oftentimes below average.

It would still be important to research similar hypotheses that were investigated in this study. Future researchers could test these same or similar hypotheses with more heterogeneous samples ethnically, racially, socio-economically, and with respect to urban or rural communities. Moreover, researchers would do well to devise strategies that could ensure a larger sample size to increase the power of their analyses and thereby limit sampling biases. In light of the return rate, future researchers may secure a larger, more representative sample by paying for prospective respondents' participation. A developmental or longitudinal study of the variables under consideration in this study would help in generalizing from the results presently available.

Future researchers might also utilize a behaviorally-oriented or criterion-based parental skills assessment device, not found in a literature search, and test the relatedness or predictability of parents' responses with children's self-esteem scores.

Limitations of the Study

The limitations of this study are predominantly related to the self-report format of the independent and dependent measures employed in this study and sampling bias. This issue gains import as a limitation of this study given the highly significant relatedness and predictability of the child participants' response-bias tendencies and the research variables. However, steps were undertaken in this study to control for this "error
variance" (Kirk, 1982) by controlling for the effects of response-bias tendencies statistically. Another threat to the validity of these results was minimized by utilizing assessment devices, like the Child's Report of Parent Behavior Inventory (Schaefer, 1965a), whose designers have reported satisfactory reliability and validity information.

The generalizability of this study's findings would be expanded by use of both self-report and behavioral assessment devices. Then, the validity of the results would be enhanced or called into question by the degree of concordance across self-report and behavioral measures.

Sampling biases limit the generalization of these results. Most notably, respondents were largely self-selected by virtue of the voluntary nature of the study. Consequently, the sample of respondents reported on in this study represent 5% of all the families who were solicited. This has limited the generalizability of the results cross-culturally, racially, and socio-economically. A larger sample would likely produce a closer match for gender, parents' marital status, and the custodial living arrangements of respondents.

Gender differences in children's mean self-esteem scores were not anticipated. Previous studies (Coopersmith, 1981; Killeen, 1993; Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974; Major et al., 1999; Nielsen & Metha, 1994) have shown that gender differences in self-esteem scores are generally minimal. This similarity in self-esteem scores across genders was observed in the majority of research articles reviewed for this study. Because it was not expected a priori, there was no way to statistically control for the effects of gender differences on children's self-esteem scores. Therefore, it was not possible to more accurately assess the impact of this study's research variables on children's levels of self-esteem by controlling for the effects of gender differences.
The researcher did not control the assignment of respondents to gifted and nongifted sample groups in this study. Instead assignment of respondents to groups was made by parents, school district criteria, and teachers. This potential threat to internal validity is most evident when considering that children meeting criteria for inclusion in the gifted group might have been assigned to the nongifted sample because of self-selection or their parents’ academic decision-making for them. Moreover, children considered gifted by one school district might not have been considered gifted by another district given the lack of standardized criteria for inclusion in gifted programs across school districts in New Jersey. It must be mentioned that one outcome of these findings is that the generalizability of the self-esteem outcome data is broadened by including a gifted sample to investigate these variables. Also, by incorporating a comparison sample of children not identified as gifted, not merely normative statistics, the validity of comparison testing is improved.

Finally, sampling selection procedures in this study intentionally controlled for maturational factors by allowing only sixth-grade respondents to participate. Therefore, the variability in child-participants’ responses attributable to developmental or age-related factors was minimized. However, it also limits the generalizability of the results to older and younger children.
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Appendix A

Parental Solicitation Letters (School and Home Testing)
<DATE>

Dear Parent/Guardian,

I am a doctoral student in Marriage and Family Counseling at Seton Hall University conducting a study of sixth-grade students and their parents to partially fulfill my doctoral program requirements. My purpose is to better understand how children's and parents' views of their families and themselves are related. I am also interested in comparing the responses of students in gifted programs and their families. I hope the results will benefit educators, counselors and parents in working with students and their families. I have discussed this study with school officials and it has been reviewed and approved by Seton Hall University's Institutional Review Board (IRB) for Human Subjects Research.

I request your participation and permission to include your sixth-grade child in this study. I know that there are many one-parent families, but I ask the participation of both parents when this is reasonably possible. If you participate, your answers will be kept anonymous. Number codes, not names, will be on answer sheets to match parents' and child's questionnaires. You and your child will be free to withdraw at any time, and school services available to you and your child will continue unchanged. If you decide to take part in this study, please discuss this study with your child.

You and your child will be selected to participate if you both sign and return the enclosed Parental Consent and Child Assent Forms using the stamped, self-addressed envelope. Your child will be asked to complete four group-administered questionnaires in a school setting. It will take your child approximately 30 minutes to answer these. Questionnaires are entitled "Family Inventory," "Parent Behavior Inventory" (mother and father forms), "Personal Beliefs Inventory-(Children)," and the school form of the "Coopersmith Inventory," which measures children's views of themselves. You will be mailed four questionnaires for each parent to complete and a brief family information inventory after your child participates. The parent questionnaires are entitled "Family Inventory," "Being a Parent" (mother and father forms), "Personal Beliefs Inventory-(Parents)," and the adult form of the Coopersmith Inventory. Once completed, you are asked to enclose each parent's questionnaires and the family information inventory in a stamped, return envelope.

Your and your child's responses will be reported as group results. Your and your child's participation is unlikely to arouse discomfort. If it appears that your child is becoming uncomfortable, they will be encouraged to discontinue their participation and you will be notified of this. Otherwise, your child can talk to you or you may contact a trusted friend or counseling professional. You and your child may also contact me at (732) 271-8888 with any concerns.

Thank you for your cooperation. Please return the Parental Consent and Child Assent Forms if signed in the return envelope.

Sincerely,

Kevin Brnight, M.A.
<DATE>

Dear Parent/Guardian,

I am a doctoral student in Marriage and Family Counseling at Seton Hall University conducting a study of sixth-grade students and their parents to partially fulfill my doctoral program requirements. My purpose is to better understand how children's and parents' views of their families and themselves are related. I am also interested in comparing the responses of students in gifted programs and their families. I hope the results will benefit educators, counselors and parents in working with students and their families. I have discussed this study with school officials and it has been reviewed and approved by the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board (IRB) for Human Subjects Research.

I request your participation and permission to include your sixth-grade child in this study. I know that there are many one-parent families, but I ask the participation of both parents when this is reasonably possible. If you participate, your answers will be kept anonymous. Number codes, not names, will be on answer sheets to match parents' and child's questionnaires. You and your child will be free to withdraw at any time, and school services available to you and your child will continue unchanged. If you decide to take part in this study, please discuss this study with your child. However, it is important that your child be allowed to complete the questionnaires privately without parental input or review.

You and your child will be selected to participate if you both sign and return the enclosed Parental Consent and Child Assent Forms using the stamped, self-addressed envelope. Your child will be asked to complete four self-administered questionnaires at home. It will take your child approximately 30 minutes to answer these. Questionnaires are entitled "Family Inventory," "Parent Behavior Inventory" (mother and father forms), "Personal Beliefs Inventory-(Children)," and the school form of the "Coopersmith Inventory," which measures children's views of themselves. You will be mailed four questionnaires for each parent to complete and a brief family information inventory. The parent questionnaires are entitled "Family Inventory," "Being a Parent" (mother and father forms), "Personal Beliefs Inventory-(Parents)," and the adult form of the Coopersmith Inventory. Once completed, you are asked to enclose both parents' and child's questionnaires and the family information inventory in a stamped, return envelope.

Your and your child's responses will be reported as group results. Your and your child's participation is unlikely to arouse discomfort. If it appears that your child is becoming uncomfortable, encourage them to discontinue their participation. Your child can talk to you or you may contact a trusted friend or counseling professional. You and your child may also contact me at (732) 271-8888 with any concerns.

Thank you for your cooperation. Please return the Parental Consent and Child Assent Forms if signed in the return envelope.

Sincerely,

Kevin Enright, M.A.
Appendix B

Parental Consent Forms (School and Home Testing)
Parental Consent Form

I voluntarily agree to allow my child to participate in a study by Kevin Enright, a doctoral student at Seton Hall University. I may contact Mr. Enright at 54 Morning Glory Road, Warren, N.J. 07059 or at (732) 271-8888 to ask any questions. The goal of this study is to understand the relationships between children's and parents' views of their families and themselves. This study will also compare the responses of students in gifted programs and their families. I understand that my child will be asked to complete four questionnaires in a school setting which will take about 30 minutes. The four questionnaires are entitled "Family Inventory," "Parent Behavior Inventory" (mother and father forms), "Personal Beliefs Inventory-(Children)," and the school form of the "Coopersmith Inventory," which measures children's self views. Additionally, I understand that I and, if available, my child's other parent, will be asked to complete a brief family information inventory and four questionnaires which will take approximately 25 minutes to complete. The four parent questionnaires are entitled "Family Inventory," "Being a Parent" (mother and/or father forms), "Personal Beliefs Inventory-(Parents)," and the adult form of the "Coopersmith Inventory."

I understand that at no time will my child's or any parent's name appear on record forms or in any report. Only a number code will appear on the record forms. The results of this study will be held in strict confidence, and only group data will be reported so that others may possibly learn from the results in the future.

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board (IRB) for Human Subjects Research. The IRB believes that the research procedures adequately safeguard the subject's privacy, welfare, civil liberties, and rights. The Chairperson of the IRB may be reached through the Office of Grants and Research Services. The telephone number of the office is (973) 761-9655.

I have read the material above, and any questions I asked have been answered to my satisfaction. I understand that participation in this study is unlikely to arouse discomfort, but if it does my child can talk to me and/or I will contact a trusted friend or professional. I know that if my child experiences undue anxiety during their participation, they will be encouraged to discontinue their participation and I will be notified. I agree to participate and allow my child to participate in this activity. I realize that my child and I may withdraw at any time and understand that school services will continue unchanged.

______________________________
Parent/Guardian Signature

______________________________
Date

(print name)

______________________________
(return address)
Parental Consent Form

I voluntarily agree to allow my child to participate in a study by Kevin Enright, a doctoral student at Seton Hall University. I may contact Mr. Enright at 54 Morning Glory Road, Warren, N.J. 07059 or at (732) 271-8888 to ask any questions. The goal of this study is to understand the relationships between children's and parents' views of their families and themselves. This study will also compare the responses of students in gifted programs and their families. I understand that my child will be asked to complete four questionnaires at home which will take about 30 minutes. The four questionnaires are entitled "Family Inventory," "Parent Behavior Inventory" (mother and father forms), "Personal Beliefs Inventory-(Children)," and the school form of the "Coopersmith Inventory," which measures children's self views. Additionally, I understand that I and, if available, my child's other parent, will be asked to complete a nine-item family information inventory and four questionnaires which will take approximately 25 minutes to complete. The four parent questionnaires are entitled "Family Inventory," "Being a Parent" (mother and/or father forms), "Personal Beliefs Inventory-(Parents)," and the adult form of the "Coopersmith Inventory."

I understand that at no time will my child's or any parent's name appear on record forms or in any report. Only a number code will appear on the record forms. The results of this study will be held in strict confidence, and only group data will be reported so that others may possibly learn from the results in the future.

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board (IRB) for Human Subjects Research. The IRB believes that the research procedures adequately safeguard the subject's privacy, welfare, civil liberties, and rights. The Chairperson of the IRB may be reached through the Office of Grants and Research Services. The telephone number of the office is (973) 761-9655.

I have read the material above, and any questions I asked have been answered to my satisfaction. I understand that participation in this study is unlikely to arouse discomfort, but if it does my child and I may contact a trusted friend or counseling professional, or my child may talk to his/her parents. I agree to participate and allow my child to answer confidentially in this activity. I realize that my child and I may withdraw at any time and understand that school services will continue unchanged.

Parent/Guardian Signature ___________________________ Date ________

(print name)

(return address)
Appendix C

Child Assent Forms (School and Home Testing)
Child Assent Form

I volunteer to take part in a study by Kevin Enright, a doctoral student at Seton Hall University. I may contact Mr. Enright at 54 Morning Glory Road, Warren, N.J. 07059 or at (732) 271-8888 to ask any questions. This study is looking at how parents and children see their families and themselves. It also compares the responses of children in gifted programs and their families. All children are welcome to take part in this study.

I am being asked to complete four questionnaires. This will take about 30 minutes. The four questionnaires are called "Family Inventory," "Parent Behavior Inventory" (mother and father forms), "Personal Beliefs Inventory-(Children)," and the school form of the "Coopersmith Inventory," a test asking my views about myself.

The four questionnaires my parent or parents will complete are called "Family Inventory," "Being a Parent" (mother and/or father forms), "Personal Beliefs Inventory-(Parent)," and the adult form of the "Coopersmith Inventory," a test asking parents' views about themselves.

I know that my name will not appear on the questionnaires or in any report of the results. Only a number code will appear on the test forms. The results of each parent's and child's questionnaire answers will be kept private. Only group data will be reported so that others may possibly learn from the results in the future. I know that no one from my family will see my answers to the questionnaires. All answers will be kept private.

This study has been reviewed and approved by the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board (IRB) for Human Subjects Research. The IRB believes that the procedures of the study protect family members' privacy, welfare, civil liberties, and rights. The Chairperson of the IRB may be reached through the Office of Grants and Research Services. The telephone number of the office is (973) 761-9655.

I have read this page. Any questions I have asked have been answered to my satisfaction. I agree to take part in this study. I know that if I feel uncomfortable when completing the questionnaires I can tell Mr. Enright or my parents. I know that I may drop out of this study at any time and school services will continue without change.

__________________________  _______________________
Child's Signature               Date
Child Assent Form

I volunteer to take part in a study by Kevin Enright, a doctoral student at Seton Hall University. I may contact Mr. Enright at 54 Morning Glory Road, Warren, N.J. 07059 or at (732) 271-8888 to ask any questions. This study is looking at how parents and children see their families and themselves. It also compares the responses of children in gifted programs and their families. All children are welcome to take part in this study.

I am being asked to complete four questionnaires. This will take about 30 minutes. The four questionnaires are called "Family Inventory," "Parent Behavior Inventory" (mother and father forms), "Personal Beliefs Inventory-(Children)," and the school form of the "Coopersmith Inventory," a test asking my views about myself.

The four questionnaires my parent or parents will complete are called "Family Inventory," "Being a Parent" (mother and/or father forms), "Personal Beliefs Inventory-(Parent)," and the adult form of the "Coopersmith Inventory," a test asking parents' views about themselves.

I know that my name will not appear on the questionnaires or in any report of the results. Only a number code will appear on the test forms. The results of each parent's and child's questionnaire answers will be kept private. Only group data will be reported so that others may possibly learn from the results in the future. I know that my parent or parents will allow me to keep my questionnaire answers private.

This study has been reviewed and approved by the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board (IRB) for Human Subjects Research. The IRB believes that the procedures of the study protect family members' privacy, welfare, civil liberties, and rights. The Chairperson of the IRB may be reached through the Office of Grants and Research Services. The telephone number of the office is (973) 761-9655.

I have read this page. Any questions I have asked have been answered to my satisfaction. I agree to take part in this study. I know that if I feel uncomfortable when completing the questionnaires I can tell my parents. I know that I may drop out of this study at any time and school services will continue without change.

_________________________  _____________
Child's Signature           Date
Appendix D

Parental Instruction Letters (School and Home Testing)
Dear Parents/Guardians,

Thank you for agreeing to take part in this study of the family. Now that your child has participated in my study of sixth-grade students and their parents, your participation is needed. I know that there are many one-parent families, yet I ask that both parents participate when this is reasonably possible. You are free to withdraw at any time, and school services available to you and your child will continue unchanged. I ask that you not include your name on answer sheets as they are already coded to match your child's and to ensure confidentiality.

Enclosed you will find two sets of four questionnaires for each parent to complete and a family information inventory. The four questionnaires are entitled "Family Inventory," "Being a Parent" (mother and father forms), "Personal Beliefs Inventory-(Parents)," and the adult form of the Coopersmith Inventory. Mothers, please use the study packet coded "(mother)." Fathers, will use the study packet coded "(father)." The "Family Inventory" is to be answered from the parent's point of view. Once completed, please return the questionnaires and family information inventory in the envelope provided.

Your responses will be included in group-reported results that are hopefully of benefit to educators, counselors and parents. Participation in this study is unlikely to arouse discomfort. But, if it does, you may contact me at (732) 271-8888 with any concerns or you may contact a trusted friend or professional.

Thanks again for your participation. Please return the family inventory and questionnaires in the enclosed envelope.

Sincerely,

Kevin Enright, M.A.
Dear Parents/Guardians,

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study of the family. Enclosed you will find three packets of test materials for the study to which you and your child have agreed to participate. As a reminder, this study is designed to assess the relationships between children's and parents' views of their families and themselves. I know that there are many one-parent families, yet I ask that both parents participate when this is reasonably possible. You are free to withdraw at any time, and school services available to you and your child will continue unchanged. I ask that you not include your name on answer sheets as they are already coded to match your child's and to ensure confidentiality.

The two parents' packets have the "Adult Form" of the "Coopersmith Inventory" stapled on top of the packet and your sixth-grader's test packet has the "School Form" of the "Coopersmith Inventory" stapled on top. All three test packets contain four questionnaires, and both parents' packets contain a family information inventory. The four children's questionnaires are entitled "Family Inventory," "Parent Behavior Inventory" (mother and father forms), "Personal Beliefs Inventory -- (Children)," and the school form of the "Coopersmith Inventory." Parents' questionnaires are entitled "Family Inventory," "Being a Parent" (mother and father forms), "Personal Beliefs Inventory -- (Parents)," and the family information inventory. Once completed, please return the questionnaires and family information inventory in the envelope provided.

Your responses will be included in group-reported results that are hopefully of benefit to educators, counselors and parents. Participation in this study is unlikely to arouse discomfort. But, if it does, your child can talk to you or you may contact a trusted friend or counseling professional. You and your child may also contact me at (732) 271-8888 with any concerns.

Thanks again for your participation. Please return all three packets of test materials once completed in the envelope provided.

Sincerely,

Kevin Enright, M.A.
Appendix E

Family Information Inventory
Information that you provide below about your family will be kept confidential. Your name will not be tied to this information.

**Family Information**

Please answer these questions keeping only the child participating in this study in mind.

Date: __________

1. What is your relationship to the child?
   
   ___ mother  ___ father

2. How old is your child?
   
   ___ years  ___ months

3. This child is my ______ of ______ children.
   
   (first, second, etc.) (1,2, etc.)

4. Is your child
   
   ___ female  ___ male

5. What is your racial/ethnic background?
   
   __________________________________________

6. What is your religious background?
   
   __________________________________________

7. Which category best describes your marital status?
   
   ___ married  ___ separated  ___ divorced  ___ widowed

8. Which category best describes your child's custodial living arrangement?
   
   ___ lives with parents  ___ joint custody

   ___ mother custodial parent  ___ father custodial parent

   ___ other (please specify) __________________________________________
9. Which category best describes your family's annual income?

_____ $15,000 to $29,999  _____ $30,000 to $44,999
_____ $45,000 to $59,999  _____ $60,000 to $74,999
_____ $75,000 to $89,999  _____ $90,000 and above

While some of the information collected here is of a very personal nature, your privacy will be protected. Research findings will not reveal individual answers tied to either you or your child. If you have any questions, please call Kevin Enright (nights after 6:00 p.m.-10:00 p.m.) at (732) 271-8888.

Thank you very much for your time and cooperation in completing these forms.
Appendix F

Family Satisfaction Inventory

(Olson & Wilson, 1982)
Appendix G

Child's Report of Parent Behavior Inventory (Mother and Father forms)

(modified versions)

(Schafer, 1965a)
PARENT BEHAVIOR INVENTORY-(Mother)

INSTRUCTIONS

We are interested in learning more about the different experiences people have had in their families. We are, therefore, asking a number of people to report their experiences during childhood. If you are under sixteen and have lived at home up to this time, answer the questions as they describe what happens there. If you left home before the age of sixteen, answer as you would have before you left home. If you did not grow up with your real mother or father, but someone took the place of that parent in your life, please describe that person. Read each item below and on the following pages and circle the answer that most closely describes the way each of your parents acts toward you. BE SURE TO MARK EACH ITEM FOR EACH PARENT.

If you think the item is LIKE your parent, circle L.
If you think the item is SOMewhat LIKE your parent, circle SL.
If you think the item is NOT LIKE your parent, circle NL.

FORM FOR MOTHER

1. Makes me feel better after talking over my worries with her. L  SL  NL
2. Likes to talk to me and be with me much of the time. L  SL  NL
3. Is easy with me. L  SL  NL
4. Seems to see my good points more than my faults. L  SL  NL
5. Feels hurt when I don't follow her advice. L  SL  NL
6. Usually finds out about my bad behavior. L  SL  NL
7. Worries about how I will turn out when I grow up because she takes anything bad I do seriously. L  SL  NL
8. Almost always speaks to me with a warm friendly voice. L  SL  NL
9. Is always thinking of things that will make me happy. L  SL  NL
10. Lets me off easy when I do something wrong. L  SL  NL
11. Understands my problems and my worries. L  SL  NL
12. Thinks I don't appreciate her when I don't obey. L  SL  NL
13. Doesn't pay much attention to my bad behavior. L  SL  NL
14. Doesn't trust me again for a long time if I break a promise. L  SL  NL
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Enjoys talking things over with me.</td>
<td>L SL NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Gives me a lot of care and attention.</td>
<td>L SL NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Says yes to anything I want.</td>
<td>L SL NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Enjoys going on drives, trips or visits with me.</td>
<td>L SL NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Feels hurt by the bad things I do.</td>
<td>L SL NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Makes me do my homework.</td>
<td>L SL NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Says some day when I grow up I'll be punished for the bad things I do now.</td>
<td>L SL NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Smiles at me often.</td>
<td>L SL NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Often gives up something in order to get something for me.</td>
<td>L SL NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Excuses the bad things I do.</td>
<td>L SL NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Makes me feel better when I am upset.</td>
<td>L SL NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Tells me how much she has suffered for me.</td>
<td>L SL NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Checks up to see whether I have done what I was told to do.</td>
<td>L SL NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Thinks and talks about my bad behavior long after it is over.</td>
<td>L SL NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Enjoys doing things with me.</td>
<td>L SL NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Makes me feel like the most important person in her life.</td>
<td>L SL NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Lets me stay up late if I keep asking.</td>
<td>L SL NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Enjoys working hard with me in the house or yard.</td>
<td>L SL NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Says if I loved her, I'd do what she wants me to do.</td>
<td>L SL NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Insists that I do things she wants me to do.</td>
<td>L SL NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Says that someday I'll be sorry that I wasn't better as a child.</td>
<td>L SL NL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If you think the item is **LIKE** your parent, circle **L**.
If you think the item is **SOMETIME LIKE** your parent, circle **SL**.
If you think the item is **NOT LIKE** your parent, circle **NL**.

**FORM FOR MOTHER**

36. Comforts me when I'm afraid.  
37. Enjoys staying at home with me more than going out with friends.  
38. Makes sure I obey even if I complain or protest.  
39. Cheers me up when I am sad.  
40. Tells me of all the things she has done for me.  
41. Makes sure that I follow her rules.  
42. Thinks that any bad behavior is very serious and will affect my life when I grow up.  
43. Often speaks of the good things I do.  
44. Makes her whole life center around her children.  
45. I can talk her out of an order, if I complain.  
46. Has a good time at home with me.  
47. Says if I really cared for her, I would not do things that make her worry.  
48. Lets me get away without doing work I am supposed to do.  
49. Says that sooner or later we always pay for bad behavior.  
50. Seems proud of the things I do.  
51. Spends almost all of her free time with the children.  
52. Can be talked into things easily.  
53. Isn't interested in changing me, but likes me as I am.  
54. Says I don't appreciate all she has done for me when I don't do what I am told.  
55. Lets me get away with a lot of things.  
56. Will talk to me again and again about anything bad I do.
PARENT BEHAVIOR INVENTORY-(Father)

INSTRUCTIONS

We are interested in learning more about the different experiences people have had in their families. We are, therefore, asking a number of people to report their experiences during childhood. If you are under sixteen and have lived at home up to this time, answer the questions as they describe what happens there. If you left home before the age of sixteen, answer as you would have before you left home. If you did not grow up with your real mother or father, but someone took the place of that parent in your life, please describe that person. Read each item below and on the following pages and circle the answer that most closely describes the way each of your parents acts toward you. BE SURE TO MARK EACH ITEM FOR EACH PARENT.

If you think the item is LIKE your parent, circle **L**.
If you think the item is SOMewhat LIKE your parent, circle **SL**.
If you think the item is NOT LIKE your parent, circle **NL**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORM FOR FATHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Makes me feel better after talking over my worries with him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Likes to talk to me and be with me much of the time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is easy with me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Seems to see my good points more than my faults.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Feels hurt when I don't follow his advice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Usually finds out about my bad behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Worries about how I will turn out when I grow up because he takes anything bad I do seriously.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Almost always speaks to me with a warm friendly voice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Is always thinking of things that will make me happy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Lets me off easy when I do something wrong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Understands my problems and my worries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Thinks I don't appreciate him when I don't obey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Doesn't pay much attention to my bad behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Doesn't trust me again for a long time if I break a promise.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If you think the item is LIKE your parent, circle L.
If you think the item is SOMewhat LIKE your parent, circle SL.
If you think the item is NOT LIKE your parent, circle NL.

**FORM FOR FATHER**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Enjoy talking things over with me.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>SL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Gives me a lot of care and attention.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>SL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Says yes to anything I want.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>SL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Enjoys going on drives, trips or visits with me.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>SL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Feels hurt by the bad things I do.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>SL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Makes me do my homework.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>SL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Says some day when I grow up I'll be punished for the bad things I do now.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>SL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Smiles at me often.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>SL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Often gives up something in order to get something for me.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>SL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Excuses the bad things I do.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>SL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Makes me feel better when I am upset.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>SL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Tells me how much he has suffered for me.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>SL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Checks up to see whether I have done what I was told to do.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>SL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Thinks and talks about my bad behavior long after it is over.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>SL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Enjoys doing things with me.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>SL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Makes me feel like the most important person in his life.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>SL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Lets me stay up late if I keep asking.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>SL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Enjoys working hard with me in the house or yard.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>SL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Says if I loved him, I'd do what he wants me to do.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>SL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Insists that I do things he wants me to do.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>SL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Says that someday I'll be sorry that I wasn't better as a child.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>SL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Comforts me when I'm afraid.</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Enjoys staying at home with me more than going out with friends.</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Makes sure I obey even if I complain or protest.</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Cheers me up when I am sad.</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Tells me of all the things he has done for me.</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Makes sure that I follow his rules.</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Thinks that any bad behavior is very serious and will affect my life when I grow up.</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Often speaks of the good things I do.</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Makes his whole life center around his children.</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>I can talk him out of an order, if I complain.</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Has a good time at home with me.</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Says if I really cared for him, I would not do things that make him worry.</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Lets me get away without doing work I am supposed to do.</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Says that sooner or later we always pay for bad behavior.</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Seems proud of the things I do.</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Spends almost all of his free time with the children.</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Can be talked into things easily.</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Isn't interested in changing me, but likes me as I am.</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Says I don't appreciate all he has done for me when I don't do what I am told.</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Lets me get away with a lot of things.</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Will talk to me again and again about anything bad I do.</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H

Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (School and Adult forms)

(Coopersmith, 1981)
Appendix I

Personal Beliefs Inventory -- (Children)

from

Children's Social Desirability Questionnaire
(Crandall, Crandall & Katkovsky, 1965)

Agreement Response Scale (Couch & Keniston, 1960)

Self-Monitoring Scale (Snyder, 1974)
Children’s Social Desirability Questionnaire
   (Crandall, Crandall & Katkovsky, 1965)

1. I am always polite to older people.
2. When I make a mistake, I always admit when I am wrong.
3. I sometimes tell a little lie.
4. I sometimes feel like doing other things instead of what the teacher wants me to do.

Agreement Response Scale (Couch & Keniston, 1960)

1. I tend to make decisions on the spur of the moment (quickly).
2. It’s great fun to mess around.
3. I seldom if ever lose my temper.
4. It’s hard to get me upset.

Self-Monitoring Scale (Snyder, 1974)

1. I guess I put on a show to impress or entertain people.
2. I would probably make a good actor.
3. In a group of people I am rarely the center of attention.
4. I would not change my opinions (or the way I do things) in order to please someone else or win their favor (approval).
Personal Beliefs Inventory-(Children)

Listed below are a number of statements. Please read each statement and place a check mark by the response that best describes your own beliefs. If you believe the statement is Like Me, place a check mark next to this category. If you believe the statement is Unlike Me, place a check mark next to this category. PLEASE PLACE A CHECK MARK IN ONLY ONE CATEGORY PER STATEMENT.

1. I am always polite to older people. ___Like Me ___Unlike Me

2. I seldom if ever lose my temper. ___Like Me ___Unlike Me

3. I sometimes tell a little lie. ___Like Me ___Unlike Me

4. I would probably make a good actor. ___Like Me ___Unlike Me

5. It's hard to get me upset. ___Like Me ___Unlike Me

6. In a group of people I am rarely the center of attention. ___Like Me ___Unlike Me

7. I guess I put on a show to impress or entertain people. ___Like Me ___Unlike Me

8. I tend to make decisions on the spur of the moment (quickly). ___Like Me ___Unlike Me

9. I sometimes feel like doing other things instead of what the teacher wants me to do. ___Like Me ___Unlike Me

10. When I make a mistake, I always admit I am wrong. ___Like Me ___Unlike Me

11. It's great fun to mess around. ___Like Me ___Unlike Me

12. I would not change my opinions (or the way I do things) in order to please someone else or win their favor (approval). ___Like Me ___Unlike Me
Appendix J

Parental Sense of Competence Scale (Mother and Father forms)

(Modified version)

(Gibaud-Wallston & Wandersman, 1978)
BEING A PARENT-(Mother)

Listed below are a number of statements. Please respond to each item, indicating your agreement or disagreement with each statement in the following manner:

If you strongly agree, circle the letters SA
If you agree, circle the letter A
If you mildly agree, circle the letters MA
If you mildly disagree, circle the letters MD
If you disagree, circle the letter D
If you strongly disagree, circle the letters SD

1. The problems of taking care of a child are easy to solve once you know how your actions affect your child, an understanding I have acquired.  
SA A MA MD D SD

2. Even though being a parent could be rewarding, I am frustrated now while my child is at his/her present age.  
SA A MA MD D SD

3. I go to bed the same way I wake up in the morning—feeling I have not accomplished a whole lot.  
SA A MA MD D SD

4. I do not know why it is, but sometimes when I'm supposed to be in control, I feel more like the one being manipulated.  
SA A MA MD D SD

5. My mother was better prepared to be a good mother than I am.  
SA A MA MD D SD

6. I would make a fine model for a new mother to follow in order to learn what she would need to know in order to be a good parent.  
SA A MA MD D SD

7. Being a parent is manageable, and any problems are easily solved.  
SA A MA MD D SD

8. A difficult problem in being a parent is not knowing whether you're doing a good job or a bad one.  
SA A MA MD D SD
If you strongly agree, circle the letters SA
If you agree, circle the letter A
If you mildly agree, circle the letters MA
If you mildly disagree, circle the letters MD
If you disagree, circle the letter D
If you strongly disagree, circle the letters SD

9. Sometimes I feel like I'm not getting anything done.  

10. I meet my own personal expectations for expertise in caring for my child.  

11. If anyone can find the answer to what is troubling my child, I am the one.  

12. My talents and interests are in other areas, not in being a parent.  

13. Considering how long I've been a mother, I feel thoroughly familiar with this role.  

14. If being a mother of a child were only more interesting, I would be motivated to do a better job as a parent.  

15. I honestly believe I have all the skills necessary to be a good mother to my child.  

16. Being a parent makes me tense and nervous.
BEING A PARENT-(Father)

Listed below are a number of statements. Please respond to each item, indicating your agreement or disagreement with each statement in the following manner:

If you strongly agree, circle the letters SA  
If you agree, circle the letter A  
If you mildly agree, circle the letters MA  
If you mildly disagree, circle the letters MD  
If you disagree, circle the letter D  
If you strongly disagree, circle the letters SD

1. The problems of taking care of a child are easy to solve once you know how your actions affect your child, an understanding I have acquired.  
SA A MA MD D SD

2. Even though being a parent could be rewarding, I am frustrated now while my child is at his/her present age.  
SA A MA MD D SD

3. I go to bed the same way I wake up in the morning—feeling I have not accomplished a whole lot.  
SA A MA MD D SD

4. I do not know why it is, but sometimes when I'm supposed to be in control, I feel more like the one being manipulated.  
SA A MA MD D SD

5. My father was better prepared to be a good father than I am.  
SA A MA MD D SD

6. I would make a fine model for a new father to follow in order to learn what he would need to know in order to be a good parent.  
SA A MA MD D SD

7. Being a parent is manageable, and any problems are easily solved.  
SA A MA MD D SD

8. A difficult problem in being a parent is not knowing whether you're doing a good job or a bad one.  
SA A MA MD D SD
If you strongly agree, circle the letters SA
If you agree, circle the letter A
If you mildly agree, circle the letters MA
If you mildly disagree, circle the letters MD
If you disagree, circle the letter D
If you strongly disagree, circle the letters SD

9. Sometimes I feel like I'm not getting anything done.  SA A MA MD D SD

10. I meet my own personal expectations for expertise in caring for my child.  SA A MA MD D SD

11. If anyone can find the answer to what is troubling my child, I am the one.  SA A MA MD D SD

12. My talents and interests are in other areas, not in being a parent.  SA A MA MD D SD

13. Considering how long I've been a father, I feel thoroughly familiar with this role.  SA A MA MD D SD

14. If being a father of a child were only more interesting, I would be motivated to do a better job as a parent.  SA A MA MD D SD

15. I honestly believe I have all the skills necessary to be a good father to my child.  SA A MA MD D SD

16. Being a parent makes me tense and nervous.  SA A MA MD D SD
Appendix K

Personal Beliefs Inventory - (Parents)

from

Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960)

Agreement Response Scale (Couch & Keniston, 1960)

Self-Monitoring Scale (Snyder, 1974)
Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960)

1. I am always willing to admit when I make a mistake.
2. I always try to practice what I preach.
3. I like to gossip at times.
4. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.

Agreement Response Scale (Couch & Keniston, 1960)

1. I tend to make decisions on the spur of the moment (quickly).
2. It’s great fun to mess around.
3. I seldom if ever lose my temper.
4. It’s hard to get me upset.

Self-Monitoring Scale (Snyder, 1974)

1. I guess I put on a show to impress or entertain people.
2. I would probably make a good actor.
3. In a group of people I am rarely the center of attention.
4. I would not change my opinions (or the way I do things) in order to please someone else or win their favor (approval).
Personal Beliefs Inventory—(Parents)

Listed below are a number of statements. Please read each statement and place a check mark by the response that best describes your own beliefs. If you believe the statement is Like Me, place a check mark next to this category. If you believe the statement is Unlike Me, place a check mark next to this category. PLEASE PLACE A CHECK MARK IN ONLY ONE CATEGORY PER STATEMENT.

1. I am always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.
   ___Like Me ___Unlike Me

2. I seldom if ever lose my temper.
   ___Like Me ___Unlike Me

3. I like to gossip at times.
   ___Like Me ___Unlike Me

4. I would probably make a good actor.
   ___Like Me ___Unlike Me

5. It's hard to get me upset.
   ___Like Me ___Unlike Me

6. In a group of people I am rarely the center of attention.
   ___Like Me ___Unlike Me

7. I guess I put on a show to impress or entertain people.
   ___Like Me ___Unlike Me

8. I tend to make decisions on the spur of the moment (quickly).
   ___Like Me ___Unlike Me

9. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.
   ___Like Me ___Unlike Me

10. I always try to practice what I preach.
    ___Like Me ___Unlike Me

11. It's great fun to mess around.
    ___Like Me ___Unlike Me

12. I would not change my opinions (or the way I do things) in order to please someone else or win their favor (approval).
    ___Like Me ___Unlike Me