



6-1967

An Exploratory Study of the Relation of Perceived Parental Attitudes to the Vocational Choices of Graduate Students at Western Michigan University

Colleen Cosgrove Schrier

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters_theses



Part of the Higher Education Commons, and the Vocational Education Commons

Recommended Citation

Schrier, Colleen Cosgrove, "An Exploratory Study of the Relation of Perceived Parental Attitudes to the Vocational Choices of Graduate Students at Western Michigan University" (1967). *Master's Theses*. 4036. https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters_theses/4036

This Masters Thesis-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.



AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF THE RELATION OF
PERCEIVED PARENTAL ATTITUDES TO THE
VOCATIONAL CHOICES OF GRADUATE
STUDENTS AT WESTERN MICHIGAN
UNIVERSITY

by

Colleen Cosgrove Schrier

A Project Report
Submitted to the
Faculty of the School of Graduate
Studies in partial fulfillment
of the
Specialist in Education Degree

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
June, 1967

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express her sincere appreciation to the following individuals who gave so generously of their time and experience during the many stages of the study.

To Dr. Kenneth Engle, chairman and advisor, who provided continuous inspiration and moral support, and whose invaluable critical evaluations made this study a very rewarding experience.

To Dr. Gilbert Mazer, committee member, whose initial suggestion prompted the author to undertake this study and whose support served as motivation to pursue this study to its final completion.

To Dr. Lewis Walker, committee member, for his critical reading of the study during its many stages and for his genuine interest in helping accomplish the task.

To Miss Dorothy Baker for her patience and kind understanding while this work was in progress and for editing the initial and final drafts of this work.

To Drs. Robert Betz, James Bosco, William Carlson, Harold Daisher, Nellie Daisher, J. Ross Eshleman, Paul Horton, George Mallinson, Arthur Manske, Paul Misner, Lewis Walker and Mrs. George Mallinson for giving the author the opportunity to use their students to participate as subjects in the study.

To the 227 graduate students who participated as subjects in the study.

DEDICATION

To my dear friend, Buena Flor Mendoza,
whose help, guidance and support made
this work a memorable and happy ex-
perience.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| CHAPTER | | PAGE |
|---------|---|------|
| I | THE PROBLEM | 1 |
| | Introduction | 1 |
| | Statement of the Problem | 4 |
| | Objectives of the Study | 5 |
| | Importance of the Study | 5 |
| | Limitations of the Study | 6 |
| | The Hypotheses | 6 |
| | Assumptions | 7 |
| II | REVIEW OF SELECTED READINGS AND RELATED STUDIES. | 8 |
| III | DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY | 19 |
| | Description of Sample | 19 |
| | Procedure | 21 |
| | Instrumentation | 22 |
| | The Null Hypotheses | 23 |
| IV | FINDINGS | 24 |
| V | SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATION AND DISCUSSION | 37 |
| | Summary and Conclusion | 37 |
| | Recommendation | 40 |
| | Discussion | 41 |
| | BIBLIOGRAPHY | 44 |

| | PAGE |
|----------------------|------|
| APPENDICES | 47 |
| Appendix A | 47 |
| Appendix B | 59 |

LIST OF TABLES

| TABLES | PAGE |
|--|------|
| 3.1 Biographical Data of Samples Describing Mean Age, Marital Status, Professional Experience, Number of Siblings and Ordinal Positions | 20 |
| 4.1 Critical Ratios of Paired Mean Differences Between Curricular Groups on the FRI | 26 |
| 4.2 Mean Scores, Standard Deviations and Inter- correlational Results According to Responses by Curricular Groups on the FRI | 27 |
| 4.3 Mean Scores, Standard Deviations, Critical Ratios and Intercorrelation Results According to Responses by Sex on the FRI | 29 |
| 4.4 Mean Scores, Standard Deviations and Inter- correlation Results Based on Responses by Ordinal Position in the Family on the FRI | 35 |

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

The importance of work to an individual in society is documented by a number of authorities who stress the idea that the average male adult spends more time in his occupation than in any other activity. Before an individual becomes involved in the world of work, he must make decisions regarding the occupation he expects to follow. This type of decision-making has been defined as " ... a process which takes place over a period of time and which is best explained by a combination of determinants which themselves interact, are modified and developed with time." (Super, 1957).

Parental influence upon vocational decision-making has been recognized as a significant factor in the choice of one's career or profession (Williamson and Darley, 1937; Korner, 1940; Ginzburg et. al., 1951). To date, the extent of this influence is not clearly defined (Super, 1942, Ginzburg et. al., 1951). Some authorities consider parental influences a determining factor (Friend and Haggard, 1948; Stewart, 1952), while others think they are not pertinent (Super, 1957; Hoppock, 1935; Holland, 1959; Blau et. al., 1956).

To the extent that parental influence is a significant factor in occupational choice, counselors should be keenly aware of

the sometimes direct, sometimes indirect influences which parents exert upon the vocational decision-making of young people.

Williamson et. al. (1938) in their discussion of special problems in vocational guidance emphasized the "problem parents" who more often than the child are the ones to be blamed for difficulties confronting the individual in the choice of a vocation.

Parents may exhibit poor judgment in sizing up a child's talents and hence may urge the child to choose a vocation beyond the child's level of ability Parents are likely to be misinformed in regard to vocational requirements. They sometimes try to realize their own thwarted vocational aims through their children Or, a parent, through 'emotional conditioning', exhibits a strong aversion to a particular type of work and goes to extreme lengths to prevent the child from entering that work though it be a wise choice (p. 286).

These examples are sufficient to indicate that counselors need to be aware of the fact that the solution to students' vocational problems can be achieved frequently through a direct approach to the parents. However, the opportunity to interview parents of counselees, especially those in the college or university setting, does not often happen.

Concerning the relationship of parental attitudes to the selection of an occupation, Roe (1957) formulated explicit hypotheses about these relationships which have promise for counseling. She proposes that the major variable in the choice of an occupation is the family atmosphere which an individual experiences during his childhood and early adolescence. As a result of the attitudes which his parents express toward him, the individual develops certain orientations toward the environment and the

people in it which influence the vocational preferences he forms and the vocational decisions he makes. There are three basic parental attitudes which affect an individual's vocational choice: acceptance, concentration, and avoidance.

Acceptance means that the parents regard the child as a full-fledged member of the family who needs a certain degree of independence, and who has the capacity to assume responsibility. Parents are noncoercive, nonrestrictive, and encourage independence. Accepting parents neither concentrate their attention upon their children nor overlook them. Either casually or affectionately, they encourage them to fulfill their potentialities as best they can. The encouragement of the child's independence and his reliance upon his own resources may be intentional, even planned, or it may be a reflection of the parents' attitudes towards others generally.

Concentration refers to emotional concentration on the child. It includes the attitude of parents who devote a disproportionate amount of their time and energy to the direction and control of their children. They overprotect them through restrictions upon their efforts to explore the environment and to meet others, or they place demands upon them to perform beyond their capacities and to achieve ambitious goals. They may push the child to high achievement in school and work, and in the upper class they emphasize the development of conceptual as opposed to motor skills.

Finally, Avoidance refers to the disposition of parents who either neglect or reject the child. They withdraw when their child

approaches them for love and affection; they spend as little time as possible with the child; they fail to satisfy the child's physical needs; or they openly abuse or berate the child. Physical neglect of the child is less harmful psychologically than emotional rejection accompanied by physical care. Parents who avoid their children manifest no positive interest in the child or his activities; at best, the child is only tolerated.

Roe's (1957) hypotheses have heightened interest in the problem and have stimulated considerable research (Griggs, 1959; Hagen, 1960; Utton, 1962; Switzer, Griggs, Miller and Young, 1962). Attempts to test her theory, however, have produced conflicting results. For the most part, the studies failed to support Roe's hypotheses.

One of the outcomes of these studies was the construction of several inventories designed specifically to test the validity of Roe's hypotheses. One of these instruments appears to have wide application and clinical value. This is the Family Relations Inventory developed by Brunkan and Crites (1963).

The present study will make use of the Family Relations Inventory (FRI) as the major instrument to assess perceived parental attitudes among graduate students at Western Michigan University.

Statement of the Problem

The problem is AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF THE RELATION OF PERCEIVED PARENTAL ATTITUDES TO THE VOCATIONAL CHOICES OF GRADUATE STUDENTS.

With respect to the major problem, the perceived parental attitudes of acceptance, concentration and avoidance will be investigated and analyzed according to the responses of the samples on the FRI by (1) curricular groups, (2) ordinal position in the family and (3) sex.

Objectives of the Study

The major purpose of the study is to ascertain the extent to which perceived parental attitudes as measured by the FRI are related to vocational decision-making at the graduate level.

Specifically, the objectives of the study are: (1) to ascertain the relationship of perceived parental attitudes to the specific choices of curriculum in higher education, and (2) to ascertain the relationship of perceived parental attitudes to sex and ordinal position in the family.

Importance of the Study

1. The results of the present study might be of some value to educational psychologists and vocational counselors studying vocational development up to the higher educational level and to psychologists in general concerned with vocational development.

2. The findings will also have relevance for the following:

a. For the students, because an awareness of their perceived attitudes as they affect their vocational decision-making would give them better knowledge, understanding and appreciation of their motivation.

b. For educators in general, since a knowledge of perceived parental attitudes would give them a better

understanding of student behavior.

3. Norms for the FRI would be established for graduate students of Western Michigan University.

4. Validation of the FRI for use at the graduate level would be accomplished.

Limitations of the Study

The limitations considered in this exploratory study are as follows:

1. Inferences which may be drawn are only as valid as the FRI is a valid instrument.

2. Inferences apply only to the samples tested.

3. The sample was not randomly chosen. Whether the sample is representative of the total population of graduate students in the fields of interest is to be questioned.

The Hypotheses

The study was designed to investigate the following five hypotheses¹:

H₁ Graduate students in Administration will have significantly higher scores on the FRI father acceptance and concentration scales than the other groups.

¹ Reformulation of the hypotheses in null form is found on page 23.

H₂ Graduate students in Guidance will have significantly higher scores on the FRI mother concentration and acceptance scales compared with the other groups.

H₃ Female graduate students will have significantly higher scores in the mother sub-scales of the FRI, and male graduate students will have significantly higher scores in the father sub-scales.

H₄ Perceived parental attitude will differ significantly among the subjects according to ordinal position in the family.

H₅ Parental attitudes of acceptance, avoidance and concentration are largely distinct. Therefore, each sub-scale of the FRI independently measures specific parental attitudes.

Assumptions

1. The FRI is a valid instrument to measure parental attitudes of acceptance, avoidance and concentration.

2. The FRI is a valid instrument for discriminating the perceived parental attitudes of males and females and of siblings according to their ordinal position in the family.

3. The sample used is representative of the different curricular groups used in the study: Administration, Guidance, Science Education, Sociology and General Education.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF SELECTED READINGS AND RELATED STUDIES

Development of vocational choice is embedded in the total process of personality development. As we look at vocational choice and its development, we have to look at the development of the individuals, particularly at their personality development. This development is not simply the result of a series of discrete events or discrete experiences. These events and experiences are all interwoven and organized around certain basic impulses - the impulses for love, for aggression - and from this complex comes the development of standards and prohibitions.

The influences of significant others upon the ways of directing and expressing one's feelings, and upon the ways of acting on impulses and directing them toward realizable goals, are part of the individual's personality development.

Feelings, for the most part, are either directly or indirectly concerned with people in relationships which have their beginnings in the family with one's parents, one's siblings or with parent substitutes if there are no biological parents. The process of development involves the process of generalizing these feelings to other relationships.

Vocational choice, therefore, has its start in the family with one's parents and siblings. In fact, several theories of vocational psychology have proposed that parents have important influence upon their child's choice of a vocational field (Ginz-

burg et. al., 1951; Roe, 1957; Super, 1957). According to these theories, parents influence their children not only by their attitudes, but also through the identifications of their children with them. Therefore it is the purpose of this review to focus upon studies which investigated specifically the influence of parents upon occupational choice.

Roe (1957) has hypothesized that the three predominant parental attitudes of (1) emotional concentration upon the child, (2) acceptance of the child, and (3) avoidance of the child are related to vocational choice in specific fields. The following studies were attempts to test Roe's hypotheses of occupational choice:

Grigg (1959) used two groups of women, those whom Roe described as oriented chiefly towards persons (nurses), and those described as oriented chiefly towards non-persons (scientists and mathematicians). These groups were given a questionnaire about their early childhood experiences and parental treatment. The results indicated that:

(1) Contrary to Roe's hypothesis, women who are in nursing do not report significantly any characteristic differences in their early experiences with their parents from women who are associated with science and mathematics.

(2) Women in science and mathematics report significantly greater interests as children in gadgets and things than in companionship. This finding was consistent with Roe's categorization of science and technology as occupational areas selected by

those whose major orientation since childhood has been towards non-persons.

(3) Empirical discrimination between the two groups does not occur on the basis of reported early experience with parents, so it appears that some variables other than experience with parental reactions during childhood are more pertinent to adult occupational choice.

Further investigation of predictions based upon Roe's theory was undertaken by Switzer, Grigg, Miller and Young (1962). It was hypothesized that ministerial students will perceive their parents as having been more over-demanding and less rejecting than will a group of chemistry students. Two groups of 80 male subjects were employed in the study: ministerial students and chemistry majors selected from the student body at Southwestern University. An additional group of graduate theology students from Perkins School of Theology, Southern Methodist University, was included as a check for possible influence of drop-outs with age. A 50-item questionnaire constructed to measure parental attitudes with reference to over-demanding and rejecting parents was administered to each group. The questionnaire was standardized on 20 male students.

The results of the study are not in agreement with the prediction. The ministers' scores are not higher on the over-demanding scale, and the chemists' scores are not higher on the rejecting scale. However, significant differences were observed between recall of fathers' and of mothers' attitudes. It was found that

the magnitude of the difference between attitudes of parents was predictive of occupational choice.

Utton's (1962) study was also designed to test a part of Roe's theory (1957) relative to early determinants of vocational choice. Four professional groups of women were used in this study. Social workers and occupational therapists, whom Roe describes as oriented chiefly toward persons, were compared with dietitians and laboratory technicians (oriented chiefly toward non-person activities). All subjects were given the The Study of Values and the Strong Vocational Inventory Blank for Women (SVIB) and two instruments designed to assist and structure the recollections of their childhood family atmosphere. Only one of the latter instruments was found suitable for the purpose - the Childhood Experience Rating Scales.

Consistent with Roe's theory, the social workers and the occupational therapists were found to manifest a greater altruistic love of people than did dietitians and laboratory technicians. The hypothesis that those subjects employed in person-oriented occupations would recall their childhood family environment as being warmer than the subjects employed in non-person oriented occupations was not supported.

Subsequent analysis of data, however, revealed that there was more similarity between the recollections of social workers and the laboratory technicians than between the other professional groups represented. Social workers felt less accepted by their parents than did either the occupational therapists or the dieti-

tians. The laboratory technicians recalled that their parents were more critical of their actions than were the parents of occupational therapists. A greater recalled rapport between the dietitians and their parents was revealed when compared with the social workers and their parents.

Hagen (1960) also has attempted to evaluate Roe's theory. He asked two judges to rate excerpts from the family histories of 245 participants in the Harvard Study of Adult Development. The family histories of the subjects were compiled from various sources including interviews with the subjects of the study, information gathered from their parents and other observers, and a follow-up questionnaire after varying periods of time. Using these materials, the judges rated the subjects on family atmosphere (protecting, demanding, etc.) and obtained agreement independently in 70% of the cases, a fairly high proportion for a subjective measurement method.

Hagen's study which measured parental attitudes has questionable objectivity and validity because his procedure was non-standardized.

Green (1965) also used adolescents to test an aspect of Roe's theory of vocational choice. Three hundred fifty-five (355) seventh graders, living with their natural cohabiting parents in the state of Oklahoma, were used as subjects (205 boys and 150 girls). The subjects were administered a 260-item questionnaire, the Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire (PCR) by Roe and Seigelman (1963). The study utilized the validity established by the authors of the

PCR. The PCR was designed to elicit the child's on-going perception of ten parental behaviors: protecting, casual, loving, neglecting, rejecting, demanding, reward symbolic-love, reward direct-object, punishment symbolic-love and punishment direct-object. These ten behaviors plus six selected combinations of behaviors were used to test four parent-child relationships: boy-mother, boy-father, girl-mother, girl-father.

The data obtained and each subject's occupational choice, classified as person or non-person, were analyzed to determine if parent-child relationships influenced choice. Statistical techniques were employed to determine whether differences in scale scores were significant and predictable of occupational choice.

The results revealed that boys indicated person orientation when either parent relationship was positive. The girls indicated non-person orientation when negative parent relationships were perceived from both parents.

The above studies did not support Roe's theory of vocational choice. As a consequence, Brunkan and Crites (1964) conducted an investigation to develop a more adequate measure to test Roe's hypotheses and to study other problems which involved family relationships. The result of the study was the development of the Family Relations Inventory (FRI), a questionnaire which measures perceived parental attitudes. Their study supported the construct that parental attitudes influence vocational decision making. The emphasis of the FRI was upon perceived parental attitudes, since

Roe's theory states that it is the individual's interpretation of his experiences with his mother and father rather than his parents' actual behavior which significantly influences his vocational choice.

The developed questionnaire (FRI) appears to have a more general applicability than just in studies of occupational decision-making.

Attempts to utilize further the FRI as an instrument for quantifying perceived parental attitudes were made in two other studies by Brunkan (1965, 1966).

Brunkan's first investigation (1965) involved the analysis of the responses of 289 male college students in tests measuring parental attitudes and parental identification with relation to probable, possible and fantasy vocational choices. Three hypotheses were tested: (1) For probable, possible, and fantasy choices, degree of parental identification differs for the various vocational choice fields. These differences depend upon which parent is being rated, and/or upon whether the real or ideal parent is being rated. (2) For probable vocational choices: (a) choices in the Service, General Cultural and Arts and Entertainment fields are accompanied by a high degree of parental concentration, (b) choices in Technological occupations are accompanied by a high degree of parental acceptance, and (c) choices of Scientific careers are accompanied by a high degree of parental avoidance. (3) For probable, possible and fantasy choices, perceived parental attitude scores differ for the various vocational fields, these differences depending upon which parent is being

rated and/or upon which attitude is being considered.

The Semantic Differential, a measure of similarity of perceptions, was used to assess the degree of parental identification. The FRI measured the quantity of familial interpersonal orientations which Roe (1957) proposed as related to vocational choice. The vocational choice was obtained from Trow's (1941) Vocational Choice-Inventory (VCI). The subjects were 289 sophomore, junior and senior undergraduate males from psychology courses at the University of Iowa.

Analysis of variance revealed no significant relationships of parental attitudes and parental identification to probable, possible and fantasy occupational choices, supporting the previous negative findings regarding Roe's theory (Segal, 1961). A significant interaction between the type of identification with father/mother indicates that sons identify significantly more with their fathers and that they perceived their real fathers as significantly different from their ideal fathers.

Brunkan (1966) analyzed the responses of the same 289 male college students to investigate the relationship of parental attitudes and parental identification to field of vocational choice. The hypotheses of Ginzburg, et. al. (1950) regarding relationship of identification to vocational choice problems was investigated by comparing subjects having no choice problem with those who were undecided. The FRI was used to measure perceived parental attitudes; the Semantic Differential, to measure similarity of perceptions; the American College Testing Battery,

to measure aptitude; and the Strong Vocational Interest Blank, to measure vocational interest. Analysis of variance indicated a relationship between parental identification and problems in vocational choice, but failed to support Ginzburg's et. al. hypotheses. No significant relationships were found between parental attitudes and problems in vocational choice. Suggestions were made to investigate these variables further.

Two other studies related to parental identification were reviewed. These studies were designed to investigate other aspects of parental influence as they pertain to occupational choice.

Crites (1962) tested three hypotheses about relationships of parental identification and its relation to vocational interest development. (1) Degree of identification with the father and mother correlates with vocational interest patterns. (2) Kind of identification with the father and mother varies with vocational interest patterns. (3) Pattern of identification is associated with masculinity-femininity of interest. The tests of the hypotheses were made on three groups of subjects. The Original Group was 100 vocational education clients seen at the counseling service of the University of Iowa during the six-month period from January to June, 1960. The Replication Group was 100 vocational education clients counseled during the next six months, July to December. The Generalization Group included 150 non-clients tested in a large undergraduate psychology course during the Winter of 1960-1961. The Semantic Differential was used to measure parental identification. Vocational interest

patterning was measured by the Strong Vocational Interest Blank (SVIB).

Results of the Semantic Differential and the SVIB indicated that a son's identification with both of his parents significantly affects the patterning of his interests, but that his identification with the father is more important.

Marr (1965) investigated some behavior and attitudes relating to vocational choices. She studied the ways in which vocational choices had been made by subjects who are heterogeneous in ability, socio-economic status and the occupations they had entered or were preparing to enter. Questionnaire and interview data were used to study the way that 129 young men had made their vocational choices.

Her findings revealed that, compared to those who had not made choices, more subjects who had made a choice were accepting of a father or father substitute ($p < .001$).

The researcher called Dr. Brunkan in Milwaukee, Wisconsin and Dr. Crites in Bedford, Massachusetts on January 10, 1967, to inquire if any other research had been done using the FRI. They both stated that, to the best of their knowledge, the professional journal articles cited in this chapter are the only research studies based upon the FRI.

Summary

The above studies employed different methods and utilized different approaches in the investigation of parental influences on vocational decision-making. It is evident that different

methods used in assessing parental attitudes have produced few differences in results. However, it is revealing that the influence(s) of the significant persons in an individual's life has an overwhelming influence on the choices he makes, whether the choices are personal, social or vocational. Therefore, since no general agreement has been established regarding Roe's hypotheses, the effect of parental attitude variables in vocational development merits more intensive research and investigation.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

In this chapter will be discussed the designs and methods utilized in this exploratory study. The discussion includes:

- (1) Description of the Sample
- (2) Procedure
- (3) Instrumentation
- (4) The Null Hypotheses.

Description of Sample

Graduate students who attended summer classes and seminars during the 1966 summer term at Western Michigan University were used as subjects of this study. These subjects totaled 227 and constituted the sample utilized in the present project. They were selected from five curriculum areas of the university. A breakdown of the sample is as follows:

| <u>Department</u> | <u>Male</u> | <u>Female</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|-------------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|
| Guidance | 55 | 25 | 80 |
| Administration | 32 | 7 | 39 |
| Science Education | 18 | 3 | 21 |
| Sociology | 16 | 3 | 19 |
| General Education | <u>47</u> | <u>21</u> | <u>68</u> |
| TOTAL | 168 | 59 | 227 |

The Administration subjects were specifically recruited from the Educational Leadership classes. These subjects were predominantly principals, superintendents and prospective administrators.

The Guidance subjects were advanced graduate students enrolled in practicum courses and the NDEA Institute.

The Science Education subjects were enrolled in the Science and Mathematics Institute for the NDEA.

The Sociology subjects were likewise institute participants.

The General Education subjects included those enrolled in graduate classes in the general teacher educational field, i. e., special education, secondary education, elementary education and the like.

Table 3.1 describes the biographical data of the subjects used.

TABLE 3.1

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA OF SUBJECTS DESCRIBING
MEAN AGE, MARITAL STATUS, PROFESSIONAL EX-
PERIENCE, NUMBER OF SIBLINGS AND ORDINAL
POSITION

| MEAN DATA | :GUID. | : ADM. | : SC.EDU. | : SOCIO. | :GEN.EDU. |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|--------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| Mean Age | 31.5 | 31.7 | 31 | 36 | 32.6 |
| Yrs. Teaching Exp. | 5.59 | 5.42 | 6.42 | 12.23 | 7.0 |
| Yrs. Counseling | 1.88 | .64 | .00 | ..89 | .04 |
| Yrs. in Admin. | 1.26 | 2.32 | .14 | 1.32 | .54 |
| Other Experiences | .08 | .84 | .54 | .52 | .49 |
| No. of Brothers | 1.12 | 1.46 | .52 | 1.26 | 1.42 |
| No. of Sisters | 1.15 | 1.38 | .95 | 1.26 | 1.33 |
| Total Children | 3.89 | 4.20 | 2.46 | 3.52 | 3.75 |
| Marital Status | 1.20 | 1.30 | 1.38 | 1.31 | 1.26 |
| Ordinal Position in the Family | | | | | |
| | Only child | 26 | | | |
| | First child | 82 | | | |
| | Second child | 33 | | | |
| | Last child | 53 | | | |
| | Middle children | 33 | | | |
| | TOTAL . . | 227 | | | |

The subjects were not randomly chosen, and whether or not they are a representative group is questionable. Therefore, for the purposes of this exploratory study, caution must be exercised in generalizing results to all students in the five curriculum areas being considered.

Procedure

When it was decided that an assessment of perceived parental attitudes among graduate students of education and other courses was to be made through the use of the FRI, preparation to gather needed data was begun. Requests were made to various professors teaching summer classes and seminars for permission to administer the FRI during class time to their groups.

Administration of the inventory was supervised personally by the researcher to insure that the same instructions for taking the test were given to all groups. Instructions were given to the effect that participants need not dwell much on each item, but were to write the first impression that came to mind. The aim was to minimize the respondent's defenses and rationalizations. A time limit of between 20 to 25 minutes was required to answer all items in the inventory.

The normative survey methodology of research was used; specifically, the frequency and statistical analysis procedures were followed.

There are six scales in the FRI: father acceptance, mother acceptance, father avoidance, mother avoidance, father concentra-

tion, and mother concentration. The scales were treated separately in three study groups: (1) curricular, (2) sex and (3) ordinal positions.

Mean scores, standard deviations and critical ratios were determined in order to ascertain the levels at which perceived parental attitudes exist, and the significance of such perceived attitudes.

To analyze the scores further, a correlational study was made. Interrelationships of sub-scale scores were established and the significances of the results obtained were determined. All statistical computations were done by the Computer Center of Western Michigan University. In testing statistical significance, the .05 level of confidence was accepted. Findings were entered in table form and interpretations follow.

Instrumentation

For the purpose of this exploratory study, perceived parental attitude will be defined as the scores obtained on the six sub-scales of the FRI. The FRI yields measures of six sub-scales, and during its standardization was administered to adolescents, college students at the University of Iowa and Harvard. The inventory was found to have reasonably high internal reliability: mother and father acceptance scales, .83 and .90; mother and father avoidance scales, .82 and .92; mother and father concentration, .82 and .59. The FRI's negative correlation and almost no relationship when validated against the Grigg's Questionnaire and Utton's Rating Scale suggest it is measuring a domain which is different from

these scales and establishes the FRI as an instrument of general applicability in the studies of perceived family relationships (Brunkan and Crites, 1963).

The Null Hypotheses

The following are restatements of the hypotheses in null form:

Ho₁ Graduate students in Administration will not have significantly higher scores on the FRI father concentration and acceptance scales than the other groups.

Ho₂ Graduate students in Guidance will not have significantly higher scores on the FRI mother concentration and acceptance scales compared with the other groups.

Ho₃ Female graduate students will not have significantly higher scores in the mother sub-scales of the FRI, nor will the male graduate students have significantly higher scores in the father sub-scales.

Ho₄ Perceived parental attitude will not differ significantly among the subjects according to ordinal position in the family.

Ho₅ Parental attitudes of acceptance, avoidance and concentration are not largely distinct. Therefore, each sub-scale of the FRI does not independently measure specific parental attitudes. Intercorrelations among them will be evidenced.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Chapter Four is a report of the findings of this exploratory study based upon the methodological approach and statistical treatment discussed in Chapter Three.

Hypothesis one states that graduate students in Administration will not have significantly higher scores on the FRI father concentration and acceptance scales than the other groups. The data relevant to this assertion are revealed by the mean scores obtained for the different groups in the six sub-scales as found in Table 4.2.

The Administration students recorded the highest observable mean scores in both father and mother acceptance scales, the lowest in the avoidance scales and the highest in father concentration. Mother concentration, however, was lower than it was for the other groups.

The least perceived acceptance by father is manifested by the Guidance students; by mother, the Sociology group. The most perceived avoidance by father was felt by the Guidance subjects; and by mother, the Sociology group.

The least perceived father concentration was indicated by the Guidance subjects and the least perceived mother concentration was felt by the General Education people.

Observable mean differences would have significance only

after subjecting them to further statistical analysis. The critical ratios of paired mean differences were computed to test statistical significance. The findings summarized in Table 4.1 indicate that hypothesis one is not a valid assertion. Mean differences, significant at the .05 level of confidence were computed between Administration and Guidance subjects on the father avoidance and father concentration scales and between the Administration subjects and the Sociology subjects in the father concentration scale. Mean differences were also noted between Administration and the other groups on both father acceptance and father concentration scales, but they are not significant. However, on the mother acceptance scale a significant difference ($p < .05$) was obtained between the Administration and the Sociology groups with the Administration subjects recording the higher score. On the basis of these findings, hypothesis one is rejected. The Administration subjects when compared with the other subjects are significantly successful in perceiving more father acceptance and concentration as well as mother acceptance.

These results have important bearing on hypothesis two which asserted that Guidance subjects will not have significantly higher scores in the FRI mother acceptance and mother concentration scales than the other groups. This inference, according to the above data, is valid.

Graduate students in Guidance do not differ significantly from the other graduate students in perception of mother acceptance and mother avoidance.

TABLE 4.2

MEAN SCORES, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND INTERCORRELATION RESULTS
 ACCORDING TO RESPONSES BY CURRICULAR GROUPS ON THE FRI
 (Guidance, N=80; Administration, N=39, Science Edu-
 cation, N=21; Sociology, N=19; Gen. Education N=68)

| SUB-SCALES : Groups : | | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Mean: | S.D. |
|------------------------------|-----------|--------|---------|---------|--------|---------|-------|------|
| 1. Father Acceptance | Guid. | .39*** | -.59*** | -.36** | -.05 | -.05 | 22.06 | 8.58 |
| | Adm. | .60*** | -.77*** | -.49** | -.09 | -.07 | 25.23 | 7.00 |
| | Sc. Edu. | .57** | -.74*** | -.36 | -.17 | -.28 | 23.05 | 7.63 |
| | Socio. | .26 | -.84*** | -.01 | -.32 | -.11 | 22.47 | 7.15 |
| | Gen. Edu. | .52*** | -.75*** | -.42*** | -.02 | -.01 | 22.60 | 7.79 |
| 2. Mother Acceptance | Guid. | | -.56*** | -.59*** | -.29* | -.40*** | 25.29 | 5.96 |
| | Adm. | | -.47** | -.64*** | -.18 | -.18 | 26.36 | 5.68 |
| | Sc. Edu. | | .28 | -.42* | -.24 | -.13 | 23.66 | 5.70 |
| | Socio. | | -.15 | -.52* | -.37 | -.54 | 22.25 | 7.09 |
| | Gen. Edu. | | -.40 | -.61*** | -.13 | -.16 | 24.71 | 6.02 |
| 3. Father Avoidance | Guid. | | | .66*** | .27* | .27* | 8.59 | 7.37 |
| | Adm. | | | .53*** | .09 | .05 | 6.92 | 6.01 |
| | Sc. Edu. | | | .39 | .35 | .47** | 6.95 | 5.69 |
| | Socio. | | | -.04 | .13 | .07 | 8.42 | 6.62 |
| | Gen. Edu. | | | .59*** | .17 | .19 | 8.17 | 6.53 |
| 4. Mother Avoidance | Guid. | | | | .37** | .14 | 6.89 | 5.29 |
| | Adm. | | | | .51*** | .07 | 6.10 | 3.94 |
| | Sc. Edu. | | | | .52** | .06 | 5.62 | 4.64 |
| | Socio. | | | | -.03 | .06 | 7.37 | 3.93 |
| | Gen. Edu. | | | | .24 | .16 | 6.84 | 5.09 |
| 5. Father Concentra- tion | Guid. | | | | | .37*** | 6.13 | 3.59 |
| | Adm. | | | | | .33** | 8.51 | 5.22 |
| | Sc. Edu. | | | | | .33 | 7.25 | 3.68 |
| | Socio. | | | | | .46* | 6.21 | 3.18 |
| | Gen. Edu. | | | | | .37*** | 6.67 | 3.81 |
| 6. Mother Concentra- tion | Guid. | | | | | | 8.74 | 4.80 |
| | Adm. | | | | | | 8.69 | 4.87 |
| | Sc. Edu. | | | | | | 9.09 | 5.25 |
| | Socio. | | | | | | 10.74 | 5.36 |
| | Gen. Edu. | | | | | | 8.54 | 4.87 |

* Significant at the .05 level of confidence

** Significant at the .01 level of confidence

*** Significant at the .001 level of confidence

That males will not identify significantly with father and females will not identify significantly with mother, was assumed in hypothesis three. Findings relevant to this assertion are found in Table 4.3. Mean scores obtained for males and females revealed no significant differences except on the mother concentration scale, where the females perceived mother to be significantly dominant. The CR obtained is 1.97 and it is significant at the .05 level of confidence. Hypothesis three is therefore partially supported. The female subjects were able to perceive their mothers as significantly high in emotional concentration.

Statistical data computed to indicate the perceived parental attitudes by ordinal position in the family is found in Table 4.4. The mean data obtained appear not to support hypothesis four which states that perceived parental attitude will not differ among subjects according to ordinal position in the family. According to the mean scores as revealed in the table, the Only Child perceived both parents as most accepting. Father avoidance was felt more strongly by children other than the Only, First, Second or Last. Father concentration seems to be perceived most strongly by the First Child, followed by the Second Child, then by the Only Child. Mother concentration was felt most strongly by the Only child and least by the Last Child. Hypothesis four is not accepted. Children, according to ordinal position in the family perceived parental acceptance, avoidance and concentration differently.

Hypothesis five states that parental attitudes of acceptance,

TABLE 4.3

MEAN SCORES, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, CRITICAL RATIOS AND
INTERCORRELATION RESULTS ACCORDING TO RESPONSES BY SEX
ON THE FRI (MALES, N=168; FEMALES, N=59)

| SUB-SCALES: GROUP : | | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Mean | S.D. |
|-----------------------------|---|--------|---------|---------|--------|--------|-------|------|
| 1. Father | M | .49*** | -.69*** | -.32*** | -.05 | -.15 | 22.60 | 7.79 |
| Acceptance | F | .37** | -.67*** | -.49*** | -.05 | .15 | 24.52 | 6.97 |
| | T | .46*** | -.69*** | -.37*** | -.04 | -.07 | 23.12 | 7.64 |
| Critical Ratio . . . -1.68 | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Mother | M | | -.46*** | -.56*** | -.24* | -.24* | 24.71 | 6.02 |
| Acceptance | F | | -.37*** | -.57*** | -.04 | -.13 | 24.84 | 6.18 |
| | T | | -.43*** | -.57*** | -.18 | -.30** | 24.74 | 6.05 |
| Critical Ratio . . . -.15 | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Father | M | | | .51*** | .11 | .30** | 8.17 | 6.53 |
| Avoidance | F | | | .65*** | .38** | .00 | 6.64 | 6.62 |
| | T | | | .55*** | .18 | .21* | 7.76 | 6.58 |
| Critical Ratio . . . 1.56 | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Mother | M | | | | .17 | .14 | 6.84 | 5.09 |
| Avoidance | F | | | | .34** | .10 | 6.74 | 6.17 |
| | T | | | | .22* | .12 | 7.76 | 5.39 |
| Critical Ratio11 | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Father | M | | | | .42*** | | 6.47 | 3.81 |
| Concentra- | F | | | | .36** | | 6.70 | 3.68 |
| tion | T | | | | .40*** | | 6.58 | 3.77 |
| Critical Ratio44 | | | | | | | | |
| 6. Mother | M | | | | | | 8.57 | 4.87 |
| Concentra- | F | | | | | | 9.85 | 4.27 |
| tion | T | | | | | | 8.91 | 4.74 |
| Critical Ratio . . . -1.97* | | | | | | | | |

* Significant at the .05 level of confidence

** Significant at the .01 level of confidence

*** Significant at the .001 level of confidence

avoidance and concentration are largely distinct and asserts that the intercorrelation of the FRI scales will not be evident. Roe (1957) states that theoretically these parental attitudes are distinct. She points out, however, that there are some relationships among them. She locates them in a circular continuum of warm-cold family relationships in the following order: casual acceptance, loving acceptance, over-protection concentration, rejecting avoidance, neglecting avoidance and casual acceptance. Given this conceptual framework, intercorrelations were made in the FRI measures of perceived parental attitude for the sample study groups.

In this exploratory study, acceptance and avoidance scales should be essentially uncorrelated with the others. The reasoning behind this is that an attitude of acceptance rules out one of avoidance (and vice versa), whereas an attitude of concentration does not necessarily indicate either avoidance or acceptance.

From an analysis of the scale intercorrelations presented in Table 4.2, the findings seem to support the predicted assumptions. Intercorrelational patterns indicate fairly high negative rs between acceptance and avoidance and non-significant rs between concentration and the other scales.

Positive insignificant-to-fairly significant correlations exist between father and mother acceptance. The highest correlation was recorded for the Administration group, .60. Similar positive but less significant relationships were found for the Sociology and General Education subjects, .57 and .52 respectively. Correlations obtained from the Guidance and Sociology subjects were positive but

insignificant, .39 and .26 respectively.

Inverse relationships are noted between acceptance and avoidance for both parents for all the sample groups. The Sociology group who perceived mother acceptance as not significantly related to father acceptance, confirmed their perceptions in the avoidance-acceptance relationships.

How did the sample groups perceive father when mother is accepting? Father was perceived as accepting also. However, the continuum of the warm-cold family atmosphere seems to be felt likewise. The Science Education group perceived the continuum of acceptance-avoidance from mother to father. A positive correlation of .28 was obtained. A test of significance of the relationship, however, indicated that the positive relationship is not statistically significant. The Guidance group seems to be the group who perceived most that father acceptance is due to mother acceptance and vice versa.

When father is perceived as avoiding or rejecting, mother is perceived in the same light. Correlation results indicating this phenomenon are statistically significant at the .001 level. The Sociology group perceived negative relationships. The Science Education group's perceived relationship was positive but statistically insignificant.

Concentration is slightly related to both acceptance and avoidance as perceived by the Administration sample. Positive and significant relationships exist between mother and father concentration. Fathers and mothers perceived as avoiding are felt to

exert certain degrees of strong demands upon their children.

The acceptance scales are positively and significantly correlated for both males and females. These correlations are evidenced in Table 4.3. Both males and females perceived negative relationship between acceptance and avoidance, the r_s $-.67$ to $-.69$ are indicative of very significant negative correlations.

The negative relationships which exist between father acceptance and mother avoidance are highly significant. There is a positive tendency for mothers to dominate to a significant degree in the same way that father does. When father tends to avoid, there is the positive tendency for mother to concentrate on the male subjects; the reverse was felt by the females with their fathers when mother tends to be rejecting.

Ordinal Position Grouping. (a) The Only Child. An analysis of Table 4.4 indicates insignificant positive relationship between father and mother acceptance. Avoidance and acceptance were perceived to be positively correlated. Father acceptance correlates positively with father avoidance, $.39$. The relationship, however, is not substantial. Mother acceptance correlates also in a positive manner with mother avoidance, $.26$, and the relationship is also not substantial. The continuum of acceptance-avoidance from both parents is definitely present, as perceived by the Only Child. Accepting parents are perceived as rejecting parents at the same time.

Low negative correlation exists between father acceptance and mother avoidance, and between mother acceptance and father avoidance.

Rejecting parents of the Only Child tend to reject fully. They do not even care to impose or dominate. So it would appear that a rejected Only Child is also just tolerated by his parents. Concentration from both parents is related positively and with moderate significance.

(b) The First Born. In the First Born group, significantly positive and moderate relationship was computed between the acceptance scales. Father acceptance and father avoidance were perceived as two separate and opposite parental attitudes. The relationship between father acceptance and mother avoidance is highly inverse and significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Acceptance and concentration are negatively related. Correlations are statistically significant. Avoidance and concentration are also related significantly. Rejecting fathers are demanding; rejecting mothers are demanding too. When father dominates, mother is perceived as equally dominating.

(c) The Second Born. A positive moderate but significant relationship exists between mother and father acceptance, .47. Father and mother acceptances are inversely related to avoidance. Avoidance of one parent is substantially related to avoidance of the other and to some insignificant amount of concentration from both. When one parent tends to dominate, a similar tendency on the part of the other is likely to be perceived.

As a group, the Second Born seems to have a clear and very positive view of acceptance, avoidance and concentration. Acceptance precludes avoidance and vice-versa. Acceptance and

avoidance, however, carry with them certain amounts of concentration from both parents.

(d) The Last Child. Unlike the Only Child, however, and more similar to the First and Second Born, the Last Child clearly and significantly was able to distinguish between father and mother acceptances and father and mother avoidances. Accepting fathers are positively perceived as accepting with nothing else involved, with mothers perceived in a similar light.

No significant relationship was revealed between mother acceptance and concentration. Father avoidance correlated positively and significantly with mother avoidance. Father and mother avoidances correlated positively but not significantly with concentration.

Relationships between father and mother concentration are positive and substantially significant.

(e) The Middle Child. In the intercorrelational study, interesting results were noted. The highest positive correlation was computed for this group between father and mother acceptance. The highest negative correlations between avoidance and acceptance were also recorded. These relationships are statistically significant at the .001 level of confidence.

Avoidance and concentration have a negative relationship. Concentration was perceived as an act of positive transaction between both parents. Generally, though perceiving the most amount of rejection among the children in the family constellation, the Middle Children seem to have a healthy perception of

TABLE 4.4

MEAN SCORES, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND INTERCORRELATION
RESULTS BASED ON RESPONSES BY ORDINAL POSITION IN THE FAMILY
ON THE FAMILY RELATIONS INVENTORY

| SUB-SCALES: GROUP : | | 2 : | 3 : | 4 : | 5 : | 6 : | Mean: | S.D. |
|---------------------|--------|--------|---------|---------|-------|---------|-------|------|
| 1. Father | Only | .13 | .39 | -.27 | .26 | .13 | 25.70 | 9.98 |
| Acceptance | First | .50*** | -.81*** | -.27* | -.23* | -.23* | 22.83 | 7.12 |
| | Second | .47** | -.55*** | -.23 | -.01 | -.04 | 24.28 | 6.99 |
| | Last | .29* | -.45*** | -.40*** | -.11 | .11 | 21.57 | 8.44 |
| | Middle | .59*** | -.86*** | -.83*** | -.01 | -.07 | 20.93 | 8.39 |
| 2. Mother | Only | | .26 | -.29 | .03 | -.19 | 25.70 | 4.78 |
| Acceptance | First | | -.43*** | -.55*** | -.22* | -.39*** | 24.61 | 5.99 |
| | Second | | -.44** | -.40** | -.19 | -.13 | 24.96 | 5.89 |
| | Last | | -.25 | -.61*** | -.29* | -.18 | 25.04 | 6.23 |
| | Middle | | -.59*** | -.79*** | -.16 | -.25 | 23.31 | 7.35 |
| 3. Father | Only | | | .39* | -.04 | .04 | 4.83 | 4.49 |
| Avoidance | First | | | .42*** | .34** | .32** | 7.83 | 6.54 |
| | Second | | | .56*** | .12 | .31 | 6.48 | 5.56 |
| | Last | | | .60*** | .36** | .18 | 9.50 | 7.64 |
| | Middle | | | .67*** | .12 | .04 | 10.43 | 7.39 |
| 4. Mother | Only | | | | .33 | .16 | 5.25 | 3.52 |
| Avoidance | First | | | | .32** | .18 | 6.21 | 4.99 |
| | Second | | | | .28 | .12 | 6.11 | 3.79 |
| | Last | | | | .27* | .001 | 8.61 | 6.40 |
| | Middle | | | | .18 | .20 | 9.13 | 7.86 |
| 5. Father | Only | | | | | .40* | 6.13 | 4.06 |
| Concentra- | First | | | | | .38*** | 7.28 | 3.62 |
| tion | Second | | | | | .42* | 6.66 | 4.22 |
| | Last | | | | | .46*** | 5.25 | 2.84 |
| | Middle | | | | | .42* | 6.06 | 3.52 |
| 6. Mother | Only | | | | | | 9.58 | 4.86 |
| Concentra- | First | | | | | | 9.34 | 5.06 |
| tion | Second | | | | | | 8.46 | 4.67 |
| | Last | | | | | | 7.42 | 4.15 |
| | Middle | | | | | | 9.31 | 4.53 |

* Significant at the .05 level of confidence

** Significant at the .01 level of confidence

*** Significant at the .001 level of confidence

parental attitudes in connection with the three basic scales: acceptance, avoidance and concentration.

On the basis of the above findings, hypothesis five is partially rejected. Avoidance and acceptance were found to be largely distinct perceived parental attitudes. Concentration on the other hand was found to correlate positively with the avoidance and acceptance scales.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND DISCUSSION

Summary and Conclusions

This exploratory study was an attempt to test Anne Roe's (1957) theory of occupational choice through the application of the FRI as developed by Brunkan and Crites (1963). The purpose was to determine the relation of perceived parental attitudes to the vocational choices of graduate students at Western Michigan University.

Two hundred twenty seven graduate students, representing five curricular groups, were used in the study. These subjects, however, were not randomly chosen and their being representative of each curricular area is questionable. For the purpose of the survey of parental attitudes proposed in the study, it was assumed that they would approximate a representative group.

The total group was divided into three separate study groups: curricular, sex, and ordinal position in the family. The normative survey method of research was utilized in the first phase of the study. Mean scores and standard deviations were computed and observable mean differences were tested for significance which might have occurred by chance.

The second phase of the investigation involved a correlational study. Interrelationships among the six sub-scales of the inventory were determined. Analysis of the results was made.

The following are conclusions based upon findings and interpreted data:

1. The hypothesis which stated that students in Administration will not have significantly higher scores in the FRI concentration and acceptance scales than the other groups was rejected. The Administration subjects scored significantly higher in father acceptance and father concentration scales, than the Guidance subjects. Statistically significant scores were also recorded for father concentration and mother acceptance as against the Sociology subjects.

2. The hypothesis which stated that Counselors will not have higher scores in mother acceptance and mother concentration scales was not supported. Mean scores revealed by the Guidance subjects on these scales are the highest when compared with the scores of the other groups. However, differences obtained were not statistically significant.

3. The hypothesis which asserted that males will not have higher scores in the FRI father acceptance and concentration scales and that females will not score higher on the mother scales was only partially supported. The mean score obtained for the males in the father acceptance scale is lower than the mean score obtained for the females. The males perceived more acceptance from mother than from father. Their perception of father avoidance is greater than that of the females. Female perception of mother concentration was highly evident.

4. The hypothesis that perceived parental attitudes will

not differ significantly among the subjects according to their ordinal position in the family was not substantiated.

a. The Only Child perceived more father acceptance than the others. He, too, felt the least father and mother avoidance, and significantly more concentrated on by mother than by father. Perceived avoidance and acceptance as ascertained by the mean scores were supported by the correlational results. However, the rs obtained are not statistically significant.

b. The First Child perceived a greater mother acceptance than father acceptance; more avoidance from father, and also more mother than father concentration.

c. For the Second Child, perceptions of mother and father acceptance and avoidance are significantly identical. They felt considerably more mother concentration.

d. The Last Child felt the most mother acceptance and the least father acceptance. Father avoidance was greater and there was much more mother concentration.

e. The Middle Children felt the least acceptance by both parents. Differences between father and mother acceptances were not as great as perceived by the Last Child. The Middle Children also perceived the most avoidance. Mother concentration supersedes father concentration.

5. The hypothesis which stated that no positive intercorrelations among the FRI scales will be indicated was rejected. Negative correlations were found between the acceptance and avoidance scales. However, positive correlations were obtained between the

concentration scale and the other scales.

The findings also supported several assumptions postulated. The perceived parental attitudes influence the choice of a vocation. The amount of accepting attitude at home from an authority figure is partly responsible for the pursuit of a vocation carrying similar authoritative functions. The Administrators established the most authority identification.

Identification with mother appears to be pronounced on the concentration scale. Mothers as perceived by the group as a whole are more dominant than fathers.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are based on the findings of this exploratory study:

1. The FRI as a measuring instrument to quantify perceived parental attitudes could be used to investigate further its applicability to a wide variety of situations involving occupational decision-making.
2. The FRI could also be used to investigate further its applicability to a variety of situations other than those involving occupational decision-making, i.e., role-model identification, ordinal position in the family constellation, social-emotional adjustment and the like.
3. At the senior high school level, the FRI could also be used to explore its value in vocational counseling.
4. The replication of this exploratory study would be of

value for checking and testing the significance of the findings obtained.

Discussion

The findings seem to suggest that the FRI as a measure of parental attitudes is valid for use among graduate students. The mean scores obtained from each sub-scale, when evaluated against the norm established by Brunkan and Crites (1963), showed that the mean samples developed are highly identical with the normative sample. T-scores ranging from 40 to 60 were obtained. Attitudes of acceptance, avoidance and concentration were clearly delineated, while at the same time interrelationships among them were found to be present. In the study of family relationships, as Roe (1957) indicated, one cannot expect to find a completely distinct pervading attitude of acceptance, avoidance or concentration alone. The circular continuum of warm-cold family relationship is expected to be present at different degrees.

Moderate to fairly high negative correlations were found between acceptance and avoidance. Moderate positive relationships were found between acceptance scales in most instances, and significant to not significant correlations between the other scales. These intercorrelations found to exist among the scales support Roe's theory that interrelationships existing among the basic parental attitudes affect vocational decision-making and other aspects of development.

That the different sample groups perceived parental attitudes differently was noted. That perception of parental attitudes dif-

ferred according to ordinal position was also substantiated. A certain amount of role-model identification was likewise indicated in the study.

The Administrators' role-model identification was with father; the Guidance subjects' was with mother. The other sample groups also indicated their identification with mother, but theirs was not as great as was the Guidance subjects'. The females' role-model identification leans toward father and the males' toward mother. Supporting statistical evidence indicated that the mother is a more dominant figure in the life of the individual. Mother concentration supersedes father concentration.

It is thought that this exploratory study has contributed additional information to the investigation of perceived parental influences as they directly or indirectly affect vocational decision-making. It is also thought that the study has contributed significant information on perception of parents' attitudes by their children according to sex and ordinal position in the family constellation. Such knowledge, this researcher believes, is essential not only to vocational decision-making, but to healthy social and cultural development.

The study produced results which are not conclusive. However, the findings concurred with those obtained by Brunkan and Crites (1963), and indicated that the FRI is useful for the purposes for which it was developed. The results seem to support Roe's theory of occupational choice. Extension of the study to include role-model identification and ordinal position in the

family was conceived in conjunction with psychological assumptions in these areas (Brunkan, 1966; Super, 1957; Ginzburg et. al., 1957; Segal, 1961; Crites, 1962; White, 1959; Stewart, 1958; Steimel, 1958; May, 1949).

The validity of the results reported should be checked by further investigations similar to this study.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barry, Ruth and Wolfe, Beverly. An Epitaph For Vocational Guidance. New York: Teacher's College, Columbia University, 1962.
- Blau, P.M., Gustad, J.W., Jessor, R., Parnes, H.S. and Wilcock, R.C. "Occupational Choice: A Conceptual Framework." Industrial Relations Review, 1956, 9, 4, 531-546.
- Borow, Henry (Ed.) Man In A World of Work. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1964.
- Brunkan, R.J. "Perceived Parental Attitudes and Parental Identification in Relation to the Field of Vocational Choice." Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1966, 13, 394-402.
- Brunkan, R.J. "Perceived Parental Attitudes and Parental Identification in Relation to the Problems of Vocational Choice." Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1965, 12, 39-47.
- Brunkan, R.J. and Crites, J.O. "A Family Relations Inventory to Measure Perceived Parental Attitudes." Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1964, 11, 3-12.
- Crites, J.O. "Parental Identification in Relation to Vocational Interest Development." Journal of Educational Psychology, 1962, 53, 262-270.
- Friend, J.G. and Haggard, E.A. "Work Adjustment in Relation to Family Background." Applied Psychology Monograph, 1948, 16, 1-150.
- Garrett, Henry E. Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: Longman's Green and Company, Inc., 1951.
- Ginzberg, E., Ginsburg, S.W., Axelrod, S. and Herma, J.L. Occupational Choice. New York: Columbia University Press, 1951.
- Green, L.B. and Parker, H.J. "Parental Influence Upon Adolescents' Occupational Choice: A Test of an Aspect of Roe's Theory." Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1965, 12, 379-383.
- Grigg, A.E. "Childhood Experience with Parental Attitudes: A Test of Roe's Hypothesis." Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1955, 6, 153-156.

- Hagen, D. "Careers and Family Atmosphere: A Test of Roe's Theory." Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1960, 7, 251-256.
- Hall, C.S. and Lindzey, G. Theories of Personality. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1957.
- Holland, J.L. "A Theory of Vocational Choice." Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1959, 6, 35-45.
- Hoppock, R. Job Satisfaction. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1935.
- Korner, A.G. "Origin of Impractical or Unrealistic Vocational Goals." Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1946, 10, 328-334.
- Marr, Evelyn. "Some Behaviors and Attitudes Relating to Vocational Choice." Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1965, 12, 404-408.
- May, Rollo. The Art of Counseling. New York: Basic Books, 1949.
- Mendoza, Buena Flor. Child Growth and Development. Manila: University Press, 1965.
- Nelson, E. "Attitudes: Theories, Nature and Development." Journal of General Psychology, 1959, 381-386.
- Peters, J.H. and Hansen, J.C. Vocational Guidance and Career Development. New York: MacMillan Company, 1966.
- Roe, Anne. Psychology of Occupations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1956.
- Roe, Anne. "Early Determinants of Vocational Choice." Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1957, 4, 212-217.
- Roe, Anne and Siegelman, M. "A Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire." Child Development, 1963, 34, 357ff.
- Segal, S.J. "A Psychoanalytic Analysis of Personality Factors in Vocational Choice." Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1961, 8, 202-210.
- Steimel, R.J. "Childhood Experience and Masculinity-Femininity Scores." Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1960, 7, 212-217.
- Stewart, L.H. "Manifest Anxiety and Mother-Son Identification." Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1958, 14, 382-384.
- Stokes, S.M. "An Inquiry Into the Concept of Identification." Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1950, 76, 163-189.

- Super, Donald E. Dynamics of Vocational Adjustment. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1942.
- Super, Donald E. The Psychology of Careers. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.
- Super, Donald E. and Bachrach, P.B. Scientific Careers and Vocational Development Theory. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teacher's College, Columbia Press, 1957.
- Switzer, D.K., Grigg, A.E., Miller, J.S. and Young, R.K. "Early Experiences and Occupational Choice: A Test of Roe's Theory." Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1962, 9, 45-48.
- Symonds, P.M. The Psychology of Parent-Child Relationships. New York: Appleton Century Crofts, 1939.
- Tiedeman, D.V. "Decision and Vocational Development: A Paradigm and Its Implications." Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1961, 40, 15-20.
- Tiedeman, D.V., O'Hara, R.P., and Baruch, R.W. "Career Development: Choice and Adjustment." College Examination Board. Princeton, N.J., 1963.
- Trow, W.D. "Fantasy and Vocational Choice." Occupations, 1941, 20, 89-93.
- Useem, Ruth. "Changing Cultural Concepts in Women's Lives." Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, 1961, 24, 29-34.
- Utton, A.C. "Recalled Parent-Child Relations as Determinants of Vocational Choice." Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1962, 9, 89-93.
- White, Becky J. "The Relationship of Self-Concept and Parental Identification to Women's Vocational Interests." Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1959, 6, 202-206.
- Williamson, E.G. and Darley, J.G. Student Personnel Work. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1937.
- Williamson, E.G., Patterson, D.G., Schneider, G.G. Student Guidance Techniques, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1938.
- Williamson, E.G. Student Personnel Services in Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

APPENDIX A

The Family Relations Inventory

7802

by

Richard J. Brunkan and J. O. Crites

Part I

Directions:

The statements which follow concern your relationships with your parents, both in the present and in the past. Read each statement and decide whether it applies to your family relationships. If the statement applies, place a mark in the TRUE column on the special answer sheet. If it does not apply, answer in the FALSE column. Use only the columns headed T and F on the answer sheet for these statements.

In marking your answers on the answer sheet, make sure that the number of the statement is the same as the number on the answer sheet. Be sure to answer either TRUE or FALSE for every statement, even if you have to guess at some.

1. My father was often "too busy to listen" to me.
2. Mother generally made most of my decisions for me.
3. If I was right about something, my father generally told me so.
4. If I got into a quarrel my father would try to show me who was right and why.
5. My father seldom asked my opinion on anything.
6. My father thinks I should have as much opportunity as possible within reasonable limits.
7. My father was quite concerned about my doing well in school.
8. I still kiss my father "good night" when I am home.
9. My mother told me that she wished that I had never been born.
10. My mother explained sex matters to me if I asked her about them.
11. My mother gave me encouragement when I needed it most.
12. My father would explain things to me when I was working with him.
13. I felt that my father understood me.
14. My mother almost always kept me dressed better than my young friends.

15. I could "talk back" to my mother if I didn't overdo it.
16. My mother was willing to listen to my side of the story and give it consideration.
17. My father seemed to overdo both "blaming" and "praising".
18. My mother never seemed to notice my "pet" projects.
19. When I asked for something my mother would almost always give it to me.
20. I hardly ever felt that my mother criticized me unjustly.
21. If I asked my father about sex matters he would explain them in a manner that I understood.
22. My advances toward my father were often met very coldly.
23. My mother didn't seem to care about teaching me how to act in social situations.
24. My father had little patience with me when I helped him on an unfamiliar task.
25. I practically always had to play where my mother could keep an eye on me.
26. I could tell my mother about my dates without fearing that she would ask prying questions.
27. When I got hurt, my mother would get very upset.
28. I seldom sat on my father's lap when I was a child.
29. I seldom talked over personal problems with my mother.
30. My mother never seemed to be very concerned about what I did or where I had been.
31. I could depend on my mother to come through in a pinch.
32. My mother always had time to listen to my stories about the day's events.
33. It was hard for me to talk about my personal thoughts and problems to my father.
34. I spent more time with a nurse or baby sitter during childhood than I did with my mother.
35. I had to get permission from my mother to go out and play.

36. Only occasionally did my mother kiss or hug me.
37. My father preferred that I do things with him rather than with some of my young friends.
38. My father gave me more spending money than I actually needed.
39. As a child I was able to have some secrets without any objections from my mother.
40. I can remember going hungry because no one prepared my meals.
41. My mother explained things to me when I worked with her.
42. At times when I needed him most, my father was usually busy or not around.
43. My father didn't care about what kind of grades I got in school.
44. The main reason I'm in school now is because it's my father's wish.
45. I often felt that my father wished he could get rid of me.
46. I can't recall that I ever really discussed my plans for the future with my father.
47. My father gave me a chance to present my side of the story and would give it consideration.
48. My father didn't seem to care if I "wandered off" for as long as half a day.
49. My mother saw to it that I got sufficient medical care when I needed it.
50. When my mother told me to do something, she expected me to do it immediately.
51. My father generally made most of my decisions for me.
52. At meals my mother required that I eat only as much as I wanted rather than having to clean up my plate.
53. I seldom felt that my father criticized me unjustly.
54. My mother showed little concern over my illnesses.
55. My mother praised more than she blamed but didn't overdo either one.
56. My mother didn't seem to care if I drank alcohol when I was young.

57. My father seldom gave me gifts--even on special occasions.
58. If I asked my father a question, he would generally tell me to ask my mother.
59. I felt that my mother understood me.
60. When I was a child my mother gave me about as much "freedom" as my friend's mothers gave them.
61. My mother usually wasn't home when I returned from school.
62. When I was a child my father would let me have my secrets without interfering.
63. My father liked to have my friends come to our house.
64. My father was usually interested in what I was doing.
65. I seldom received gifts from my mother--even on special occasions.
66. My mother spent considerable time in dressing me up for school and company.
67. My father spent very little time with me when I was growing up.
68. My father used to "snap" at me frequently.
69. My mother was reluctant to let me stay at a friend's house overnight.
70. Mother scolded other children who picked on me.
71. My father gave me more gifts than he should have.
72. My mother would let me work at a task until I asked for help.
73. I often felt that I was tolerated more than I was accepted by my mother.
74. When we were together, either at home or in other places, my mother would usually put her arm around me or hold my hand.
75. My father was not concerned about the company I kept.
76. I could "talk back" to my father if I didn't overdo it.
77. My mother didn't like the idea of me going on class trips away from home.

78. My mother would explain things to me just to the point of satisfying my curiosity.
79. Even when I was big enough to dress myself, my mother did it for me.
80. It was all right with my mother when I brought friends home with me.
81. My mother didn't mind if I got my playclothes dirty.
82. My mother asked for my opinion and considered it seriously.
83. My mother asks rather than tells me to do things.
84. My father was reluctant to let me stay at a friend's house, go to camp, or go on a trip for a few days.
85. My father is too concerned about me but I wouldn't want him to know that I think so.
86. If I wanted to go somewhere, I usually had to ask my mother.
87. I could usually get my father to do what I wanted.
88. I enjoyed helping my father do odd jobs.
89. My mother often showered me with affection after punishing me.
90. I could tell my father about things that happened on a date without being afraid of prying questions being asked.
91. I sometimes wished that my mother would let me fight my own battles.
92. There was seldom a mealtime that my father did not correct me for something.
93. My father tried to look at my companions through my eyes.
94. My mother usually treated others with more consideration and courtesy than she did me.
95. My mother would tell me to do something over and over again.
96. My father permitted me to take an occasional alcoholic drink at home, after I was in high school.
97. I could rely upon my father if it was necessary.
98. Some of the best times in my childhood were when my father brought me toys as a surprise.

99. If I got into serious trouble my father would do what he could to help me out.
100. My father often showed greatest affection toward me right after he had punished me rather severely.
101. My mother never bought anything "just for me" (for example, candy or gum) when I went to the store with her.
102. My father wouldn't allow me to leave the table until I had eaten everything on my plate.
103. My mother's attitude was that children are just naturally bad.
104. My mother would get very upset when I did not come home right after school.
105. My father would let me work at a task until I asked for help.
106. My father would often abide by my will even though he did not agree.
107. My father visited my school and teachers a number of times each year.
108. My mother would often make promises to me, but would only infrequently keep them.
109. There were many times when I wished that my father better understood how I felt about things.
110. When I was criticized by others my mother would take my side and defend me.
111. My mother didn't care how messy I was when I was young.
112. I felt like my father was a good friend as well as a parent.
113. My mother always had time to listen if I had a problem to discuss.
114. I hardly ever took any of my personal problems to my father.
115. My mother seemed to overdo both "blaming" and "praising".
116. My father usually ignored me when there were other adults around.
117. My mother would take time out to play with me if I wanted her to.

118. I wish now that my father had been stricter with me than he was..
119. My father seldom encouraged me in anything.
120. My mother gave me more gifts than I deserved.
121. When I was learning table manners my mother didn't mind if I sometimes used my fingers after trying with the silverware.
122. My mother trusted me.
123. My father wouldn't consider letting me go out at night if my homework was unfinished.
124. My mother didn't seem interested in explaining things to me.
125. My father would nev er let me "putter around" in his work-shop.
126. I can remember my father encouraging me to make "small" decisions when I was quite young.
127. When I got into serious trouble I could expect very little help from my father in getting things straightened out.
128. My father was not very much interested in showing me how to act in social situations.
129. I sometimes wished my father would let me fight my own battles.
130. My father never seemed to mind when I interrupted him as he was talking.
131. My friends were allowed to go out at night long before my father would allow me to go with them.
132. If I kissed or hugged my mother, she seemed to be embarrassed.
133. My father often expected me to do more than I thought I could.
134. My father was disappointed if I got only average grades in school.
135. My mother seldom seemed interested in my opinion.
136. My father preferred that I date only occasionally.
137. My father never bought anything "just for me" (for example, candy or gum) when I went to the store with him.

138. My father preferred that I not go on class trips away from home.
139. My father always seemed to be very busy when I asked him for something.
140. My mother doesn't seem to realize that I'm no longer a child.
141. When I was learning table manners my father didn't mind if I used my fingers after trying to use the silverware.
142. My father seldom took the time to explain things to me so that I could understand them.
143. My father almost always gave me what I wanted when I asked for something.
144. I often felt that my mother expected more of me than I could accomplish.
145. My father had the knack of knowing just when to "put his foot down".
146. My mother seldom "tucked" me into bed.
147. My father never seemed interested in the things I did at school.
148. Quite often I would get a quick, emphatic "NO" from my father even though my request was reasonable.
149. When my father promised me something, I knew that he would keep the promise.
150. My father was a willing listener if I had a problem.
151. My mother seldom gave me much "moral support".
152. I found it next to impossible to have a heart to heart talk with my mother.
153. My mother didn't care about what kind of grades I got in school.
154. At times when I needed her most my mother was usually busy or not around.
155. My mother showed little affection toward me.
156. I hardly ever sat on my mother's lap when I was young.
157. My father often acted as if I was disgusting to him.

158. I remember that my mother usually told me what I should do.
159. My father asked for my opinion and considered it seriously.
160. My mother wouldn't often go to sleep until after I got home at night.
161. My mother showed little concern if I "wandered off" for as long as half a day.
162. I felt as if my father was concerned about how I was growing up.
163. My mother treated me pretty much as her equal.
164. My father praised more than he blamed but didn't overdo either one.
165. My mother always seemed to be very busy when I asked her for something.
166. My mother thought I should rank near the top scholastically.
167. My father often put off seeking medical help when I needed it.
168. If I got into serious trouble my mother thought it was up to me to straighten things out.
169. My mother never seemed interested in the things I made for her in school.
170. My father would explain things to me just to the point of satisfying my curiosity.
171. My father used to help me with my hobbies.
172. I could depend on my father for encouragement when I needed it most.
173. When I asked him a question, my father would often explain a thing to the point of boredom.
174. My mother was often "too busy to listen" to me.
175. My father used to spend time playing games with me.
176. I usually went home after school because mother wanted me to.
177. Mother almost always watched me when I was playing.
178. My mother knew just how far to let things go before "putting her foot down".

179. I can remember my mother encouraging me to make "small" decisions when I was quite young.
180. I felt that my mother could have kept my clothes nicer.
181. It was long after my friends were allowed to go out at night that my mother finally gave me her permission to go with them.
182. I could go out and play without first asking my mother.
183. I felt that my father was too strict about table manners.
184. My father seldom showed any interest in my "pet" projects.
185. I could never do anything well enough to completely satisfy my father.
186. I enjoyed doing little jobs for my mother.
187. I often felt that my mother wished she could get rid of me.
188. If I got into serious trouble my mother would do what she could to help me out.
189. My mother would lend a helping hand on a project if I desired it.
190. My father trusted me.
191. My father wanted me to be at the top of my class.
192. When I was a child my father gave me about as much "freedom" as my friends' fathers gave them.
193. My mother tried to look at my companions through my eyes.
194. My mother was unhappy if I wanted to stay away from home for a few days, for example, at camp or at a friend's house.
195. My mother usually dressed me about the same as my friends.
196. My father didn't care when I got home from school or dates.
197. There were very few times that my mother tried to teach me to do something.
198. I was allowed to help myself without asking if I wanted to borrow something from my father's personal belongings.
199. Because my mother never objected, I ate pretty much what I wanted at home.
200. My father always wanted me to do things "just a little bit better" than my friend did them.

201. When I was in high school, mother didn't mind if I took an occasional alcoholic drink at home.
202. My father threatened to evict me when I behaved very badly.

TO ASSURE YOU THAT THIS SURVEY IS CONFIDENTIAL, YOUR NAME IS NOT REQUESTED.

DATE _____ AGE _____ SEX M F GRADUATE _____
 UNDERGRAD _____ YEAR _____ MAJOR FIELD _____
 GUID., PSYCH., ED., ADM., OTHER _____

Professional Experience (Years):

Teaching _____ Administration _____
 Counseling _____ Other (specify) _____

Number of brothers _____ sisters _____

Circle your ordinal position in the family 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 _____

Married _____ Single _____ Divorced _____ Widow(er) _____

This is a family relations inventory. It aims to make a survey of parental attitudes. Please do not mull over these questions. Answer them quickly with what would be considered your first response.

PUT AN X IN THE TRUE OR FALSE COLUMN AFTER EACH NUMBER, BEING SURE TO MATCH THE NUMBER OF THE QUESTION WITH THE NUMBER ON THE ANSWER SHEET.

| | T | F | | T | F | | T | F | | T | F | | T | F | | T | F |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|
| 1. | --- | --- | 35. | --- | --- | 70. | --- | --- | 105. | --- | --- | 140. | --- | --- | 175. | --- | --- |
| 2. | --- | --- | 36. | --- | --- | 71. | --- | --- | 106. | --- | --- | 141. | --- | --- | 176. | --- | --- |
| 3. | --- | --- | 37. | --- | --- | 72. | --- | --- | 107. | --- | --- | 142. | --- | --- | 177. | --- | --- |
| 4. | --- | --- | 38. | --- | --- | 73. | --- | --- | 108. | --- | --- | 143. | --- | --- | 178. | --- | --- |
| 5. | --- | --- | 39. | --- | --- | 74. | --- | --- | 109. | --- | --- | 144. | --- | --- | 179. | --- | --- |
| 6. | --- | --- | 40. | --- | --- | 75. | --- | --- | 110. | --- | --- | 145. | --- | --- | 180. | --- | --- |
| 7. | --- | --- | 41. | --- | --- | 76. | --- | --- | 111. | --- | --- | 146. | --- | --- | 181. | --- | --- |
| 8. | --- | --- | 42. | --- | --- | 77. | --- | --- | 112. | --- | --- | 147. | --- | --- | 182. | --- | --- |
| 9. | --- | --- | 43. | --- | --- | 78. | --- | --- | 113. | --- | --- | 148. | --- | --- | 183. | --- | --- |
| 10. | --- | --- | 44. | --- | --- | 79. | --- | --- | 114. | --- | --- | 149. | --- | --- | 184. | --- | --- |
| 11. | --- | --- | 45. | --- | --- | 80. | --- | --- | 115. | --- | --- | 150. | --- | --- | 185. | --- | --- |
| 12. | --- | --- | 46. | --- | --- | 81. | --- | --- | 116. | --- | --- | 151. | --- | --- | 186. | --- | --- |
| 13. | --- | --- | 47. | --- | --- | 82. | --- | --- | 117. | --- | --- | 152. | --- | --- | 187. | --- | --- |
| 14. | --- | --- | 48. | --- | --- | 83. | --- | --- | 118. | --- | --- | 153. | --- | --- | 188. | --- | --- |
| 15. | --- | --- | 49. | --- | --- | 84. | --- | --- | 119. | --- | --- | 154. | --- | --- | 189. | --- | --- |
| 16. | --- | --- | 50. | --- | --- | 85. | --- | --- | 120. | --- | --- | 155. | --- | --- | 190. | --- | --- |
| 17. | --- | --- | 51. | --- | --- | 86. | --- | --- | 121. | --- | --- | 156. | --- | --- | 191. | --- | --- |
| 18. | --- | --- | 52. | --- | --- | 87. | --- | --- | 122. | --- | --- | 157. | --- | --- | 192. | --- | --- |
| 19. | --- | --- | 53. | --- | --- | 88. | --- | --- | 123. | --- | --- | 158. | --- | --- | 193. | --- | --- |
| 20. | --- | --- | 54. | --- | --- | 89. | --- | --- | 124. | --- | --- | 159. | --- | --- | 194. | --- | --- |
| 21. | --- | --- | 55. | --- | --- | 90. | --- | --- | 125. | --- | --- | 160. | --- | --- | 195. | --- | --- |
| 22. | --- | --- | 56. | --- | --- | 91. | --- | --- | 126. | --- | --- | 161. | --- | --- | 196. | --- | --- |
| 23. | --- | --- | 57. | --- | --- | 92. | --- | --- | 127. | --- | --- | 162. | --- | --- | 197. | --- | --- |
| 24. | --- | --- | 58. | --- | --- | 93. | --- | --- | 128. | --- | --- | 163. | --- | --- | 198. | --- | --- |
| 25. | --- | --- | 59. | --- | --- | 94. | --- | --- | 129. | --- | --- | 164. | --- | --- | 199. | --- | --- |
| 26. | --- | --- | 60. | --- | --- | 95. | --- | --- | 130. | --- | --- | 165. | --- | --- | 200. | --- | --- |
| 27. | --- | --- | 61. | --- | --- | 96. | --- | --- | 131. | --- | --- | 166. | --- | --- | 201. | --- | --- |
| 28. | --- | --- | 62. | --- | --- | 97. | --- | --- | 132. | --- | --- | 167. | --- | --- | 202. | --- | --- |
| 29. | --- | --- | 63. | --- | --- | 98. | --- | --- | 133. | --- | --- | 168. | --- | --- | | | |
| 30. | --- | --- | 64. | --- | --- | 99. | --- | --- | 134. | --- | --- | 169. | --- | --- | | | |
| 31. | --- | --- | 65. | --- | --- | 100. | --- | --- | 135. | --- | --- | 170. | --- | --- | | | |
| 32. | --- | --- | 66. | --- | --- | 101. | --- | --- | 136. | --- | --- | 171. | --- | --- | | | |
| 33. | --- | --- | 67. | --- | --- | 102. | --- | --- | 137. | --- | --- | 172. | --- | --- | | | |
| 34. | --- | --- | 68. | --- | --- | 103. | --- | --- | 138. | --- | --- | 173. | --- | --- | | | |
| | | | 69. | --- | --- | 104. | --- | --- | 139. | --- | --- | 174. | --- | --- | | | |

SCORES

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____
 4 _____ 5 _____ 6 _____