THE MOTHERS AND FATHERS OF YOUNG DRUG ABUSERS: THEIR DESCRIPTIONS OF SELF, SPOUSE, EGO IDEAL, AND DRUG-ABUSER CHILD

A Thesis
Presented to
the Faculty of the College of Education
University of Houston

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

---

by
R. Mack McAfee
May 1972

Acknowledgments

If one approaches the writing of a thesis with some degree of enthusiasm, he has undertaken far more than he suspects. Indeed, until his work has been finished and suitably laid to rest, the person finds himself involved not with a project but an illness — a kind of sweet and voluntary madness that one will not let go. For their kind help and insistence that he survive his episode, the writer gives thanks to many:

To the thesis committee, made up of Dr. G. E. Osborne, chairman, and Drs. LaVerne Carmical and G. H. Strauss, for their skillful direction of the study;

To Dr. Ronald Frankiewicz, for his helpfulness in the handling of statistical data;

To Dr. R. E. Williams, for his implanting in students the spirit of inquiry and research;

To Dr. Don Edwards, for his needed and helpful advice;

To Sister Mary Amelia, CCVI, for the many kindnesses she extended the writer at St. Joseph Hospital, Houston;

To Mrs. Bonnie Gordon, Secretary to the Psychology Department of St. Joseph Hospital, for her cheerful scoring of the test instrument;

To Michael J. Butera, M.S.W., moderator of the group for parents of drug abusers, St. Joseph Hospital, for his

and his group's splendid cooperation in the experiment;

To the Rev. Thomas W. Sumners, former Rector of the Church of St. John the Divine, Houston, for affording an office in which the writer could work;

To the Rev. Thomas A. Roberts, D.D., present Rector of the Church of St. John the Divine, for the continuation by Thomas the Second of the coffee and courtesies started during the reign of Thomas the First;

And to Nancee, the writer's wife, for her continued encouragement and sanity through it all.

R. Mack McAfee

Houston, Texas

April 1972

THE MOTHERS AND FATHERS OF YOUNG DRUG ABUSERS: THEIR DESCRIPTIONS OF SELF, SPOUSE, EGO IDEAL, AND DRUG-ABUSER CHILD

An Abstract of a Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of the College of Education

University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Education

---

by

R. Mack McAfee

May 1972

ABSTRACT

Descriptions of self, spouse, imaginary ideal, and abuser child made by 26 mothers and fathers of young drug abusers were compared with corresponding descriptions made by counterpart parents of non-abusers. Both groups described themselves as strong, socially-acceptable persons with similar imaginary ideals. When descriptions of self were compared to descriptions of imaginary ideal, both groups indicated self-rejection. There was no significant difference in the two groups' descriptions of spouse, and each group was seen both to identify with and devaluate the spouse. The two groups differed significantly in their descriptions of the child: parents of non-abusers depicted their child as strong and consistent, while abusers were characterized by hostile weakness and inconsistency. Comparisons of descriptions of imaginary ideal with descriptions of child indicated that members of each group devaluated the child, both in and away from the home. Parents of non-abusers identified the child's behavior, both in and away from home, with their own behavior significantly more than did the parents of abusers. Also, parents of non-abusers equated their spouse's behavior with their child's behavior, both in and away from home, significantly more than did the parents of abusers.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter | Page

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

Chapter I

The Problem

Importance of the Study

Although previous investigators had attempted to relate drug abuse among the young with personality patterns of the parents (Zimmering et al, 1951; Ausubel, 1961; Laskowitz, 1964) and familial influences (Brotman et al, 1971; Kleber, 1967; Levy, 1968; Schoolar et al, 1971), usually their conclusions about such parent-abuser relationships were reached through the use of second-hand information. Unfortunately, the large majority of the studies had used only interpretations of parental behavior inferred from communication with the drug abuser in treatment. Obviously, the descriptions of parental behavior provided by persons in treatment were subject to distortions and misinterpretations.

When this investigator reviewed the literature, he did not find a single study in which the mothers and fathers of young drug abusers had been asked to evaluate their own personalities, to express their attitudes and feelings toward each other, and to describe the behavior of a young drug abuser from a parent's point of view. Also, he found the literature lacking in research related to certain crucial aspects of the parent-abuser relationship. For example, the

researcher found no studies that had assessed the values or ideals of mothers and fathers of young drug abusers, or that had examined the degree that one parent identified his own behavior with that of the other parent, or with that of the abuser.

Statement of the Problem

Because the emotional problems of young drug abusers had been assumed to be related to parental adjustments, it seemed important that several questions be answered:

1. When making self-descriptions, how do the mother and father of a young person who abuses drugs differ from the mother and father of a young person who does not abuse drugs?

2. When describing their child, how do the mother and father of a young person who abuses drugs differ from the mother and father of a young person who does not abuse drugs?

3. When describing an imaginary ideal person, how do the mother and father of a young person who abuses drugs differ from the mother and father of a young person who does not abuse drugs?

4. When comparing self and spouse, do the mother and father of a young drug abuser identify their own behavior with that of the other less frequently than do the mother and father of a young person who does not abuse drugs?

5. When comparing self with child, do the mother and father of a young drug abuser identify their own behavior with that of the child less frequently than do the mother and father of a young person who does not abuse drugs?

6. When comparing spouse with an imaginary ideal person, do the mother and father of a young drug abuser idealize their spouse less frequently than do the mother and father of a young person who does not abuse drugs?

7. When comparing the child with an imaginary ideal person, do the mother and father of a young drug abuser devaluate the child less frequently than do the mother and father of a young person who does not abuse drugs?

This investigation was designed to provide answers to such questions. The primary purpose of the study was to determine if the mothers and fathers of young persons who had abused drugs differed from the mothers and fathers of young persons who had not abused drugs, with respect to self-descriptions, their attitudes toward each other, and their attitudes toward their children.

Hypotheses

To provide a framework for the scope and direction of the investigation, several provisional conjectures were outlined. Specifically, it was hypothesized that:

1. Mothers and fathers of young persons who abuse

drugs show self-rejection more frequently than do the mothers and fathers of young persons who do not abuse drugs.

2. Mothers and fathers of young persons who abuse drugs show conscious dis-identification with each other more frequently than do the mothers and fathers of young persons who do not abuse drugs.

3. Mothers and fathers of young persons who abuse drugs show conscious dis-identification with their child more frequently than do the mothers and fathers of young people who do not abuse drugs.

4. When comparing a young person's behavior in the home with his behavior away from home, mothers and fathers of young persons who abuse drugs ascribe a high discrepancy between the two behaviors more frequently than do the mothers and fathers of young persons who do not abuse drugs.

5. Mothers and fathers of young persons who abuse drugs describe a spouse-child equation more frequently than do the mothers and fathers of young persons who do not abuse drugs.

6. Mothers and fathers of young persons who abuse drugs show a devaluation of spouse more frequently than do the mothers and fathers of young persons who do not abuse drugs.

7. Mothers and fathers of young persons who abuse

drugs show an idealization of the child more frequently than do the mothers and fathers of young persons who do not abuse drugs.

Definitions of Terms

Conscious descriptions. The term *conscious description* was used to indicate that each subject reported his conscious views of himself and others through use of the Interpersonal Check List (ICL). The person's perception of self and others that he reported may have or may not have agreed with the perceptions of others, for the subject made his descriptions out of the context of his own phenomenological field — the way he saw himself and others in relationship to his world.

Devaluation. The term *devaluation* was used to designate a high discrepancy (or dis-similarity) between a subject's conscious description of his imaginary ideal person and his conscious description of another person, such as spouse or child. If on the diagnostic grid the summary point for the subject's description of his imaginary ideal person fell more than one octant away from the summary point for his description of another person, the term *devaluation* was used to indicate the dis-similarity of the two descriptions. For example, if the summary point for

the subject's description of his imaginary ideal person fell in Octant 6 while the summary point for his description of his spouse fell in Octant 3 (the two summary points were thus more than one octant apart), the term *devaluation* was used to designate the dis-similarity of the two descriptions.

Diagnostic grid. A set of variables, listed in a circular continuum and termed *a diagnostic grid*, was used to categorize behavior that had been described through use of the Interpersonal Check List. The circle was thought of as a two-dimensional grid, with the vertical axis used to measure dominance-submissiveness, and the horizontal axis used to measure love-hate or affiliation-opposition. The center of the grid was seen as the mean of the normative population. The distance and direction of the summary point of a description from the center of the grid reflected the type of behavior that had been described and the intensity of the behavior that had been described.

Dis-identification. The term *dis-identification* was used to designate a high discrepancy (or dis-similarity) between a subject's conscious description of self and his conscious description of another person, such as spouse or child. If on the diagnostic grid the summary point for the subject's description of himself fell more than one octant

away from his description of another person, the term *dis-identification* was used to indicate the dis-similarity of the two descriptions.

Ego ideal or *imaginary ideal person.* When each subject described an imaginary ideal person, the description was guided by the person's own system of values. The imaginary ideal personified what the subject held to be "good," "proper," and "right." In effect, the term *imaginary ideal person* has been used to indicate what the subject felt that he himself should be and would like to be.

High discrepancy in descriptions. The criterion for determining the similarity between two different descriptions made by the subject was the difference in the locations of the two summary points on the diagnostic grid. If the summary point for one description fell more than one octant away from the summary point for another description, the term *high discrepancy in descriptions* was used.

Idealization. The term *idealization* was used to designate a low discrepancy (or similarity) between a subject's conscious description of his imaginary ideal person and his conscious description of another person, such as spouse or child. If on the diagnostic grid the summary point for the subject's description of his imaginary ideal person fell one

octant or less away from the summary point for his description of another person, the term *idealization* was used to indicate the similarity of descriptions.

Identification. The term *identification* was used to designate a low discrepancy (or similarity) between a subject's conscious description of himself and his conscious description of another person, such as spouse. If on the diagnostic grid the summary point for the subject's description of himself fell one octant or less away from the summary point for his description of another person, the term *identification* was used to indicate the similarity of the two descriptions.

Interpersonal Check List (ICL). Each subject, in making a description, used the ICL. That is, the subject chose those items on the ICL that afforded the best wording for what he wished to describe. Examples of the 128 items on the ICL included "manages others," "friendly," "apologetic," "skeptical," and "critical of others."

Low discrepancy in descriptions. The criterion for determining the similarity between two different descriptions made by a person was the difference in the locations of the two summary points on the diagnostic grid. If the summary point for one description fell one octant or less away from

the summary point for another description, the term *low discrepancy in descriptions* was used to designate the similarity of the two descriptions.

Self-acceptance. The term *self-acceptance* was used to designate a low discrepancy (or similarity) between a subject's conscious description of himself and his conscious description of his ego ideal or imaginary ideal person. If on the diagnostic grid the summary point for the subject's description of himself fell one octant or less away from the summary point for his description of his imaginary ideal person, the term *self-acceptance* was used to indicate the similarity of the two descriptions.

Self-description. When a subject reported his views of himself through use of the Interpersonal Check List, the result was termed a *self-description.* The self-perception reported by way of the Check List may have been different from the perception that others had of the subject, for the subject's self-description was related to his own phenomenological field — the way he saw himself in relationship to his world.

Self-rejection. The term *self-rejection* was used to designate a high discrepancy (or dis-similarity) between a subject's conscious description of himself and his conscious

description of his ego ideal or imaginary ideal person. If on the diagnostic grid the summary point for the subject's description of himself fell more than one octant away from the summary point for his description of his imaginary ideal person, the term *self-rejection* was used to indicate the dis-similarity of the two descriptions.

Spouse-child dis-equation. The term *spouse-child dis-equation* was used to indicate a high discrepancy (or dis-similarity) between a subject's conscious description of his spouse and his conscious description of his child. If on the diagnostic grid the summary point for the person's description of his spouse fell more than one octant away from the summary point for his description of his child, the term *spouse-child dis-equation* was used to designate the dis-similarity of the two descriptions.

Spouse-child equation. The term was used to denote a low discrepancy (or similarity) between a subject's conscious description of his spouse and his conscious description of his child. If on the diagnostic grid the summary point for the subject's description of his spouse fell one octant or less away from the summary point for his description of his child, the term *spouse-child equation* was used to designate the similarity of the two descriptions.

Summary point. The location on the diagnostic grid that summarized all the Interpersonal Check List items chosen by the subject in making a description was termed the *summary point.* After the person had described himself, a summary point was plotted for his description of himself; similarly, when he described his spouse, a summary point was plotted for his description of his spouse. Thus, there were as many summary points as there were descriptions made. Each of the summary points was arrived at by following a fixed procedure:

1. The Check List had 16 items related to the behavior categorized under each of the eight octants (AP, BC, DE, FG, HI, JK, LM, and NO) of the diagnostic grid, making a total of 128 items that could have been selected by the subject. The items related to a given octant that had been checked by the subject were summed to arrive at a raw score value.

2. The raw score sums were then inserted in the two formulas,

$$Dom = AP - HI + 0.7(NO + BC - FG - JK), \text{ and}$$

$$Lov = LM - DE + 0.7(NO - BC - FG + JK).$$

That is, the raw score sum for each octant was used to replace the alphabetical designation of the octant. This provided two numerical indices, one vertical (Dom = Dominance) and one horizontal (Lov = Love).

3. The two indices were then converted to standard scores and plotted on the diagnostic grid. The result was the summary point for that description.

Young drug abuser. The term *young* was operationally defined as one who was 25 years of age or younger. The term *drug abuser* was operationally defined as a person who excessively or persistently used, without regard to accepted medical practices, one or more of the following types of drugs:

1. Mood-altering and sense-altering substances, such as *cannabis sativa* (marihuana) and hashish.

2. Depressants or "downers," such as phenobarbital, pentobarbital, amobarbital, secobarbital, glutethmide, paraldahyde, and chloral hydrate.

3. Hallucinogens, such as lysergic diethylamide (LSD), mescaline, psilocybin, and morning glory seeds.

4. Inhalants that produce intoxication, such as fast-drying glue or cement, paints, lacquers, thinners, lighter and dry-cleaning fluids, gasoline, kerosene, and nail-polish remover.

5. Narcotics, such as opium, morphine, paregoric, codeine, heroin, Dilaudid, meperidine (Demerol), and methadone (Dolophine).

6. Stimulants or "uppers," such as cocaine, Benzedrine,

Dexedrine, Methedrine, and Ritalin.

7. Tranquilizers, such as the phenothiazines, Miltown, Equanil, Librium, Placidyl, and Valium.

None of the mothers and fathers of young drug abusers reported that their offspring used only marihuana; if marihuana was used, it was used in addition to the abuse of another drug.

Although alcohol has been classified as a drug, for purposes of this study it was not considered as one of the drugs that the young abusers used.

Chapter II

The Literature

Incidence of Drug Abuse by the Young

During the last twenty-five years the literature has reflected a marked increase in drug abuse, particularly among the young. Chein (1956) reported children only ten years old being addicted to heroin. He assigned no great social significance to the matter, for he believed that such instances of drug abuse by children were few in number and confined strictly to large cities.

Clausen (1961) linked drug abuse by the young to the neighborhood where the abuser lived. He saw the highest incidence in the specific areas of large cities occupied by minority groups, where the lives of individuals were characterized by low income, little education, and poor family influences.

Freedman and Wilson (1964) believed that a greater percentage of young people were becoming addicts, and that the new users were coming mainly from middle-class and upper-class families, and not from minority groups and slum areas.

In a statement in the *Journal of the American Medical Association* (1967, p. 48), the Association's Committee on

Alcoholism and Drug Abuse reported that the ranks of young drug abusers were increasing, particularly among college students. An editorial in the same publication (1967, p. 369) suggested that the casual, episodic use of marihuana by adolescents and young people in urban centers and in university settings was growing, and that the use of marihuana among high school students was spreading.

Having conducted a study with 2,270 seniors in an urban college, Pearlman (1967) indicated that 6.3% of his subjects acknowledged drug experimentation. He did not identify the drugs that were used for experimentation, and he did not believe that the high incidence of experimentation manifested addiction or habituation.

The ratio of students who appeared for treatment at the University of California (Berkeley) psychiatric emergency room as the result of self-administration of lysergic acid diethylamide (LSD) tripled in one year, a research team reported (Ungerleider, Fisher, & Fuller, 1966), and this number constituted 12% of all cases seen by the university psychiatric emergency staff.

In a study (Preston, 1970) of students in grades 7 through 12, the Drug Education Committee of the Houston Independent School District Board of Education reported these percentages of students to have used one or more of nine substances: alcohol - 58%; cigarettes - 49%; marihuana -

22%; stimulants - 16%; cough syrup - 15%; solvents - 12%; barbiturates - 11%; hallucinogens - 10%; and opiates or cocaine - 5%. The report stated that more than half the students who had used marihuana once also had used it ten or more times, indicating more than simple experimentation had been involved.

Explanations Offered for Drug Abuse

Various explanations have been offered in the literature for the increase of drug abuse among the young. Kleber (1967) felt that the increase in the use of marihuana on college campuses resulted from the fact that students considered the drug to be non-addictive, and from their notion that the law governing the use of marihuana was a poor one, to be ignored in the manner that the laws governing the use of alcohol at one time had been ignored.

The increase in drug abuse was equated (Pollard, 1967) with the fact that many drug abusers had grown up in a society which had fostered the myth that almost any discomfort, personal or physical, could be corrected with drugs. Similarly, Nowlis (1968) believed that increased drug abuse was related to a "pill society" in which people felt they could buy a drug to alleviate any and all problems.

The 1960's were seen by Kieffer and Moritz (1968) as a time of change that lent itself to drug experimentation by

the young. In a "youth culture" that disregarded the conventional and flaunted its own styles, music, language, activities, and attitudes, the use of drugs found unprecedented acceptance. In a different vein of thought, Stanton (1966) observed that, while the use of drugs was not new to man's history, nothing in history could have pointed to the outburst of drug experimentation among the young.

Reasons Given by Young Drug Abusers

Through the last several years, the literature has cited a variety of reasons that the young have given for their abuse of drugs. Many investigators (Blaine, 1966; Mamlet, 1967; Kleber, 1967; Pollard, 1967; Pervin, 1967; Nowlis, 1968; Cameron, 1968; Allen, & West, 1968) agreed that what they heard foremost was a strong note of youthful rebellion against the conditions that the young perceived to be the main ills of society: the war, competitiveness, materialism, and the hypocrisy of the older generation. Other factors seen to be coupled with youth's rebellion were the elements of mystique, the occult (Allen, & West, 1968; Brickman, 1968), the desire to discover meaningful solutions to life's problems, and an attempt at becoming more creative (Farnsworth, & Oliver, 1968). Many of the researchers noted they were told by youths that the peer affiliation afforded by group marihuana sessions was very

important, for it served to bind the "in" group, and it helped to separate its members from the "squares."

After interviewing 112 young people admitted to Bellevue Psychiatric Hospital, New York City, Hekimian and Gershon (1968) reported that the reasons most frequently given them by the young for their drug abuse were curiosity, the influence of peers, and the desire for a euphoric state. In another study (Keeler, 1968) it was noted that curiosity and the desire to "go along" with friends were the reasons that most of the subjects gave for their drug abuse. Curiosity, the desire for "kicks," efforts to shake off apathy, and the wish to attain personal esoteric goals were the reasons that Ludwig and Levine (1965) heard most often from their subjects.

Attributes of Young Drug Abusers

Also, the literature has offered various notions concerning the role that psychological factors have played in making some young people seemingly more susceptible to drug abuse than others. A group of 21 adolescent males who were treated at Bellevue Hospital for heroin addiction were described (Zimmering, Toolan, & Safrin, 1951) as soft-spoken, non-aggressive, verbally skilled, and social; most were considered to have had a close, empathic relationship with the mother. The adolescent drug addict was described by Laskowitz (1961) as socially distant, suffering from heightened

feelings of inadequacy, lacking courage, and desiring to be shielded.

Boys who had become addicted before they were 16 years old showed more pathology in personality than those who had become addicted after that age, Bender (1963) noted; she believed Wikler's contention that psychopathic deviation (with variable mixtures of neurotic and schizoid features) continued to be the most outstanding traits of institutionalized narcotic addicts, adolescents as well as adults.

A particular type of youth was seen by Blaine (1966) to have been more susceptible to drug abuse; this type of young person was believed to have been attracted to the dangerous element, having exhibited an inordinate preoccupation with death and a willingness to tempt fate. Kleber (1967) discussed five LSD users from a psychodynamic viewpoint and presented features of his subjects that were suggestive of identity conflicts. Having elicited early memories from 13 persons addicted to various drugs, two investigators (Lombardi, & Angers, 1967) reported personality characteristics that appeared common to young abusers: dependency, lack of direction in life, insecurity, a sense of inadequacy, and perceptions of the world as dangerous and hostile.

Using the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) to measure the personality characteristics of 45

young male narcotic addicts and their non-addicted counterparts from similar socio-economic backgrounds, Gilbert and Lombardi (1967) described deep-seated and widespread psychopathic traits among the addicts they saw: depression, strong feelings of inadequacy, and an inability to form warm and lasting interpersonal relationships. Most addicts, they reported, appeared to show character disorders, although psychoneurotic and psychotic traits were discernible in some.

After they had studied 21 LSD users, a team (Blacker, Jones, Stone, & Pfefferbaum, 1968) evaluated their subjects as passive, frustrated, and angry with their parents and life situation. A psychoanalyst (Levy, 1968) using Karen Horney's concept of inner hatred arising from the discrepancy between what one "should" be and what one is, thought that the personality traits of young drug abusers indicated a desire to postpone decisions; this, in turn, necessitated the drug abuser's rejection of society, for to have admitted the validity of societal claims would have been to expose oneself to personal failure. According to Levy, all his patients manifested a psychopathic process in which fragmented relatedness, intense egocentricity, and sick individualism operated together.

After administering the MMPI to 100 LSD users and 46 non-user controls, Smart and Jones (1970) indicated a higher incidence of psychopathology among users than among non-users.

The researchers reported that the two diagnoses they made of the abusers most frequently were conduct disorders and psychosis, and the interview data they gathered seemed to suggest to them that the disturbances predated LSD usage.

School studies have outlined qualities that student drug abusers appeared to have in common. The Dallas Independent School District (1970) surveyed 57,000 junior and senior high school pupils and found the abusers to be less oriented toward achievement, less involved in extra-curricular activities, and more apt to make lower grades than non-abusers. A study made in the New York schools (Brotman, Silverman, & Suffet, 1970) indicated similar differences between users and non-users; it added that users were more concerned with concerts and art galleries, while non-users were attracted to sports.

A Texas Research Institute of Mental Sciences (TRIMS) experimental team (Schoolar, White, & Cohen, 1971), after it had compared the interpersonal behavior of 80 drug abusers with their non-abuser counterparts, described abusers as being more hostile and critical, more self-deceptive, and more apt to value such undesirable behaviors as distrust and nonconformity.

In a 12-year follow-up study of addicts, Vaillant (1966) concluded that the roots of addiction might more fruitfully have been sought in trying to understand the dynamics of

repetitive delinquent behavior in general. Freedman and Wilson (1964) held that addicts often showed personality deviations, but they concluded there was no "typical" personality profile for drug abusers. They agreed with an earlier investigator (Clausen, 1961), which stated that certain types of subcultures had given support to behavior that was inconsistent with the norms of conventional society. Other investigators (Finlator, 1968; White, Cohen, & Schoolar, 1971) pointed out that the drug syndrome was no longer confined to the slums, and that it had spread to the affluent society, as well. One researcher (Schonfeld, 1967) suggested that adolescents had been given "too much too soon," and that this had led to delinquency that was unwittingly sanctioned by parents.

Attributes of Parents of Abusers

If the literature has lacked agreement on the personality type of the young person who has abused drugs, it has been even less definitive as to the personality type of the parents who have reared drug abusers. Zimmering et al (1951) described their abuser subjects as having had a close, empathic relationship with their mothers. Ausubel (1961) reported that typically in the background of the addicts he had seen there was an overprotecting, or overdominating, or underdominating parent.

The Dallas Independent School District study (1970) noted that parents of drug abusers had been more permissive than parents of non-abusers, although the users had not made a practice of turning to their parents in times of crisis. The New York school study (Brotman et al, 1970) saw the families of non-abusers to have been more closely knitted than were the families of abusers.

Kleber (1967) believed that his subjects had had identity conflicts with their parents. In the background of many addicts that had received treatment at the Riverside Hospital in New York, Laskowitz (1964) reported that he noted an unstable, pampering attitude on the part of the mother; he believed this to have been an effort by the mother to compensate for the fact that the sons lacked a stable, significant father in the home. A psychoanalyst (Levy, 1968) contended that the disapproval of the parents of abusers had exerted no corrective influence on the subjects he had seen; in fact, he saw disapproval as a stimulus that caused the abusers to "act out."

The TRIMS study (Schoolar et al, 1971) showed that drug abusers viewed both parents as strong, independent persons who behaved in a socially desirable manner. Neither the controls nor the abusers were reported to have idealized the behaviors they ascribed to their fathers: independence, self-interest, aloofness, and the ability to exploit others

in the pursuit of their own goals — all of which qualities were seen by the investigators as the attributes of the successful business man in the American culture. Although the control group members idealized the behavior of their mothers, the drug abusers did not; instead, they saw their mothers as strong, dominating persons who lacked empathic, nurturant, intimate, sharing behavior.

In summary, the literature has reflected that the problem of drug abuse among the young has been one with many facets: drug abuse has increased rapidly among the young people of all social classes; researchers have varied widely in the motivations they have assigned to the abusers; motivations supplied by the abusers themselves have ranged from rebellion against the war to preoccupation with death; there has been no agreement as to what personality type, if any, has abused drugs most; and definitive data on the parents of abusers has been lacking. The literature has afforded educators, counselors, therapists, and other professional workers no conceptual model to which they could turn for help when they tried to deal effectively with the problem of drug abuse among the young.

Chapter III

The Method

General Experimental Approach

The primary purpose of this study was to determine if the mothers and fathers of young persons who had abused drugs differed from the mothers and fathers of young persons who had not abused drugs, with respect to their self-descriptions, their attitudes toward each other, and their attitudes toward their children.

In an effort to determine such possible differences, the mothers and fathers of young persons who had abused drugs were invited to participate in the study, as were also the mothers and fathers of young persons who had not abused drugs. Each mother and father who accepted the invitation to participate in the study was placed, for experimental purposes, in one of two categories: the mothers and fathers of abusers were assigned to an experimental group, and the mothers and fathers of non-abusers were assigned to a control group. In effect, the two groups served as parallel experiments in which several important factors or conditions (such as one's age, sex, or level of educational attainment) were "matched" or "controlled." The members of the control group (the mothers and fathers of non-abusers)

thereby afforded points of comparison for the members of the experimental group (the mothers and fathers of abusers).

Subjects in the Experimental Group

Those persons who accepted the invitation to be subjects of investigation and who were assigned to the experimental group included 9 fathers and 17 mothers of young drug abusers. Each of the 9 males in the experimental group was the spouse of a female also in the experimental group. The remaining 8 females in the experimental group participated alone, without their husbands.

Subjects in the experimental group ranged in age from 37 years to 56 years, with a mean age of 43.2 years. The level of educational attainment for the mothers and fathers of abusers ranged from 8 years to 16 years, with a mean educational level of 12.9 years. Religious affiliations of the members of the experimental group were: Baptist - 6, Catholic - 6, Episcopal - 3, Jewish - 2, and Methodist - 9.

The 26 subjects in the experimental group met weekly with a group composed of parents of young drug abusers.

Offsprings of Subjects in the Experimental Group

All of the offsprings of the mothers and fathers in the experimental group had received treatment for drug abuse

in a large urban hospital, or had been incarcerated in various institutions for offenses associated with the abuse of drugs. The drug-abuser offsprings of subjects in the experimental group included 14 males and 4 females who ranged in age from 15 years to 24 years, with a mean age equivalent to 18.7 years. The level of educational attainment for the young abusers ranged from 9 years to 15 years, with a mean educational level equivalent to 10.7 years. Two of the abusers were brother and sister, and their mother and father participated in the experimental group.

All of the mothers and fathers who were members of the experimental group had lived under middle-class socio-economic conditions, and their drug-abuser offsprings had been reared in that atmosphere.

Subjects in the Control Group

Each subject in the experimental group (composed of the mothers and fathers of young drug abusers) was matched individually with a subject in the control group (composed of the mothers and fathers of young non-abusers) with respect to eight factors:

1. Age of the offspring.
2. Sex of the offspring.
3. Educational attainment of the offspring.
4. Age of the participating mother or father.

5. Sex of the participating mother or father.

6. Educational attainment of the participating mother or father.

7. Religious affiliation of the participating mother or father.

8. Participation or non-participation of the spouse of the participating mother or father.

Thus, an invitation to participate in the control group was extended only to a potential subject who could approximately match the eight factors relevant to a subject in the experimental group.

To expedite the tedious process of matching each subject in the experimental group with a counterpart subject in the control group, the assistance of several Churches was enlisted. The Church secretary was given the eight factors to be matched relevant to each of the subjects of that religious affiliation in the experimental group, although she was not given the names of subjects in the experimental group. Also, the secretary was asked to supply the investigator with names of persons on the Church's roster, randomly selected and without preference to the regularity of their attendance, who could match or approximate the eight factors relevant to each subject in the experimental group of that religious affiliation. The potential subjects for the control group were then telephoned by the investigator and

invited to participate in the study. Each subject in the experimental group had a religious affiliation, and this procedure was followed until every member in the experimental group had been matched with a counterpart subject in the control group.

Those persons who accepted the invitation to serve as subjects of investigation and who were assigned to the control group included 9 fathers and 17 mothers of young non-abusers. Each of the 9 males in the control group was the spouse of a female who was also in the control group. The remaining 8 females in the control group participated alone, without their husbands.

Subjects in the control group ranged in age from 35 years to 62 years, with a mean age equivalent to 45.1 years. The level of educational attainment for the mothers and fathers of young non-abusers ranged from 9 years to 16 years, with a mean educational level equivalent to 14.3 years. Religious affiliations of the members of the control group were: Baptist - 6, Catholic - 6, Episcopal - 3, Jewish - 2, and Methodist - 9.

At the time they were invited to participate, members of the control group were told that the investigator was doing a study on the parents of young persons who did not abuse drugs. Therefore, the logical assumption was made that the offsprings of members of the control group had

never received treatment for drug abuse, nor had they been incarcerated for offenses associated with the abuse of drugs.

Offsprings of Subjects in the Control Group

The non-abuser offsprings of subjects in the control group included 14 males and 4 females who ranged in age from 15 years to 23 years, with a mean age equivalent to 18.3 years. The level of educational attainment for the young non-abusers ranged from 8 years to 16 years, with a mean educational level equivalent to 12.1 years. Two of the young non-abusers were brother and sister, and their mother and father participated in the control group.

All of the mothers and fathers who were members of the control group had lived under middle-class socio-economic conditions, and their non-abuser offsprings had been reared in that atmosphere.

A comparison of subjects who participated in the control group with subjects who participated in the experimental group is provided by Table 1. Table 2 provides a comparison of the non-abuser offsprings of subjects in the control group with the drug-abuser offsprings of subjects in the experimental group.

Table 1

A Comparison of Subjects in the Control Group With Subjects in the Experimental Group

Control Group	Experimental Group
Sex of subjects in the control group	Sex of subjects in the experimental group
9 Fathers with spouse in control group 9 Mothers with spouse in control group 8 Mothers with no spouse in control group	9 Fathers with spouse in experimental group 9 Mothers with spouse in experimental group 8 Mothers with no spouse in experimental group
Age of subjects in the control group	Age of subjects in the experimental group
Lowest age: 35 years Mean age: 45.1 years Highest age: 62 years	Lowest age: 37 years Mean age: 43.2 years Highest age: 56 years
Level of educational attainment of subjects in the control group	Level of educational attainment of subjects in the experimental group
Lowest level: 9.0 yrs. Mean level: 14.3 yrs. Highest level: 16.0 yrs.	Lowest level: 8.0 yrs Mean level: 12.9 yrs. Highest level: 16.0 yrs.
Religious affiliations of subjects in the control group	Religious affiliations of subjects in the experimental group
Baptists: 6 Catholics: 6 Episcopalians: 3 Jewish: 2 Methodists: 9	Baptists: 6 Catholics: 6 Episcopalians: 3 Jewish: 2 Methodists 9

Table 2

A Comparison of the Non-abuser Offsprings of Subjects in the Control Group With the Drug-abuser Offsprings of Subjects in the Experimental Group

Non-abuser Offsprings of Subjects in the Control Group	Drug-abuser Offsprings of Subjects in the Experimental Group
Sex of non-abuser offsprings of subjects in the control group	Sex of drug-abuser offsprings of subjects in the experimental group
14 Males 4 Females	14 Males 4 Females
Age of non-abuser offsprings of subjects in the control group	Age of non-abuser offsprings of subjects in the experimental group
Lowest age: 15 years Mean age: 18.3 years Highest age: 23 years	Lowest age: 15 years Mean age: 18.7 years Highest age: 24 years
Level of educational attainment of non-abuser offsprings of subjects in the control group	Level of educational attainment of drug-abuser offsprings of subjects in the experimental group
Lowest level: 8.0 yrs. Mean level: 12.1 yrs. Highest level: 16.0 yrs.	Lowest level: 9.0 yrs. Mean level: 10.7 yrs. Highest level: 15.0 yrs.

Personality System Used

The Interpersonal System of Personality (Leary, 1957) was employed in this study to determine if the mothers and fathers of young persons who had abused drugs differed from the mothers and fathers of young persons who had not abused drugs, with respect to their self-descriptions, their descriptions of each other, their descriptions of their children, and their descriptions of their ego ideals.

The System can be used to study behavior on four levels, which it refers to as Levels I, II, III, and IV. The study of Level I behavior involves public communication, or the way a person appears to others in his interactions with them. The study of Level II behavior has to do with a person's private phenomenological field, or the way he consciously looks at himself and the important other persons in his life. The study of Level III behavior makes use of art, dreams, and projective tests to tap a person's fantasies and imaginative expressions. (The procedure for studying behavior at Level IV is not yet fully developed, but it will explore the subject's unexpressed unconscious, or the personal themes which are compulsively and systematically avoided at all levels of the subject's behavior.) The study of Level V behavior reflects the values, traits, and actions that a person deliberately holds to be "good," "proper," and "right" — one's conscious picture of what he feels he should be and

would like to be.

The eight themes that the System uses to categorize personality at all levels of study include:

1. managerial - autocratic behavior
2. competitive - exploitive behavior
3. blunt - aggressive behavior
4. skeptical - distrustful behavior
5. modest - self-effacing behavior
6. docile - dependent behavior
7. cooperative - over-conventional behavior
8. responsible - over-generous behavior

For each of the behavior themes, the first adjective refers to adaptive or desirable behavior, while the second adjective refers to maladaptive or undesirable behavior.

When the themes are thought of as pie-shaped octants in a circular continuum, successively numbered 1 through 8, a systematic relationship is seen to exist between any and all of the themes. For example, a behavior that is categorized in Octant 1 is spatially close and similar in nature to a behavior that is categorized in Octant 2; however, a behavior that is categorized in Octant 1 is spatially remote and quite dis-similar in nature to a behavior that is categorized in Octant 5.

The circular continuum may be thought of as a two-dimensional grid in which the vertical axis measures the

degree of dominance or submission in the behavior, and the horizontal axis measures the degree of love (affiliation) or hate (opposition) in the behavior. The center of the grid represents the mean of the normative population; therefore, the direction (from the center of the grid) of the summary point for a behavior reflects the quality or theme of the behavior, and the distance (from the center of the grid) of the summary point for a behavior reflects the intensity, or the degree of deviation from the normative population.

The vertical and horizontal axes of the grid intersect to form quadrants. Behavior categorized in any of the quadrants of the grid may be thought of as "blends" of two dichotomies: love versus hate, and power versus weakness. It has been noted (Leary, 1957, pp. 71-72) that behavior categorized in each of the quadrants has a counterpart in the four behaviors described by Hippocrates. Behavior categorized in the upper-left quadrant (hostile strength) equates with the choleric temperament; behavior categorized in the lower-left quadrant (hostile weakness) corresponds to the melancholic temperament; behavior categorized in the lower-right quadrant (friendly weakness) is similar to the phlegmatic temperament; and behavior categorized in the upper-right quadrant (friendly strength) is like the sanguine temperament.

Level II of the Interpersonal System of Personality was used to determine if the mothers and fathers of young persons who had abused drugs differed from the mothers and fathers of young persons who had not abused drugs, with respect to their self-descriptions, their descriptions of each other, and their descriptions of their children. Level V was used to determine if the mothers and fathers of young persons who had abused differed from the mothers and fathers of young persons who had not abused drugs, with respect to their descriptions of their ego ideal.

Test Instrument Used

The Interpersonal Check List (ICL) was used to obtain descriptions from all subjects at Level II, the way a person sees himself and others, and at Level V, the ideals that a person consciously holds. The ICL is so designed that 16 items are included to measure behavior categorized in each of the eight behavior themes, making a total of 128 items that may be checked. Each subject was asked to go through the complete list each time he made a description, and to select those items that pertained to the person he had been asked to describe.

The ICL was devised to be used in conjunction with the Interpersonal System of Personality (Leary, 1956, 1957), and it has been used to study a variety of subjects, such

as: psychiatric groups (Leary, 1956, 1957); alcoholics (Gynther, Presher, & McDonald, 1959); prison inmates (Gynther, & McDonald, 1961); seminarians (Gynther, & Kempson, 1962); parents of emotionally disturbed children (McDonald, 1962); medical students (McDonald, 1962); and young drug abusers (Schoolar et al, 1971).

Test-retest reliability correlations reported on 77 subjects (LaForge, & Suczek, 1955) for ICL items pertaining to each octant on the diagnostic grid are: Octant 1, .76; Octant 2, .76; Octant 3, .81; Octant 4, .73; Octant 5, .78; Octant 6, .83; Octant 7, .75; and Octant 8, .80. Interoctant correlations for ICL items reported on the same subjects include the following: items pertaining to one octant correlated with items pertaining to an adjacent octant, .51; items pertaining to one octant correlated with items pertaining to another octant, when there is one space between the octants, .37; items pertaining to one octant correlated with items pertaining to another octant, when there are two spaces between the two octants, .22; and items pertaining to one octant correlated with items pertaining to another octant, when there are three spaces between the two octants, .12. Because the correlations progressively decreased as the distance between two octants progressively increased, it was thought (LaForge, & Suczek, 1955) that a circular continuum (such as the diagnostic

grid) could be used successfully to describe the degree of relationship between the eight behavior themes.

Ethical Considerations Afforded Subjects

In keeping with professional standards for experimentation with persons, a statement of ethical considerations afforded all subjects was read prior to each person's participation in the study. The complete statement appears in Appendix A - Statement of Ethical Considerations.

Scoring of the Test Instrument

In accordance with the nomenclature used by the Interpersonal System of Personality (Leary, 1957), descriptions of self, spouse, and child were Level II descriptions, and descriptions of imaginary ideal persons were Level V descriptions. The four descriptions made by each subject at Level II, and the abbreviated designation that each description was given, included the following:

1. Description of self (II-S).
2. Description of the child seen in the context of the home (II-C-h).
3. Description of spouse (II-Sp).
4. Description of the child seen in the context of being away from the home (II-C-a).

The one description made by each subject at Level V,

his or her description of an imaginary ideal person, was similarly designated V-Id.

In scoring the test instrument, a summary point was plotted for each Level II description, and for each Level V description. The summary point for any description was thought of as the location on the diagnostic grid that "bunched up" or summarized all the ICL items that had been chosen by the subject in making that description.

Statistical Analyses of Data

Three methods of interpretation of summary points for descriptions were employed in this study: by similarity or dis-similarity of descriptions, by quadrant themes, and by behavior themes. The three methods had several things in common: (a) each dealt with two or more nominal categories; (b) the data for each method consisted of a frequency count that was tabulated and placed in appropriate categories; and (c) there was no immediately obvious way to assign an expected frequency value to each category. To accommodate the factors inherent in the use of the three methods, the χ^2 (*Chi*-square) Test of the Independence of Categorical Variables was used. For purposes of computations, the following formula was used:

$$\chi^2 = \sum \left[\frac{(fo - fe)^2}{fe} \right]$$

, with *fo* representing the obtained frequency for each category, and *fe* representing

the expected frequency for each category.

Analysis of data by similarity and dis-similarity of descriptions. After a summarization for the similarity or dis-similarity of the ten operational comparisons of descriptions had been made for the 26 members of the experimental group, *chi*-square analysis was used to determine if the obtained distribution differed significantly from an expected or chance distribution. Since there were two independent categories (high discrepancy or low discrepancy, adjacency or non-adjacency of octants) in which the summary points might fall, one degree of freedom was employed for use of the *chi*-square tables; that is, $df = 2 - 1 = 1$. The same procedure was used for the operational comparison of descriptions made by the 26 members of the control group. *Chi*-square analysis was then used to see if the two groups differed significantly from each other in respect to the operational comparison of descriptions.

Analysis of data by quadrant themes. After the summary points for the five respective descriptions made by each of the 26 subjects in the experimental group had been categorized and summed according to quadrants, *chi*-square analysis was used to determine if the obtained distribution departed significantly from an expected or chance distribution. Since there were four independent categories (each of

the quadrants) in which the summary points might fall, three degrees of freedom were employed for use of the *chi*-square tables; that is, $df = 4 - 1 = 3$. The same procedure was used for the five respective descriptions given by the 26 members of the control group. *Chi*-square analysis was then used to see if the two groups differed significantly from each other in respect to the quadrant themes (or love vs. hate and dominance vs. weakness blends) used for their respective descriptions.

Analysis of data by behavior themes or octants. After the summary points for the five respective descriptions made by each of the 26 subjects in the experimental group had been categorized and summed according to octants, *chi*-square analysis was used to determine if the obtained distribution departed significantly from an expected or chance distribution. Since there were eight independent categories (each of the octants) in which the summary points might fall, seven degrees of freedom were used: $df = 8 - 1 = 7$. The same procedure was used for the five respective descriptions provided by the 26 members of the control group. *Chi*-square anlysis was then used to see if the two groups differed significantly from each other in respect to behavior or octant themes utilized for their respective descriptions.

Limitations

When the researched began the study, it was believed that approximately 50 sets of parents (mothers and fathers) of young drug abusers would accept the invitation to participate. A big majority of the parents so invited did participate; however, the number of young persons who presented themselves for drug abuse treatment dropped sharply soon after the research began, due to policy changes in the federal government's regulation of methadone (a heroin substitute) maintenance programs for addicts. The number of parents attending weekly meetings dropped correspondingly, leaving fewer persons to be issued invitations.

For analytical purposes, the experimental group was considered to be 26 persons, without regard to whether such persons were mothers or fathers. The control group likewise was considered to be 26 persons, without regard to motherhood or fatherhood.

Chapter IV

The Results

The primary purpose of this study was to determine if the mothers and fathers of young persons who had abused drugs differed from the mothers and fathers of young persons who had not abused drugs, with respect to their self-descriptions, their attitudes toward each other, and their attitudes toward their children.

To ascertain such possible differences, the 26 subjects in the experimental group (the mothers and fathers of young persons who had abused drugs) and the 26 subjects in the control group (the mothers and fathers of young persons who had not abused drugs) were each asked to use the ICL to describe themselves (II-S), their young person seen in the context of the home (II-C-h), their spouse (II-Sp), their young person seen in the context of being away from the home (II-C-a), and their imaginary ideal person (V-Id).

For each of the five descriptions made by each subject, a summary point was calculated; this, in effect, "bunched up" all the ICL items that had been chosen by the subject in making a particular description. Distributions of summary points for the five descriptions made by members of each group were established; this was accomplished by categorizing the summary points according to each of three methods:

by similarity or dis-similarity of descriptions, by quadrant themes, and by behavior or octant themes. For each of the three methods of categorization, *chi*-square analysis was used to determine if the distribution of summary points for the experimental group and for the control group differed significantly from chance expectancy. Also, *chi*-square analysis was used to determine if the distribution of summary points for descriptions made by members of the experimental group differed significantly from the distribution of summary points for corresponding descriptions made by members of the control group.

Similar and Dis-similar Descriptions

Descriptions of self (II-S) and imaginary ideal (V-Id). The distribution of summary points, categorized according to operational definitions, indicated (see Table 3) that 73% of the mothers and fathers of drug abusers described themselves in a manner that was dis-similar to the way they described their imaginary ego ideal, while the remaining 27% made similar descriptions of themselves and their ego ideals. In keeping with the operational definitions that had been established for similar and dis-similar descriptions, 73% of the mothers and fathers of drug abusers *rejected self*, while the remaining 27% *accepted self*. This ratio did not significantly differ from chance prediction,

as noted in Table 4 [$p(\chi^2_{df:1} \geq 0.99)$N.S.].

As indicated in Table 3, 62% of the mothers and fathers of non-abusers *rejected self* (or gave dis-similar descriptions of themselves and their ego ideals), while 38% *accepted self* (or described themselves and their ego ideals in similar manners). This ratio among the mothers and fathers of non-abusers did not depart significantly from chance expectancy [$p(\chi^2_{df:1} \geq 0.01)$N.S.], as noted in Table 5. And, even though more mothers and fathers of non-abusers accepted themselves (38%) than did the mothers and fathers of drug abusers (27%), the two distributions of summary points, categorized according to operational definitions, did not significantly differ from each other [$p(\chi^2_{df:1} \geq 1.20)$N.S.], as presented in Table 6.

Descriptions of self (II-S) and child seen in the context of the home (II-C-h). Twenty-five percent of the mothers and fathers of drug abusers described themselves in a manner similar to the way they described their abuser child, as the child was seen in the context of the home. In operational terms, 25% *identified* their child's behavior in the home with their own behavior; the remaining 75%, who gave dis-similar descriptions of themselves and the child as he was seen in the home, *dis-identified* their

Table 3

Summary Points, Categorized According to the Operational Definitions of Similarity and Dis-similarity, for Descriptions Made by Members of the Experimental and Control Groups of Self (II-S), Ego Ideal (V-Id), Child at Home (II-C-h), Spouse (II-Sp), and Child Away from Home (II-C-a), Expressed in Numbers and Percentages

Similarity or dis-similarity of descriptions compared, and the nomenclature used	Results obtained from experimental and control groups	
	Experimental group	Control group
Similarity of II-S and V-Id *Accepted self*	7 (27%)	10 (38%)
Dis-similarity of II-S and V-Id *Rejected self*	19 (73%) (100%)	16 (62%) (100%)
Similarity of II-S and II-C-h *Identified with child at home*	7 (25%)	20 (71%)
Dis-similarity of II-S and II-C-h *Dis-identified with child at home*	21 (75%) (100%)	8 (29%) (100%)
Similarity of II-S and II-Sp *Identified with spouse*	16 (62%)	14 (54%)
Dis-similarity of II-S and II-Sp *Dis-identified with spouse*	10 (38%) (100%)	12 (46%) (100%)
Similarity of II-S and II-C-a *Identified with child away from home*	14 (50%)	22 (79%)
Dis-similarity of II-S and II-C-a *Dis-identified with child away from home*	14 (50%) (100%)	6 (21%) (100%)

Table 3 - Continued

Similarity or dis-similarity of descriptions compared, and the nomenclature used	Results obtained from experimental and control groups	
	Experimental group	Control group
Similarity of II-C-h and II-C-a *Saw similarity of behavior of child at home and away*	17 (61%)	24 (86%)
Dis-similarity of II-C-h and II-C-a *Saw dis-similarity of behavior of child at home and away*	11 (39%) (100%)	4 (14%) (100%)
Similarity of II-C-h and II-Sp *Equated child at home with spouse*	4 (14%)	20 (71%)
Dis-similarity of II-C-h and II-Sp *Dis-equated child at home with spouse*	24 (86%) (100%)	8 (29%) (100%)
Similarity of II-C-a and II-Sp *Equated child away from home with spouse*	11 (39%)	21 (75%)
Dis-similarity of II-C-a and II-Sp *Dis-equated child away from home with spouse*	17 (61%) (100%)	7 (25%) (100%)
Similarity of V-Id and II-C-h *Idealized child at home*	13 (46%)	9 (32%)
Dis-similarity of V-Id and II-C-h *Devaluated child at home*	15 (54%) (100%)	19 (68%) (100%)

Table 3 - Concluded

Similarity or dis-similarity of descriptions compared, and the nomenclature used	Results obtained from experimental and control groups	
	Experimental group	Control group
Similarity of V-Id and II-Sp *Idealized spouse*	8 (31%)	10 (38%)
Dis-similarity of V-Id and II-Sp *Devaluated spouse*	18 (69%) (100%)	16 (62%) (100%)
Similarity of V-Id and II-C-a *Idealized child away from home*	10 (36%)	8 (29%)
Dis-similarity of V-Id and II-C-a *Devaluated child away from home*	18 (64%) (100%)	20 (71%) (100%)

own behavior with that of the abuser child as he was seen in the context of the home. This ratio (see Table 4) did not significantly depart from chance prediction or expectancy [$p(\chi^2_{df:1} \geq 1.87)$N.S.].

As noted in Table 3, 71% of the mothers and fathers of non-abusers *identified* their child's behavior, as the child was seen in the context of the home, with their own behavior (that is, they gave similar descriptions of their child's behavior at home and their own), while 29% *dis-identified* their behavior with that of the child as he

was seen in the context of the home (that is, the two descriptions were dis-similar). Chance expectancy predicted that only 37.5% of the mothers and fathers would identify their child's behavior at home with their own behavior; therefore, as noted in Table 5, the ratio of mothers and fathers of non-abusers who identified and dis-identified with the child as he was seen in the home differed significantly from chance expectancy [$p(\chi^2_{df:1} \geq 13.75) < .001$]. Moreover, because the percentage of mothers and fathers in the control group who identified with their child as he was seen in the home (71%) was so much higher than the corresponding percentage for mothers and fathers in the experimental group (25%), the two distributions of summary points, categorized according to operational definitions, differed significantly from each other, as presented in Table 6 [$p(\chi^2_{df:1} \geq 12.08) < .001$].

Descriptions of self (II-S) and spouse (II-Sp). Sixty-two percent of the mothers and fathers of drug abusers described themselves in a manner similar to the way that they described their spouse (see Table 3), while the other 38% gave dis-similar descriptions of themselves and their spouse. In operational terms, 62% *identified* their own behavior with that of the spouse, while 38% *dis-identified* their behavior with that of the spouse. As shown in

Table 4

Use of *Chi*-square Test to Determine if the Distribution of Summary Points, Categorized According to Operational Definitions of Similarity and Dis-similarity, for Descriptions Made by Members of the Experimental Group of Self (II-S), Spouse (II-Sp), Child at Home (II-C-h), Child Away from Home (II-C-a), and Ego Ideal (V-Id) Significantly Differed from the Chance Distribution of Summary Points Expected for the Same Descriptions

Comparison of similar descriptions and operational definitions used	Application of *Chi*-square, using 1 degree of freedom	
	χ^2	*p*
Similarity of II-S and V-Id *Accepted self*	0.99	N.S.
Similarity of II-S and II-C-h *Identified with child at home*	1.87	N.S.
Similarity of II-S and II-Sp *Identified with spouse*	5.79	<.02
Similarity of II-S and II-C-a *Identified with child away*	1.86	N.S.
Similarity of II-C-h and II-C-a *Saw similarity of child at home and away from home*	6.43	<.02
Similarity of II-C-h and II-Sp *Equated child at home with spouse*	6.43	<.02
Similarity of II-C-a and II-Sp *Equated child away with spouse*	0.03	N.S.
Similarity of V-Id and II-C-h *Idealized child at home*	0.96	N.S.
Similarity of V-Id and II-Sp *Idealized spouse*	0.35	N.S.
Similarity of V-Id and II-C-a *Idealized child away from home*	0.03	N.S.

Table 4, this ratio differed significantly from chance expectancy [$p(\chi^2_{df:1} \geq 5.79) < .02$].

As noted in Table 3, 54% of the mothers and fathers of non-abusers *identified* their behavior with that of the spouse (that is, they gave similar descriptions of their and their spouse's behavior), while 46% *dis-identified* their behavior with that of the spouse (that is, the two descriptions were dis-similar). This ratio did not depart significantly from chance expectancy [$p(\chi^2_{df:1} \geq 2.55)$N.S.], as shown in Table 5. Also, although more mothers and fathers of drug abusers identified with their spouse (62%) than did the mothers and fathers of non-abusers (54%), the two distributions of summary points, categorized according to operational definitions, did not differ significantly from each other, as noted in Table 6 [$p(\chi^2_{df:1} \geq 0.32)$N.S.].

Descriptions of self (II-S) and child seen in the context of being away from the home (II-C-a). Fifty percent of the mothers and fathers of drug abusers described themselves in a manner similar to the way they described their abuser child, when the latter was seen in the context of being away from the home (see Table 3). In operational terms, 50% *identified* their child's behavior when he was seen outside the home with their own behavior, while the

Table 5

Use of *Chi*-square Test to Determine if the Distribution of Summary Points, Categorized According to Operational Definitions of Similarity and Dis-similarity, for Descriptions Made by Members of the Control Group of Self (II-S), Spouse (II-Sp), Child at Home (II-C-h), Child Away from Home (II-C-a), and Ego Ideal (V-Id) Significantly Differed from the Chance Distribution of Summary Points Expected for the Same Descriptions

Comparison of similar descriptions and operational definitions used	Application of *Chi*-square, using 1 degree of freedom	
	χ^2	*p*
Similarity of II-S and V-Id *Accepted self*	0.01	N.S.
Similarity of II-S and II-C-h *Identified with child at home*	13.75	<.001
Similarity of II-S and II-Sp *Identified with spouse*	2.55	N.S.
Similarity of II-S and II-C-a *Identified with child away*	20.16	<.001
Similarity of II-C-h and II-C-a *Saw similarity of child at home and away from home*	27.77	<.001
Similarity of II-C-h and II-Sp *Equated child at home with spouse*	13.75	<.001
Similarity of II-C-a and II-Sp *Equated child away with spouse*	16.80	<.001
Similarity of V-Id and II-C-h *Idealized child at home*	0.34	N.S.
Similarity of V-Id and II-Sp *Idealized spouse*	0.07	N.S.
Similarity of V-Id and II-C-a *Idealized child away from home*	0.95	N.S.

remaining 50% *dis-identified* the two behaviors. This ratio, as presented in Table 4, did not significantly depart from chance expectancy [$p(\chi^2_{df:1} \geq 1.86)$N.S.].

As shown in Table 15, 79% of the mothers and fathers of non-abusers *identified* the behavior of the child when he was seen outside the home with their own behavior (that is, they gave similar descriptions of the child's behavior away from the home and their own behavior), while the other 21% *dis-identified* their behavior with the child's behavior away from the home (that is, the two descriptions were dissimilar). Chance expectancy predicted that only 37.5% of the mothers and fathers would identify their child's behavior away from the home with their own behavior; therefore, as noted in Table 5, the obtained ratio significantly differed from chance expectancy [$p(\chi^2_{df:1} \geq 20.16) < .001$]. Moreover, because the percentage of mothers and fathers in the control group who identified with their child as seen away from the home (79%) was considerably higher than the corresponding percentage for mothers and fathers in the experimental group (50%), the two distributions of summary points, categorized according to operational definition, differed significantly from each other [$p(\chi^2_{df:1} \geq 4.98) < .05$], as noted in Table 6.

Table 6

Use of *Chi*-square Test to Determine if the Distribution of Summary Points, Categorized According to Operational Definitions of Similarity and Dis-similarity, for Descriptions Made by Members of the Experimental Group of Self (II-S), Spouse (II-Sp), Child at Home (II-C-h), Child Away from Home (II-C-a), and Ego Ideal (V-Id) Differed Significantly from the Distribution of Summary Points for Corresponding Descriptions Made by Members of the Control Group

Comparison of similar descriptions and operational definitions used	Application of *Chi*-square, using 1 degree of freedom	
	χ^2	*p*
Similarity of II-S and V-Id *Accepted self*	1.20	N.S.
Similarity of II-S and II-C-h *Identified with child at home*	12.08	<.001
Similarity of II-S and II-Sp *Identified with spouse*	0.32	N.S.
Similarity of II-S and II-C-a *Identified with child away*	4.98	<.05
Similarity of II-C-h and II-C-a *Saw similarity of child at home and away from home*	3.60	<.10
Similarity of II-C-h and II-Sp *Equated child at home with spouse*	18.66	<.001
Similarity of II-C-a and II-Sp *Equated child away with spouse*	7.28	<.01
Similarity of V-Id and II-C-h *Idealized child at home*	1.20	N.S.
Similarity of V-Id and II-Sp *Idealized spouse*	0.18	N.S.
Similarity of V-Id and II-C-a *Idealized child away from home*	0.16	N.S.

Descriptions of child when seen in the home (II-C-h) and when seen away from the home (II-C-a). The distribution of summary points, categorized according to operational definitions, indicated that 61% of the mothers and fathers of drug abusers described their child's behavior at home in a manner that was similar to the way they described their child's behavior when he was seen outside the home, while the remaining 29% made dis-similar descriptions of their child's behavior as seen in the home and as seen away from the home (see Table 3). In operational terms, 61% saw a *similarity of behavior* when the child was seen at home and when he was seen away from home. Compared to the 61% of the mothers and fathers who made similar descriptions, chance expectancy predicted that only 37.5% would do so; as noted in Table 4, this constituted a significant departure from chance expectancy [$p(\chi^2_{df:1} \geq 6.43) < .02$].

As presented in Table 3, 86% of the mothers and fathers of non-abusers described a *similarity of behavior* in the child as he was seen in the home and as he was seen away from the home, while 14% described a *dis-similarity of behavior* (or gave dis-similar descriptions of the child as he was seen in the home and as he was seen outside the home). This ratio, as noted in Table 5, departed drastically from chance expectancy [$p(\chi^2_{df:1} \geq 27.77) < .001$]. However, since

the members of both the experimental and control groups made a higher percentage of similar descriptions than chance expectancy predicted, the difference between the distribution of summary points for the two groups was less significant [$p(\chi^2_{df:1} \geq 3.60) < .10$] than was the difference between either group and chance expectancy.

Descriptions of child as seen in the home (II-C-h) and spouse (II-Sp). Whereas chance expectancy predicted that 37.5% of the mothers and fathers of drug abusers would do so, only 14% made similar descriptions of their spouse and their child as he was seen in the home (see Table 3). That is, only 14% *equated* the behavior of the child as he was seen at home with the behavior of the spouse, while 86% *dis-equated* the two behaviors. As presented in Table 4, this ratio differed significantly from chance expectancy [$p(\chi^2_{df:1} \geq 6.43) < .02$].

An unusually high percentage (71%) of the mothers and fathers of non-abusers, as noted in Table 3, gave similar descriptions of their spouse and child as he was seen in the context of the home. In operational terms, 71% *equated* the behavior of their spouse with the behavior of the child as he was seen in the home, while the other 29% *dis-equated* the two behaviors. As shown in Table 5, this ratio differed

significantly from chance [$p(\chi^2_{df:1} \geq 13.75) < .001$]. Also, because the percentage of members in the experimental group who equated their spouse's behavior with the child as he was seen in the home was lower (14%) than chance expectancy, and because the percentage of members in the control group who equated the two behaviors was higher (71%) than chance expectancy, the distribution of summary points for the two groups, categorized according to operational definitions, differed more from each other (see Table 6) than either did from chance prediction or expectancy [$p(\chi^2_{df:1} \geq 18.66) < .001$].

Descriptions of child as seen away from home (II-C-a) and spouse (II-Sp). As presented in Table 3, 39% of the mothers and fathers of drug abusers similarly described their spouse's behavior and the behavior of the child as he was seen away from the home. In operational terms, 39% *equated* the behavior of the child as he was seen away from the home with the behavior of the spouse, while 61% *dis-equated* the two behaviors. This ratio did not depart significantly from chance expectancy, as noted in Table 4 [$p(\chi^2_{df:1} \geq 0.03)$N.S.].

Chance expectancy predicted that 37.5% of the mothers and fathers of non-abusers would give similar descriptions

of their spouse and their child as he was seen in the context of being away from the home; as noted in Table 3, however, an unusually high percentage (75%) did so. In operational terms, 75% *equated* the behavior of their spouse with the behavior of the child as he was seen away from the home, while the other 25% *dis-equated* the two behaviors. As shown in Table 5, this ratio significantly differed from chance expectancy [$p(\chi^2_{df:1} \geq 16.80) < .001$]. Moreover, the distribution of summary points for the two groups, categorized according to operational definitions, differed significantly from each other, as noted in Table 6 [$p(\chi^2_{df:1} \geq 7.28) < .01$].

Descriptions of imaginary ego ideal (V-Id) and the child as seen in the home (II-C-h). The distribution of summary points, categorized according to operational definitions, indicated (see Table 3) that 46% of the mothers and fathers of drug abusers described their imaginary ego ideal in a manner that was similar to the way they described their child as he was seen in the context of the home, while the remaining 54% gave dis-similar descriptions of the two behaviors. In operational terms, 46% of the mothers and fathers of drug abusers *idealized* the child's behavior in the home, while 54% *devaluated* the child's

behavior in the home. This ratio did not significantly differ from chance expectancy [$p(\chi^2_{df:1} \geq 0.96)$N.S.], as noted in Table 4.

Thirty-two percent (see Table 3) of the mothers and fathers of non-abusers gave similar descriptions of their imaginary ego ideal and their child as he was seen in the context of the home. In operational terms, 32% *idealized* their child's behavior at home, while the other 68% *devaluated* their child's behavior at home. This ratio did not differ significantly from chance expectancy, as shown in Table 5 [$p(\chi^2_{df:1} \geq 0.34)$N.S.]; and, even though more mothers and fathers of drug abusers idealized their child's behavior in the home (46%) than did the mothers and fathers of non-abusers (32%), the two distributions of summary points, categorized according to operational definitions, did not differ significantly from each other, as shown in Table 6 [$p(\chi^2_{df:1} \geq 0.35)$N.S.].

As noted in Table 3, 38% of the mothers and fathers of non-abusers *idealized* the behavior of their spouse (that is, they gave similar descriptions of their ego ideal and their spouse), and 62% *devaluated* the behavior of their spouse (that is, they gave dis-similar descriptions of their ego ideal and their spouse). This ratio did not significantly

depart from chance expectancy, as presented in Table 5 [$p(\chi^2_{df:1} \geq 0.07)$N.S.]. Also, although more mothers and fathers of non-abusers idealized their spouse's behavior (38%) than did the mothers and fathers of abuser (31%), the two distributions of summary points, categorized according to operational definitions, did not significantly differ from each other [$p(\chi^2_{df:1} \geq 0.18)$N.S.], as shown in Table 6.

Descriptions of imaginary ego ideal (V-Id) and the child seen away from the home (II-C-a). The distribution of summary points, categorized according to operational definitions, indicated (see Table 3) that 36% of the mothers and fathers of drug abusers described their imaginary ego ideal in a manner that was similar to the way they described their child as he was seen in the context of being away from the home, while the remaining 64% gave dis-similar descriptions. In operational terms, 36% of the mothers and fathers of drug abusers *idealized* their child's behavior as he was seen away from the home, while 64% *devaluated* the child's behavior as he was seen away from the home. This ratio did not depart significantly from chance expectancy, as noted in Table 4 [$p(\chi^2_{df:1} \geq 0.03)$N.S.].

Twenty-nine percent (see Table 3) of the mothers and

fathers of non-abusers gave similar descriptions of their imaginary ego ideal and their child as he was seen outside the home. In operational terms, 29% *idealized* their child's behavior away from the home, while the other 61% *devaluated* their child's behavior away from the home. This ratio (see Table 5) did not depart significantly from chance expectancy [$p(\chi^2_{df:1} \geq 0.95)$N.S.]; also, even though more mothers and fathers of drug abusers idealized their child's behavior outside the home (36%) than did the mothers and fathers of non-abusers (29%), the two distributions of summary points, categorized according to operational definitions, did not significantly differ from each other, as noted in Table 6 [$p(\chi^2_{df:1} \geq 0.16)$N.S.].

Quadrant Themes

Descriptions of self (II-S). As shown in Table 7, both the experimental and control groups had high percentages of summary points that fell in Quadrants I and IV, both of which depicted strength. The distribution of summary points, categorized according to quadrant themes, for descriptions of self made by the mothers and fathers of drug abusers did not differ significantly from the distribution of summary points for the descriptions of self made by the mothers and fathers of non-abusers, as noted in Table 8 [$p(\chi^2_{df:3} \geq 0.40)$N.S.].

Table 7

Summary Points, Categorized According to Quadrant Themes, for Descriptions Made by Members of the Experimental and Control Groups of Self (II-S), Ego Ideal (V-Id), Child at Home (II-C-h), Spouse (II-Sp), and Child Away from Home (II-C-a), Expressed in Numbers and Percentages

Quadrant and Theme		Description				
		Experimental Group				
		II-S	V-Id	II-C-h	II-Sp	II-C-a
I.	hostile strength	7 (27%)	5 (19%)	8 (29%)	10 (38%)	10 (36%)
II.	hostile weakness	2 (8%)	10 (38%)	15 (54%)	2 (8%)	5 (18%)
III.	friendly weakness	2 (8%)	3 (12%)	2 (7%)	0 (0%)	6 (21%)
IV.	friendly strength	15 (57%)	8 (31%)	3 (10%)	14 (54%)	7 (25%)
		N 26	*N* 26	*N* 28	*N* 26	*N* 28
		Control Group				
		II-S	V-Id	II-C-h	II-Sp	II-C-a
I.	hostile strength	8 (31%)	8 (31%)	20 (71%)	13 (50%)	12 (43%)
II.	hostile weakness	2 (8%)	5 (19%)	0 (0%)	2 (8%)	0 (0%)
III.	friendly weakness	3 (11%)	9 (35%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)
IV.	friendly strength	13 (50%)	4 (15%)	8 (29%)	11 (42%)	15 (53%)
		N 26	*N* 26	*N* 28	*N* 26	*N* 28

Table 8

Use of *Chi*-square Test to Determine if the Distribution of Summary Points, Categorized According to Quadrant Themes, for Each Description Made by Members of the Experimental Group Significantly Differed from the Distribution of Summary Points for Each Description Made by Members of the Control Group

Description made	Application of *Chi*-square, using 3 degrees of freedom	
	χ^2	*p*
Self (II-S)	0.40	N.S.
Ego Ideal (V-Id)	6.69	N.S.
Child at Home (II-C-h)	24.42	<.001
Spouse (II-Sp)	0.76	N.S.
Child Away from Home (II-C-a)	11.66	<.01

Descriptions of imaginary ego ideal (V-Id). Both the experimental and control groups had summary points that fell fairly evenly in all four quadrants. The distribution of summary points, categorized according to quadrant themes, for the descriptions of an imaginary ideal person made by the mothers and fathers of drug abusers did not differ significantly from the distribution of summary points for the corresponding descriptions made by the mothers and father of non-abusers [$p(\chi^2_{df:3} \geq 6.69)$N.S.], as presented in Table 8.

Descriptions of the child as seen in the context of the home (II-C-h). The mothers and fathers of drug abusers stressed the presence of the hostile weakness theme (Quadrant II), and the absence of the friendly weakness theme (Quadrant III), as noted in Table 7; the mothers and fathers of non-abusers stressed the presence of the hostile strength theme (Quadrant I), and the absence of the hostile weakness (Quadrant II) and friendly weakness (Quadrant III) themes. The distribution of summary points for the experimental group's descriptions of the child as he was seen in the home differed significantly from the distribution of summary points for the corresponding descriptions made by members of the control group [$p(\chi^2_{df:3} \geq 24.42) < .001$], as noted in Table 8.

Descriptions of spouse (II-Sp). The experimental and control groups each had unusually high percentages of summary points that fell in the two strength themes (Quadrants I and IV), as shown in Table 7. The distribution of summary points for the experimental group's descriptions of spouse, categorized according to quadrant themes, did not differ significantly (see Table 8) from the distribution of summary points for the descriptions of spouse made by members of the control group [$p(\chi^2_{df:3} \geq 0.76)$N.S.].

Descriptions of the child as seen in the context of being away from the home (II-C-a). The summary points for the descriptions made by members of the experimental group fell fairly evenly in all four themes or quadrants (see Table 7), whereas unusually high percentages of summary points for the descriptions made by members of the control group fell in the two strength themes (Quadrants I and IV). The distribution of summary points for the experimental group's descriptions of the child as he was seen in the context of being away from home, categorized according to quadrant themes, differed significantly from the distribution of summary points for the corresponding descriptions made by members of the control group, as noted in Table 8 [$p(\chi^2_{df:3} \geq 11.66) < .01$].

The departure or non-departure from chance expectancy for the distribution of summary points for each description made by members of the experimental and control groups are presented in Appendix B - Quadrant Themes.

Octants or Behavioral Themes

Descriptions of self (II-S). The bulk of the summary points for descriptions of self made by the experimental group fell in Octants 1, 2, and 8 (see Table 9), while the bulk of the summary points for descriptions of self made by

Table 9

Summary Points, Categorized According to Behavior Themes, for Descriptions Made by Members of the Experimental Group of Self (II-S), Ego Ideal (V-Id), Child at Home (II-C-h), Spouse (II-Sp), and Child Away from Home (II-C-a), Expressed in Numbers and in Percentages

Octant and Theme	Descriptions				
	II-S	V-Id	II-C-h	II-Sp	II-C-a
1. managerial - autocratic theme	8 (30%)	3 (12%)	0 (0%)	11 (42%)	6 (21%)
2. competitive - exploitive theme	3 (12%)	2 (8%)	0 (0%)	6 (23%)	5 (18%)
3. blunt - aggressive theme	0 (0%)	3 (12%)	11 (39%)	4 (15%)	4 (14%)
4. skeptical - distrustful theme	1 (4%)	5 (18%)	10 (35%)	1 (4%)	3 (11%)
5. modest - self-effacing theme	2 (8%)	6 (23%)	3 (11%)	0 (0%)	4 (14%)
6. docile - dependent theme	1 (4%)	2 (8%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)
7. cooperative - overconventional theme	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	3 (11%)
8. responsible - overgenerous theme	10 (38%)	4 (15%)	3 (11%)	3 (12%)	2 (7%)
	N 26	*N* 26	*N* 28	*N* 26	*N* 28

the control group (see Table 10) fell in Octants 1, 2, and 8. The statistical difference between the two groups was non-significant [$p(\chi^2_{df:7} \geq 12.66)$N.S.], as presented in Table 11.

Descriptions of an imaginary ego ideal (V-Id). The summary points for the descriptions made by both the experimental and control groups of an imaginary ego ideal fell fairly evenly among the octants or behavioral themes. The distribution of summary points for the description of an imaginary ideal person made by the mothers and fathers of drug abusers did not differ significantly from the distribution of summary points for the description of an imaginary ideal person made by the mothers and fathers of non-abusers [$p(\chi^2_{df:7} \geq 11.16)$N.S.], as noted in Table 11.

Descriptions of the child as seen in the context of the home (II-C-h). In describing the child as seen in the context of the home, the experimental group stressed the presence of the blunt - aggressive (39%) and skeptical - distrustful (35%) themes, and the absence of the managerial - autocratic (0%), competitive - exploitive (0%), and cooperative - overconventional (0%) themes, as noted in Table 9. In making the corresponding description, the mothers and fathers of non-abusers (see Table 10) stressed

Table 10

Summary Points, Categorized According to Behavior Themes, for Descriptions Made by Members of the Control Group of Self (II-S), Ego Ideal (V-Id), Child at Home (II-C-h), Spouse (II-Sp), and Child Away from Home (II-C-a), Expressed in Numbers and in Percentages

Octant and Theme	Descriptions				
	II-S	V-Id	II-C-h	II-Sp	II-C-a
1. managerial - autocratic theme	11 (42%)	1 (4%)	8 (29%)	12 (46%)	14 (50%)
2. competitive - exploitive theme	5 (19%)	2 (8%)	11 (39%)	8 (30%)	9 (32%)
3. blunt - aggressive theme	0 (0%)	7 (27%)	4 (14%)	2 (8%)	0 (0%)
4. skeptical - distrustful theme	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)
5. modest - self-effacing theme	1 (4%)	3 (11%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
6. docile - dependent theme	2 (8%)	4 (15%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
7. cooperative - overconventional theme	4 (15%)	6 (23%)	2 (7%)	1 (4%)	2 (7%)
8. responsible - overgenerous theme	2 (8%)	2 (8%)	3 (11%)	2 (8%)	3 (11%)
	N 26	*N* 26	*N* 28	*N* 26	*N* 28

the presence of the competitive - exploitive (39%) and managerial - autocratic (29%) themes, and the absence of the skeptical - distrustful (0%), modest - self-effacing (0%), and docile - dependent (0%) themes. The distribution of summary points for the description of the child, seen in the context of the home, by the mothers and fathers of drug abusers differed significantly from the distribution of summary points for the corresponding description made by the mothers and fathers of non-abusers, as shown in Table 11 [$p(\chi^2_{df:7} \geq 38.26) < .001$].

Descriptions of spouse (II-Sp). In describing their spouses (see Table 9), the experimental group stressed the presence of the managerial - autocratic (42%) and competitive - exploitive (23%) themes, and the absence of the modest - self-effacing (0%) and docile - dependent (0%) themes. In describing their spouses (see Table 10), the control group similarly stressed the presence of the managerial - autocratic (46%) and competitive - exploitive (30%) themes, and the absence of the modest - self-effacing (0%) and docile - dependent (0%) themes. Consequently, the distribution of summary points for descriptions of spouse made by the mothers and fathers of drug abusers did not significantly differ from the distribution of summary points for the corresponding description made by the

Table 11

Use of *Chi*-square Test to Determine if the Distribution of Summary Points, Categorized According to Behavior Themes, for Each Description Made by Members of the Experimental Group Significantly Differed from the Distribution of Summary Points for Each Description Made by Members of the Control Group

Description made	Application of *Chi*-square, using 7 degrees of freedom	
	χ^2	*p*
Self (II-S)	12.66	N.S.
Ego Ideal (V-Id)	11.16	N.S.
Child at Home (II-C-h)	38.26	<.001
Spouse (II-Sp)	1.39	N.S.
Child Away from Home (II-C-a)	16.74	<.02

mothers and fathers of non-abusers, as shown in Table 11 [$p(\chi^2_{df:7} \geq 1.39)$N.S.].

Descriptions of the child as seen in the context of being away from the home (II-C-a). The summary points for the experimental group's descriptions of the child as seen away from home fell fairly evenly among the octants or behavioral themes, as noted in Table 9. The summary points for the control group's descriptions of the child as seen away from the home heavily stressed the managerial - autocratic (50%) and competitive - exploitive (32%) themes (see

Table 10). The distribution of summary points for the descriptions of the young person, seen in the context of being away from the home, made by the mothers and fathers of drug abusers differed significantly from the distribution of summary points for the corresponding descriptions made by the mothers and fathers of non-abusers, as shown in Table 11 [$p(\chi^2_{df:7} \geq 16.74) < .02$].

The departure or non-departure from chance expectancy for the distribution of summary points, categorized according to octants or behavioral themes, for each description made by members of the experimental and control groups are presented in Appendix C - Octants or Behavioral Themes.

Chapter V

The Summary

Discussion

The primary purpose of this study was to determine if the mothers and fathers of young persons who had abused drugs differed from the mothers and fathers of young persons who had not abused drugs, with respect to their self-descriptions, their attitudes toward each other, and their attitudes toward their children. Because the emotional problems of young drug abusers were assumed to be related to parental and familial adjustments, it seemed important to the investigator that several factors be evaluated.

One of the factors open to study concerned the matter of self-acceptance. It seemed reasonable that the mothers and fathers of young drug abusers would show less self-acceptance than would the mothers and fathers of non-abusers. This conjecture was predicated on the possibility that the depression, tension, and feelings of inadequacy that had been ascribed to young drug abusers (Laskowitz, 1961; Lombardi, & Angers, 1967; Gilbert, & Lombardi, 1967) might have been reflections of the notions that the mothers and fathers of the abusers had held of themselves. To investigate this, *Hypothesis 1* was formulated: *Mothers and fathers*

of young persons who do not abuse drugs show self-acceptance more frequently than do the mothers and fathers of young persons who abuse drugs.

Evidence obtained from the study did not lend credence to the hypothesis. Although a higher percentage of the mothers and fathers of non-abusers described themselves as being self-accepting (38%) than did the mothers and fathers of drug abusers (27%), neither group departed significantly from chance expectancy, nor did the groups differ significantly from each other in respect to self-acceptance [$p(\chi^2_{df:1} \geq 1.20)$N.S.].

Another element that warranted research related to the matter of identification between parents. The investigator believed that the mothers and fathers of young drug abusers would show conscious identification with the spouse less often than would the mothers and fathers of non-abusers. This supposition rested on the possibility that the typical frustration and anger toward parents that had been ascribed to the young drug abuser (Blacker, Jones, Stone, & Pfefferbaum, 1968) might have resulted from the fact that the two parents had demonstrated widely disparate behaviors in their relationships with the abuser. In some instances, the parents might have acted consistently in opposite ways; that is, one parent might have tended to act aggressively,

while the other parent acted in a more conventional way. The anxiety presumably associated with determining which parent's behavior should be imitated could have been reflected in the drug abuser's inability to achieve a normal adjustment. To determine if this was true, *Hypothesis 2* was conjectured: *Mothers and fathers of young persons who do not abuse drugs show conscious identification with each other more frequently than do the mothers and fathers of young persons who abuse drugs.*

Evidence obtained from the study did not substantiate the hypothesis. Contrary to the provisional conjecture, a higher percentage of the mothers and fathers of abusers identified with each other (62%) than did the mothers and fathers of non-abusers (54%). Also, even though the mothers and fathers of abusers described identification with the spouse more often than chance expectancy predicted, the experimental and control groups did not differ significantly from each other in respect to identification with spouse $[p(\chi^2_{df:1} \geq 0.32)\text{N.S.}]$.

The parent's identification of the child's behavior with his own behavior was another factor considered in the study. To this investigator, it seemed reasonable to assume that the mothers and fathers of drug abusers would describe their child's behavior in a manner similar to the way that

they described their own behavior less frequently than would the mothers and fathers of non-abusers. This assumption was predicated on the probability that parents would describe, from their own point of view, that which had already been described from the abusers' point of view — an identity conflict between the abusers and their parents (Ausubel, 1961; Kleber, 1967; Blacker, Jones, Stone, & Pfefferbaum, 1968). For purposes of inquiry, *Hypothesis 3* was theorized: *Mothers and fathers of young persons who do not abuse drugs show conscious identification of their child's behavior with their own behavior more frequently than do the mothers and fathers of young persons who abuse drugs.*

Evidence obtained from the study strongly substantiated the hypothesis in each of two contexts. A much higher percentage of the mothers and fathers of non-abusers (71%) identified their child's behavior at home with their own than did the mothers and fathers of abusers (25%). While the experimental group did not depart significantly from chance prediction, the control group did; the percentage of mothers and fathers of non-abusers who identified their child's behavior in the context of the home with their own was significantly higher than the corresponding percentage for experimental group members [$p(\chi^2_{df:1} \geq 12.08) < .001$].

Similarly, a much higher percentage of the mothers and fathers of non-abusers (79%) identified their child's behavior away from the home with their own than did the mothers and fathers of abusers (50%). Whereas the experimental group did not significantly differ from chance expectancy, the control group did; the percentage of mothers and fathers of non-abusers who identified their child's behavior away from home with their own behavior was significantly higher than the corresponding percentage for the mothers and fathers of young persons who abused drugs [$p(\chi^2_{df:1} \geq 4.98) < .05$].

The parents' comparisons of the drug abusers' behavior as seen at home with their behavior as seen outside the home also warranted investigation. After he had attended several weekly meetings for parents of drug abusers, the investigator came to believe that the described behavior of the abuser at home might be quite unlike his described behavior outside the home. To test this notion, *Hypothesis 4* was arrived at: *When comparing a young person's behavior in the home with his behavior away from home, mothers and fathers of young persons who do not abuse drugs ascribe a similarity (or low discrepancy) between the two behaviors more frequently than do the mothers and fathers of young persons who abuse drugs.*

Evidence obtained from the study gave strong credence to the hypothesis. A much higher percentage of the mothers and fathers of non-abusers described a similarity in the child's behavior at home and his behavior away from home (86%) than did the mothers and fathers of abusers (61%). Although the percentage in the experimental group making similar descriptions of the two behaviors exceeded chance expectancy only slightly, the corresponding percentage for the control group members was very much higher than chance prediction. The percentage of mothers and fathers of non-abusers who described a similarity in their child's behavior at home and away from home was significantly higher than the corresponding percentage for the mothers and fathers of abusers [$p(\chi^2_{df:1} \geq 3.60) < .10$].

Another factor pertinent to the investigation concerned the supposed effect that the spouse might have on the young abuser's behavior. Because mankind often places real or supposed lack of responsibility on the shoulders of someone else, it seemed reasonable to this researcher that the parents of abusers would tend to blame the socially-undesirable behavior of the abuser on the spouse; that is, the parent would tend to see a direct connection or similarity between the behavior of the abuser and the behavior of the spouse. To test the validity of this speculation, *Hypothesis 5* was formulated: *Mothers and fathers of young persons*

who abuse drugs describe a spouse-child equation more frequently than do the mothers and fathers of young persons who do not abuse drugs.

Evidence obtained from the study strongly negated the hypothesis in each of two contexts. A much higher percentage of mothers and fathers of non-abusers described a spouse-child equation when the child's behavior was seen in the home (71%) than did the mothers and fathers of the abusers (14%). The experimental group percentage was significantly lower than chance prediction, while the control group percentage was significantly higher than chance expectancy. The percentage of mothers and fathers of non-abusers who described a spouse-child equation when the child was seen in the home was significantly higher than the corresponding percentage for the mothers and fathers of abusers [$p(\chi^2_{df:1} \geq 18.66) < .001$]. Similarly, the percentage of mothers and fathers of non-abusers who described a spouse-child equation when the child was seen outside the home (75%) was significantly higher than the corresponding percentage (39%) for mothers and fathers of young drug abusers [$p(\chi^2_{df:1} \geq 7.28) < .01$].

An additional element that invited investigation concerned the attitudes that parents of abusers might have toward their spouses. It seemed reasonable that parents

of abusers might consciously "run down" or devaluate their spouse, when they compared their marriage partner to their imaginary ideal person. This notion was based on the thought that the tension, frustration, and indecision that had been ascribed to young abusers (Laskowitz, 1961; Lombardi, & Angers, 1967; Gilbert, & Lombardi, 1967; Blacker, Jones, Stone, & Pfefferbaum, 1968; Levy, 1968) might have resulted in part from the parents' devaluation of each other in the presence of the child. To investigate this possibility, *Hypothesis 6* was conjectured: *Mothers and fathers of young persons who do not abuse drugs idealize the spouse more frequently than do the mothers and fathers of young persons who abuse drugs.*

Evidence obtained from the study did not substantiate the hypothesis. Although a higher percentage of the mothers and fathers of non-abusers idealized their spouse (38%) than did the mothers and fathers of abusers (31%), neither group departed significantly from chance expectancy, nor did the groups differ significantly from each other in respect to idealization of spouse [$p(\chi^2_{df:1} \geq 0.18)$N.S.].

The attitudes that parents of drug abusers might have toward the abuser child were also considered important to the study. After he had attended several weekly meetings for parents of abusers, the researcher came to believe that

the parents might be trying to live their lives vicariously through the abusers; if such were true, the parents of abusers would describe the abuser in much the same way that they would describe their imaginary ideal person, the latter serving as a projection of their own values. To ascertain if this speculation had merit, *Hypothesis 7* was theorized: *Mothers and fathers of young persons who abuse drugs idealize the child more frequently than do the mothers and fathers of young persons who do not abuse drugs.*

Evidence obtained from the study failed to substantiate the hypothesis in each of two contexts. Although a higher percentage of the mothers and fathers of drug abusers idealized the child's behavior as seen in the context of the home (46%) than did the mothers and fathers of non-abusers (32%), neither group departed significantly from chance expectancy, nor did the groups differ significantly from each other [$p(\chi^2_{df:1} \geq 0.34)$N.S.]. Similarly, a higher percentage of the mothers and fathers of drug abusers idealized the child's behavior as seen in the context of being away from the home (36%) than did the mothers and fathers of non-abusers (29%); however, neither group departed significantly from chance prediction, nor did the experimental and control groups differ significantly from each other [$p(\chi^2_{df:1} \geq 0.16)$N.S.].

Summary

Members of both the experimental and control groups described themselves as strong, socially-acceptable individuals whose personalities were characterized primarily by the managerial - autocratic, competitive - exploitive, and responsible - overgenerous behavior themes. Viewed in the light of behavior themes or strength-weakness themes, the mothers and fathers of drug abusers did not describe themselves in a way that differed significantly from the way that the mothers and fathers of non-abusers described themselves.

Also, members of both the experimental and control groups described their imaginary ideal persons in approximately the same manner; rather than following a specific pattern, the ideals held by each of the groups varied widely. Considered from the point of view of behavioral themes or strength-weakness themes, the results indicated that the mothers and fathers of drug abusers did not differ significantly from the mothers and fathers of non-abusers when they described their imaginary ideal persons.

Similarity between a subject's description of himself and his description of his imaginary ideal person was operationally defined as *self-acceptance.* When the descriptions of self were compared with the descriptions of

an imaginary ideal person, the members of both the experimental and control groups were seen to be predominantly self-rejecting; moreover, the number of mothers and fathers of drug abusers who were self-rejecting did not differ significantly from the number of mothers and fathers of non-abusers who were self-rejecting.

Members of both the experimental and control groups described their spouses as strong, socially-acceptable individuals whose personalities were characterized primarily by the managerial - autocratic and competitive - exploitive behavior themes. Seen in the light of behavior themes or strength-weakness themes, the results indicated that the mothers and fathers of drug abusers did not significantly differ from the mothers and fathers of non-abusers in the descriptions they made of their spouses.

Similarity between a subject's description of himself and his description of his spouse or child was operationally defined as *identification*. When descriptions of self were compared to descriptions of spouse, the majority of members in both the experimental and control groups identified their behavior with that of the spouse; moreover, the percentage of mothers and fathers of drug abusers who identified with their spouse did not significantly differ from the percentage of mothers and fathers of non-abusers who identified with their spouse.

Similarity between a subject's description of his imaginary ideal person and his description of spouse or child was operationally defined as *idealization*. Comparisons of descriptions of spouse with descriptions of imaginary ideal person indicated that the majority of both the experimental and control groups failed to idealize (devaluated) their spouse, and that the percentage of mothers and fathers of drug abusers who devaluated their spouse did not differ significantly from the percentage of mothers and fathers of non-abusers who devaluated their spouse.

In respect to their descriptions of self, imaginary ideal person, and spouse, the mothers and fathers of drug abusers did not differ significantly from the mothers and fathers of non-abusers; instances where the experimental and control groups did differ significantly related to their descriptions of the child.

Members of the experimental group described their abuser children, when viewed in the context of the home, as weak and hostile individuals whose personalities were characterized primarily by the blunt - aggressive and skeptical - distrustful behavior themes. Members of the control group described their non-abuser children, when seen in the context of the home, as strong and hostile individuals whose personalities were characterized by the

managerial - autocratic and the competitive - exploitive behavior themes. In respect to behavior themes and strength-weakness themes, the mothers and fathers of drug abusers described their abuser children, when seen in the context of the home, in a manner that differed significantly from the corresponding descriptions made by the mothers and fathers of non-abusers.

When the young persons were seen in the context of being away from the home, members of the experimental group did not describe their abuser children as fitting any particular behavioral pattern; rather, a variety of behavioral and strength-weakness themes were stressed. Members of the control group described their non-abuser children, seen in the context of being away from the home, as strong individuals whose personalities were characterized primarily by the managerial - autocratic and the competitive - exploitive behavior themes. Both in regard to behavior themes and strength-weakness themes, the mothers and fathers of drug abusers described their children, when viewed outside the home, in a way that differed significantly from the corresponding descriptions made by the mothers and fathers of non-abusers.

When descriptions of self were compared to descriptions of the child as seen in the context of the home, the majority of members in the control group identified

their non-abuser children's behavior with their own behavior, while the majority of members in the experimental group failed to identify their abuser children's behavior with their own. The percentage of mothers and fathers of non-abusers who identified with their children as seen in the context of the home was significantly higher than the percentage of mothers and fathers of drug abusers who identified with their abuser offsprings, as seen in the context of the home.

Similarly, when descriptions of the child as seen in the context of being outside the home were compared with descriptions of self, the majority of members in the control group identified their non-abuser children's behavior with their own behavior, while the majority of members in the experimental group did not. Again, the percentage of mothers and fathers of non-abusers who identified with their children as seen in the context of being away from the home was significantly higher than the percentage of mothers and fathers of abusers who identified with their abuser offsprings, as seen in the context of being outside the home.

Similarity between a subject's description of his child as seen at home and his description of his child as seen outside the home was operationally defined as a *similarity of behavior.* When the two descriptions of the

child were compared, the majority of members of each group described a similarity of behavior; however, the percentage of mothers and fathers of non-abusers who did so was significantly higher.

Similarity between a subject's description of his spouse and either of his descriptions of his child was operationally defined as a *spouse-child equation*. Comparisons of descriptions of spouse with each of the descriptions of the child indicated that a majority of the members of the control group equated their non-abuser offspring's behavior, both in and out of the home, with the behavior of the spouse; in neither context did the members of the experimental group describe a spouse-child equation. The percentage of spouse-child equations described by the mothers and fathers of non-abusers was significantly higher than the corresponding percentage for the mothers and fathers of drug abusers.

When comparisons of descriptions of an imaginary ego ideal were made with descriptions of the child, the majority of members of each group were seen to devaluate the child, whether the child was viewed in the context of the home or as being away from home; also, the percentage of mothers and fathers of drug abusers who devaluated their child in or out of the home was not significantly higher

than the percentage of mothers and fathers of non-abusers who did so.

Conclusions

As a result of the study, the investigator concluded that:

1. Parental self-acceptance appeared to be unrelated to the emotional problems of the drug abusers. In general, the mothers and fathers of abusers indicated no less (nor no more) self-acceptance than did the mothers and fathers of non-abusers.

2. Parental identification with spouse appeared to be unrelated to the emotional problems of the drug abusers. In general, the mothers and fathers of abusers showed no less (nor no more) identification with spouse than did the mothers and fathers of non-abusers.

3. Parental devaluation of spouse appeared to be unrelated to the emotional problems of the drug abuser. In general, the mothers and fathers of abusers indicated no more (nor no less) devaluation of spouse than did the mothers and fathers of non-abusers.

4. Parental devaluation of child appeared to be unrelated to the emotional problems of the drug abusers. In general, the mothers and fathers of drug abusers showed no

less (nor no more) devaluation of child than did the mothers and fathers of non-abusers.

5. The emotional problems of the drug abusers appeared to be related to a lack of consistency in their behavior. In general, the mothers and fathers of non-abusers described a consistency in the child's behavior, whether the child was seen in the context of being at home or away from home. On the other hand, the mothers and fathers of drug abusers generally described an inconsistency in the abuser's behavior. At home, the abuser was characterized by hostile weakness; but, away from the home, he was described as friendly and strong about as often as he was described as hostile and weak.

6. The emotional problems of the drug abusers appeared to be related to a lack of parental identification with the abuser's behavior. The mothers and fathers of non-abusers identified their child's behavior, both in and out of the home, with their own behavior significantly more than did the mothers and fathers of abusers; also, the mothers and fathers of non-abusers equated their child's behavior, both in and out of the home, with the behavior of the spouse significantly more than did the mothers and fathers of abusers.

The two factors that appeared to be related to the emotional problems of the drug abusers — inconsistency and

lack of parental identification with the child — have been incorporated into a common conclusion.

True, the behavior attributed to the non-abusers in the study was characterized by consistency. However, it was reasonable to assume that, in terms of the child's development, the non-abuser had first learned the behavior inside the home; then, more and more, he had come to use and reuse the behavior outside the home. Also, the behavior that the non-abuser had first learned in the home appeared to be a strong behavior — one for which he had received reinforcement both inside and outside the home. The assumption that the behavior of the non-abuser had been strongly reinforced inside the home was substantiated by two factors: first, by the high degree of similarity that the non-abuser's parent saw in the child's behavior and his own; and, second, by the high degree of similarity that the non-abuser's parent saw in the child's behavior and his spouse's behavior. Assuming that the parent's perceptions were accurate, it indicated that the child had learned to imitate and identify with not only one but both of his parents. For that, no doubt, he had received parental reinforcement.

Evidence obtained from the study indicated that such had not been the case with the abusers. The behavior ascribed to them was not characterized by consistency inside

and outside the home, although in the latter context the behavior was described as stronger, more friendly, and more like that of the non-abuser.

It was reasonable to assume that, in terms of the child's development, the weak behavior that was attributed to the drug abuser in the home had first been learned in the home, also. However, the behavior appeared not to have been learned through the dynamics of identification. That assumption was substantiated by two factors: first, by the low degree of similarity that the abuser's parent saw in the child's behavior and his own; and, second, by the low degree of similarity that the abuser's parent saw in the child's behavior and his spouse's behavior. Assuming that the parent's perceptions were accurate, it indicated that the child had not learned to imitate and identify with either parent, much less the two parents with which the non-abuser had learned to identify. For whatever reason the abuser had received parental reinforcement, it appeared not to have been for imitation or identification. Therefore, the behavior that the abuser had learned to use in the home appeared to be related to either or both of two explanations: (a) the mothers and fathers of abusers had knowingly or unknowingly reinforced a weak behavior, unlike their own behavior; and/or (b) the parents had failed to serve as a model with which the abuser consistently could

identify. The latter possibility appeared to be supported by the fact that the abuser had learned to use a behavior outside the home quite unlike the behavior he had learned to use inside the home; moreover, the behavior the abuser had learned to use outside the home was very much like the behavior that the non-abuser had learned to use inside and outside the home. The inevitable question arose: if the drug abuser had learned to use the same behavior outside the home that the non-abuser had learned to use outside the home, why had the abuser not learned to use the same type of more socially-acceptable behavior inside the home? It appeared that the cues for behavior-shaping that had been provided him by his parents were inadequate or inconsistent, or both.

Recommendations

The investigator sees two avenues of potentially fruitful research, each of which stems from questions left unanswered by this study.

1. *Does the parent of a drug abuser serve as a consistent model with which the child can identify?*

The mothers and fathers of drug abusers who participated in this study described their conscious ideals in much the same fashion they described themselves. That is,

they appeared to show no more unfulfilled goals than did the mothers and fathers of non-abusers. However, had the subjects' unconscious ideals been compared with their notions of themselves, the mothers and fathers of abusers might have shown more unfulfilled goals than the mothers and fathers of non-abusers. Common sense indicates that the greater the unfulfilled goals, the greater the inconsistency the parent would exhibit in his serving as a model for the child. That is, the greater the unfulfilled goals, the more likely the parent would be to vascillate between that which he felt he actually was and that which he really wanted to be. It might be that the parents of abusers unconsciously reinforce in the child a kind of behavior that they cannot consciously tolerate in themselves.

The possible difference between the unfulfilled goals of parents of abusers and the unfulfilled goals of the parents of non-abusers could be quantified through the use of projective techniques.

2. Given the same parents, do the abuser and non-abuser pick up and return similar emotional messages?

It would be helpful to know if a drug abuser picks up a parent's emotions in approximately the same manner that his non-abuser brother or sister does. Also, it would be equally helpful to know if a parent picks up the emotions of his abuser child in approximately the same manner that he picks

up the emotions of his non-abuser child.

These factors could be ascertained by use of video-tapes. For example, an emotionally-charged statement by a parent could be recorded and shown at different times to the abuser child and to the non-abuser child; then, the emotional messages that each received could be compared. A similar procedure could be used to ascertain if a parent can read the emotions of the abuser and the non-abuser equally well.

An adequate answer to either of the posed questions would constitute a considerable contribution toward understanding drug abuse among the young.

REFERENCES

Allen, J. R., & West, L. J. Flight from violence: hippies and the green rebellion. *American Journal of Psychiatry,* 1968, *125*(3), 365-370.

American Medical Association. Dependence on cannabis (marihuana). *Journal of the American Medical Association,* 1967, *201*(6), 368-371.

American Medical Association. Dependence on LSD and other hallucinogenic drugs. *Journal of the American Medical Association,* 1967, *202*(1), 47-50.

Ausubel, D. P. Causes and types of narcotic addiction: A psychosocial view. *Psychiatric Quarterly,* 1961, *35,* 523-531.

Bender, L. Drug addiction in adolescence. *Comprehensive Psychiatry,* 1963, *4*(3), 181-194.

Blacker, K. H., Jones, R. T., Stone, G. C., &-Pfefferbaum, D. Chronic users of LSD: The acidheads. *American Journal of Psychiatry,* 1968, *125,* 341-351.

Blaine, G. B. *Youth and the hazards of affluence.* New York: Harper & Row, 1966.

Brickman, H. R. The psychedelic "hip scene" return of the death instinct. *American Journal of Psychiatry,* 1968, *125*(6), 766-779.

Brotman, R., Silverman, I., & Suffet, F. Some correlates of student drug use. *Crime and Delinquency,* 1970, *16*(1), 67-74.

Cameron, D. C. Youth and drugs. *Journal of the American Medical Association,* 1968, *206*(6), 1267-1271.

Chein, I. Narcotic use among juveniles. *Social Work*, 1956, *1*, 50.

Clausen, J. A. Drug addiction. In R. K. Merton & R. A. Nisbet (Eds.), *Contemporary social problems*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1961.

Dallas Independent School District: Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Drug Abuse, Dallas, April 1970.

Farnsworth, D. L., & Oliver, H. K. The drug problem among young people, *Rhode Island Medical Journal*, 1968, *51*(3), 179-192.

Finlator, J. The drug syndrome in the affluent society. *Journal of Forensic Science*, 1968, *13*(7), 293-301.

Freedman, A. M., & Wilson, E. A. Childhood and adolescent addictive disorders. *Pediatrics*, 1964, 283-292.

Gilbert, J. G., & Lombardi, D. N. Personality characteristics of young male narcotic addicts. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 1967, *31*(5), 536-538.

Gynther, M. D., & Kempson, J. O. Seminarians and clinical pastoral training: A follow-up study. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 1962, *55*, 9-14.

Gynther, M. D., & McDonald, R. L. Personality characteristics of prisoners, psychiatric patients, and student nurses as depicted by the Leary system. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 1961, *64*, 387-395.

Gynther, M. D., Presher, C. H., & McDonald, R. L. Personal and interpersonal factors associated with alcoholism. *Quarterly Journal for Studies of Alcohol*, 1959, *21*, 321-323.

Hekimian, L., & Gershon, S. Characteristics of drug abusers admitted to a psychiatric hospital. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 1968, *205*(3), 125-131.

Keeler, M. H. Motivation for marihuana use: A correlate of adverse reaction. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 1968, *125*(3), 386-390.

Kieffer, S. N., & Moritz, T. B. Psychedelic drugs. *Pennsylvania Medicine*, April 1968, 57-67.

Kleber, H. D. Prolonged adverse reactions from unsupervised use of hallucinogenic drugs. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 1967, *144*(4), 308-319.

LaForge, R., & Suczek, R. F. The interpersonal dimension of personality: III. An interpersonal check list. *Journal of Personality*, 1955, *24*(1), 94-112.

Laskowitz, D. The adolescent drug addict: An Adlerian view. *Journal of Individual Psychology*, 1961, *17*, 68-79.

Laskowitz, D. Psychological characteristics of the adolescent addict. In E. Hams (Ed.), *Drug addiction in youth*. New York: Macmillan, 1964.

Leary, T. *Multilevel measurement of interpersonal behavior*. Berkeley, Calif.: Psychological Consultation Service, 1956.

Leary, T. Interpersonal diagnosis of personality. New York: Ronald Press, 1957.

Levy, N. J. The use of drugs by teenagers for sanctuary and illusion. *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 1968, *28*(1), 48-58.

Lombardi, D. N., & Angers, W. P. First memories of drug addicts. *Individual Psychologist*, 1967, *5*(1), 7-13.

Ludwig, A. M., & Levine, J. Patterns of hallucinogenic drug abuse. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 1965, *191*(2), 92-96.

Mamlet, L. Consciousness-limiting side effects of "consciousness-expanding" drugs. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 1967, *37*, 267-268.

McDonald, R. L. Personality characteristics of freshman medical students as depicted by the Leary system. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 1962, *100*, 313-323.

McDonald, R. L. Intrafamilial conflict and emotional disturbance. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 1962, *101*, 201-208.

McGlothin, W. H., & West, L. J. The marihuana problem: An overview. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 1968, *125*, 370-375.

Nowlis, H. H. Why students use drugs. *American Journal of Nursing*, 1968, *68*(8), 1680-1685.

Pearlman, S. Drug use and experience in an urban college population. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 1967, *37*, 297-299.

Pervin, L. A. Some questions concerning illicit use of drugs on the campus. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 1967, *37*, 299.

Pollard, J. C. Teen-agers and the use of drugs. *Clinical Pediatrics*, 1967, *6*(11), 613-620.

Preston, J. D. A survey of drug use among high school

students in Houston. Departmental Information Report No. 70-9. Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, Texas Agricultural and Mechanical University, College Station, Texas, 1970.

Schonfeld, W. A. Socioeconomic affluence as a factor. *New York State Journal of Medicine*, 1967, *67*(14), 1981-1990.

Schoolar, J. C., White, E. H., & Cohen, C. P. Drug abusers and their clinic-patient counterparts: A comparison of personality dimensions. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 1971, in press.

Smart, R. G., & Jones, D. Illicit LSD users: Their personality characteristics and psychopathology. *Journal of Abnormal and Clinical Psychology*, 1970, *75*, 286-292.

Stanton, A. H. Drug use among adolescents. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 1966, *122*(11), 1282-1283.

Ungerleider, J. T., Fisher, D. D., & Fuller, M. The dangers of LSD. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 1966, *197*(6), 389-392.

Ungerleider, J. T., Fisher, D. D., Goldsmith, S. R., Fuller, M., & Forgy, E. A statistical survey of adverse reactions to LSD in Los Angeles County. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 1968, *125*(3), 352-357.

Vaillant, G. E. A 12-year follow-up study of New York addicts: III. Some social and psychiatric characteristics. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 1966, *15*(6), 599-609.

White, E. H., Cohen, C. P., & Schoolar, J. C. Families — how can we help? *St. Joseph Hospital Medical Surgical Journal*, 1971, *6*, 43-51.

Zimmering, P., Toolan, J., Safrin, R., & Wortis, S. B. Heroin addiction in adolescent boys. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 1951, *114*, 19-34.

APPENDIX A

STATEMENT OF ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

APPENDIX A

STATEMENT OF ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

1. "Thank you for accepting the invitation to participate in this study.

2. "The study concerns your descriptions of important people in your life: yourself, your young person or child seen in the context of your home, your husband or wife, your young person or child seen in the context of being away from your home, and your imaginary 'ideal person'. Terms will be explained more fully when you are handed a test booklet.

3. "Although such information as your name and age are asked, your identity will be known only to this researcher and another person helping to score your test booklet; nowhere will your name appear in writing, including the completed study. You may use a fictitious name, if you so choose; however, if you elect to do that, and if your spouse is also participating in the study, please confer with him or her and decide upon what fictitious last name both of you will want to use.

4. "All information and data provided by you will be used for scientific and research purposes only. This study is not sponsored by any company or business interest.

5. "Upon completion of the test booklet, please hand it to the researcher.

6. "You are assured that your husband, wife, or child will not see your completed test booklet.

7. "Please know there are no right or wrong answers, since the test booklet is used only to help you describe important people in your life. Obviously, descriptions will vary from person to person.

8. "Although instructions are printed on

the face of the test booklets, the instructions will be read aloud after each person receives his or her test booklet.

9. "Before you attempt to complete the test booklet, I will try to answer any questions that you might have.

10. "Thank you for your cooperation."

APPENDIX B

QUADRANT THEMES

APPENDIX B

QUADRANT THEMES

Table A

Use of *Chi*-square Test to Determine if the Distribution of Summary Points, Categorized According to Quadrant Themes, for Each Description Made by Members of the Experimental and Control Groups Significantly Differed from the Chance Distribution of Summary Points Expected for the Same Description

Description made	Application of *Chi*-square, using 3 degrees of freedom	
Experimental Group		
	χ^2	*p*
Self (II-S)	14.92	<.01
Ego Ideal (V-Id)	3.54	N.S.
Child at Home (II-C-h)	15.14	<.01
Spouse (II-Sp)	18.92	<.001
Child Away from Home (II-C-a)	2.00	N.S.
Control Group		
	χ^2	*p*
Self (II-S)	11.85	<.02
Ego Ideal (V-Id)	2.62	N.S.
Child at Home (II-C-h)	38.29	<.001
Spouse (II-Sp)	19.23	<.001
Child Away from Home (II-C-a)	24.86	<.001

APPENDIX C

OCTANTS OR BEHAVIORAL THEMES

APPENDIX C

OCTANTS OR BEHAVIORAL THEMES

Table B

Use of *Chi*-square Test to Determine if the Distribution of Summary Points, Categorized According to Behavior Themes, for Each Description Made by Members of the Experimental and Control Groups Significantly Differed from the Chance Distribution of Summary Points Expected for the Same Description

Description made	Application of *Chi*-square, using 7 degrees of freedom	
Experimental Group		
	χ^2	*p*
Self (II-S)	29.31	<.001
Ego Ideal (V-Id)	5.97	N.S.
Child at Home (II-C-h)	40.43	<.001
Spouse (II-Sp)	30.61	<.001
Child Away from Home (II-C-a)	5.14	N.S.
Control Group		
	χ^2	*p*
Self (II-S)	26.90	<.001
Ego Ideal (V-Id)	10.92	N.S.
Child at Home (II-C-h)	33.14	<.001
Spouse (II-Sp)	41.07	<.001
Child Away from Home (II-C-a)	54.85	<.001