

SUBJECTS WHICH ONE HUNDRED SELECTED COLLEGE STUDENTS
FOUND DIFFICULT TO DISCUSS WITH THEIR PARENTS
AND
REASONS FOR THEIR DIFFICULTIES

by

MARVIN CLARENCE DUBBE'

A THESIS

submitted to

OREGON STATE COLLEGE

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

JUNE 1956

APPROVED:

Redacted for privacy

Associate Professor of Education

In Charge of Major

Redacted for privacy

Head of Department of Education

Redacted for privacy

Chairman of School Graduate Committee

Redacted for privacy

Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis is presented December 1, 1955

Typed by Marguerite B. Dubbe'

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Recognition is due Dr. Robert R. Reichart for assistance in the early planning of this study. To Dr. R. B. Denis Baron and to every member of my committee, I extend appreciation. I wish to express special thanks to Dr. Glenn A. Bakkum for his painstaking work with my early draft of the dissertation. Dr. Jerome Li was very kind and patient to help me with the statistical processes. I acknowledge with thanks the interest of Dr. Curtis E. Avery, Director of the E. C. Brown Trust for Social Hygiene Education, and the generosity of that agency in providing certain financial support for the study. Though I sent individual letters to the students who supplied the data, I would be remiss if I failed to express appreciation here for their cooperation. I cannot name all of the kindnesses that were extended to me during the project, but the faithful assistance of my wife and the devoted cooperation of my three daughters have been no less than inspirational to me.

LISTS AND APPENDICES

	Page
Alphabetical List of Subjects Indicating Numbers and Percentages of Students Having Difficulty with Them by Sex and in Totals	44
Alphabetical List of Reasons for Difficulty Indicating Numbers and Percentages of Students Giving Them Credence by Sex and in Totals	46
APPENDIX I FORMS AND INSTRUCTIONS USED	69
APPENDIX II TABLES DESCRIBING THE STUDENTS IN THE SAMPLE	88
APPENDIX III PRESENTATION OF DATA	101
APPENDIX IV DISPLAY OF THE WRITE-INS	118

**SUBJECTS WHICH ONE HUNDRED SELECTED COLLEGE STUDENTS FOUND DIFFICULT
TO DISCUSS WITH THEIR PARENTS AND REASONS FOR THEIR DIFFICULTIES**

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Among the numerous problems which have been discovered and listed as existing for teen-agers is the difficulty of communicating with parents. By teen-agers is meant young people of ages thirteen through nineteen. A great deal of evidence can be brought to bear on the point that problems of parent-youth relationships are of serious consequence for both age groups. The relationships of social beings at any level are fundamentally communicative activities. The child does not merely sustain life in the vicinity of a parent. A relationship exists between the two. The relationship is produced and sustained by signals which the two exchange in various forms, primarily in the form of the language which is native to the family.

The present study was undertaken with the purpose of seeking new information about the communication of teen-agers with their parents. It was undertaken in the belief that principles for education and guidance for children, parents, and teachers might be derived from knowing where some of the resistances occur in the lines of communication. If topics of genuine difficulty and those of slight difficulty could be isolated, then helpful activities of teaching and counseling might be designed and applied where they would be most effective.

Also, to assist in the understanding of the blocking of relationship-communication, controlling attitudes or reasons held

by the troubled and limited communicators need to be examined. If several subjects were significantly difficult to talk about, then out of a number of possible reasons, it would be desirable to know which reasons were of genuine importance and which were not.

Furthermore, in the family make-up there would be reasons to suspect differences in difficulty of communication because of sex-role variations. In fact, previous research which is cited in Chapter II of this study will support this contention. If these variations produce meaningful information, they should also be considered. Not only the subjects discussed but the reasons for difficulty will be affected if the respondent is a boy or a girl and if he or she is talking with father or mother.

It is now possible to present a schematic design for the information sought through this study:

Which subject areas give important difficulty?

For teen-agers?	For boys?	{	When talking to father?
		{	When talking to mother?
	For girls?	{	When talking to father?
		{	When talking to mother?

Which reasons for difficulty are importantly operative?

For teen-agers?	For boys?	{	When talk with father is difficult?
		{	When talk with mother is difficult?
	For girls?	{	When talk with father is difficult?
		{	When talk with mother is difficult?

The scope of this study is necessarily limited by time, place, means, and the frailties of the researcher. It cannot do many desirable things nor answer many questions which need to be answered. A call for further investigations is made in the concluding chapter. In several respects this research may be regarded as a pilot study for extended structures of investigation.

The investigator was unable to find any established research instruments suited to the study of the projected depths of the problem. Since no suitable instruments were available, the necessary tools had to be devised. Thus a primary part of this study has been the development of instruments and methods for securing the desired data.

How the Instruments Were Made

In order to determine which subject areas produced trouble in discussion by teen-agers with their parents, a list of subjects was needed. It could reasonably be expected that in the total population of young people, every subject in the universe would appear. Obviously all items could not be detailed in a questionnaire, even if all could be defined, since a questionnaire or an interview must be held to reasonable length or duration. Subject areas were decided upon as an alternative to endless listing of minute topics. At first these were listed in the form of brief topical titles. Intimate acquaintance with more than a thousand youths in fifteen years of child welfare work and eight years of teaching served as resource for this material. These subjects were worked over again and again

for improvement of coverage and wording. Each was put on a separate card.

Parallel with the making of the subject cards, reasons for difficulties were developed, revised, and put on cards.

When twenty-two discussion topics and thirteen reasons had evolved, the cards were offered to any teen-aged individuals who could be detained and questioned. Each one was asked, "If you were to make a list of things that could be discussed with father or mother, what would you add to or take away from this set of topics?" Several improvements resulted. The reason cards were likewise submitted to the refining observations of the teen-agers. Fifteen young people gave this assistance.

A test run of the cards was then made in a class of college freshmen. More profitable than the actual tabulations for the twenty-four students of the class were their animated discussions of several facets of the parent-child relationship. The urgency or reality of the problem, for at least the occasional youth, was dramatized by the announcement of one student that communication between him and his father was totally blocked. Despite the fact that he ate three meals a day across the table from his father, he declared that no word had passed between them for three years. One girl admitted that she had unsatisfactory conversational relationships with her father since he regarded her as the "black sheep" of the family. As a result of this trial run, several subjects and reasons were added or improved.

In the next step, the card sets were presented to numerous

persons of training and related experience. Included were the following: five experienced teachers, two psychologists, a school principal, the head of a college English department, two trained research men, three statisticians, an anthropologist, and a number of parents. Again, valuable suggestions for improving the items were obtained.

A graduate seminar of twelve candidates for masters and doctoral degrees assisted in further improving the instrument.

The discussion items finally totaled thirty-six and the reasons, twenty-two. Blank cards were included for "write-ins." It was assumed that the items and reasons presented on the cards could not be complete for every person. His experience and understanding would necessarily differ from that of others. Consequently the blank cards were provided so that items could be added or so that additional reasons could be entered. Each card was headed by a control line or identification. The subject cards were headed, ITEM HARD TO TALK ABOUT WITH PARENTS. The others were headed, REASON FOR DIFFICULTY. Thus it was believed that the interviewed students would be constantly reminded of the intention of the evaluation of each element. (See models of cards below. Also see complete list of item and reason entries, Appendix I, pp. 70-80.)

ITEM HARD TO TALK ABOUT WITH PARENTS:

RELATIVES. My brothers, sisters, aunts, uncles, cousins, grandparents—relatives living at home or elsewhere. My attitudes toward them or my relationships with them.

F _____ M _____

REASON FOR DIFFICULTY:

INFERIORITY. I feel inferior to my parents. Consequently I do not feel like talking with them about my ideas, problems, interests.

F _____ M _____

Near the bottom of each card, spaces were provided thus: F _____ M _____ in which weighted responses (see page 18; also see Appendix I, pp. 81-82) could be entered for each item as it was evaluated relative to father and mother respectively. Mimeographed instruction sheets for filling out the cards were prepared, one

for the discussion items, one for the reasons. (See in Appendix I pp. 81-82.)

When a model set of cards had been prepared on the typewriter, the cards were laid out and glued to large sheets of cardboard. Twenty-one small cards, three by five inches, were arranged three wide and seven deep, covering a space fifteen inches wide by twenty-one inches. These panels were then photolithically reproduced. Printing was done on white ledger paper. The cards were then cut and collated into sets.

In order to reduce errors which are sometimes charged to fatigue near the end of long questionnaires, these card sets were shuffled. The result of this shuffle was a randomization of the cards in the sets. No items being investigated were constantly at the end of the series where fatigue might reduce the honesty of response. Furthermore, this randomizing of the items virtually eliminated any possibility of one respondent's being influenced by what a near-neighbor was doing. Only by infrequent chance could parallel items appear in two sets at the same time.

An advantage hoped for in the card sets as against typical questionnaire arrangements was that the manipulation of the items one at a time would focus attention on each. No objections were raised in the course of the investigation to any part of this method; rather, numerous positive reactions were registered by both the investigator's conferrees and the interviewees.

While no respondent was to be identified by name or number, certain descriptive information about the students of the sample was

obtained. A simple schedule was prepared on which to secure information about the teen-ager himself, about his father, and about his mother. It was also considered to be useful to obtain evaluations from the student about his familial relationships. A two-page schedule was prepared on the mimeograph for these purposes. (See Appendix I, pp. 86-87.) A deliberate attempt was made to keep this set of queries minimal rather than to make it exhaustive.

To acquaint the student with the intent of the research, to obtain his interest in contributing data of value, to assure him of anonymity, and to explain to him the tasks to be performed, introductory remarks were prepared. Not only were these remarks set up in mimeographed form to be read but the same words were also put on a tape recording to be played simultaneously with his reading. This hear-and-see procedure was based on a Purdue study which revealed that of five methods of transmitting information, the most effective was by oral presentation at the same time that written material was made available. (14, pp. 243-246) It was deemed especially important to make these GENERAL INTRODUCTORY REMARKS ABOUT THE STUDY uniformly clear if possible. (See Appendix I, pp. 83-84.) It was presumed that the sample could include students of extremely low reading ability or those of foreign extraction with severe language handicaps. Uniformity of instruction was facilitated by these devices.

Finally, a letter of invitation was made up to be sent to the randomly selected students. (See Appendix I, p. 85.)

Certain Definitions and Assumptions

In order to sharpen understanding of what was wanted on the item cards, the following definition was included on the sheet of instructions for filling them out:

By DIFFICULTY or HARD TO TALK ABOUT is meant any small or great amount of choking up, holding back, painfulness, embarrassment, feelings of shyness, inadequacy, not knowing what to say or how to say it, fears, beliefs that talks would be futile, or similar things. Some persons have experienced difficulty (or believe they would if they tried to talk about these things) with nearly every subject; others would have trouble with few or none.

An assumption was held that young people themselves would know more about this problem than any other age group. This assumption was not original in the present study but was held by the scholars who led the extensive investigations of American children and young people for the White House Conference of the Hoover administration. (66, p. xiv)

Since it was assumed to be desirable that certain controls be in effect in getting data of highly subjective nature, the sample was made homogeneous in several respects. While the total population of incoming students at Oregon State College represented students away from home for the first time, those who were attending college while still living at home, those who had been at other schools and were now transferring at advanced levels, those who had been away from home in military or employment service, and persons of advanced age who were just entering a college career, only those entering college for the first time and living away from the parental home

were accepted as part of the sample. It was assumed in this connection that these young students of the upper adolescent group, now having separated from direct home association with parents, might have sharpened sensitivity to the difficulties of communication in the home situation. They might have a means of evaluating the problems by comparison of being with the parents and away from them. They might have insight into the difference in talking with parents and in talking with strangers, instructors, advisors, dormitory matrons, and others.

The present study is concerned with difficulties teen-agers have in talking with parents, not the difficulties they had as infants or young children, not those which might be experienced in the adult future. Therefore the respondents were asked in the directions to consider "each item to estimate its degree of difficulty as you have experienced it during your teen years." For the inevitable questions which some respondents might have about items in the list which had never come up in their talk with parents, directions said, "answer as you think you would if you discussed it with your father or mother."

It was assumed, too, that findings about the freshmen at Oregon State College would be prejudiced in several respects and that they could not be universally applicable. This college is primarily a technical school. It therefore attracts students of special backgrounds and interests. While the school is coeducational, by no means are the sex representations equivalent to those in the general population. The male population on the campus outnumbered the female

about three to one.

With respect to the validity of the items and reasons presented on the card sets, it was well known in advance that their construction was imperfect. In constructing any word lists, phrases, or sentences, the problem of semantics is ever present. Also some overlapping and omission had to be suspected. However, the results from the use of the cards could be assumed reasonably accurate, not only because of the validating work in their construction, but because the scoring methodology was designed to provide for the elimination of the non-valid entries, and the blank cards for write-ins made possible the discovery or inclusion of neglected items.

How the Sample Was Selected

For the purposes of this study a randomly selected group of Oregon State College freshmen of the 1954-55 year was used. To use the entire population of new students was not considered to be feasible. It was desired that half the sample should be of male students and that half should be female students. Also it was desired that the students should not be residing with parents while attending college.

At the beginning of the college year, American College Entrance Examinations are administered to all incoming students at Oregon State College. The results of such tests are provided for deans and department heads so that incoming students may be assisted intelligently with respect to the courses they should enter upon and the study load they should carry. The list is regarded as confidential.

It is prepared in alphabetical order for the convenience of its users. Permission was obtained for the use of such a list for the selection of the sample in this study.

Numbers were assigned to the names of students on the entrance examination list in rotation from 1 to 2,184. Then numbers were taken from a table of random numbers in a textbook on statistical analysis. (15, p. 290 ff.) The numbers from the table indicated the names of the students who were to be called. The purposes of this step were to remove the possibility of personal bias in the selection of cases and to ensure that the small sample would be representative of the total population. Each randomly chosen name was written on a small card. The name cards were then taken to the Registrar's files for the addition of addresses, college classification, facts about the student's residence, and hours free from class obligations in which he could be interviewed.

When students had not completed registration or were living at home with parents or were otherwise not available, their names were dropped. New names were secured from the list through the random numbers table until the selection of the sample was complete.

Description of the Sample

The ages of the students in the sample ranged from seventeen to thirty-five. The average age of the fifty women students was 18.0 while the average age of the fifty men was 19.76, nearly two years higher. The overall average for the hundred people in the study was 18.89.

Decile distributions covered the entire range from tenth decile to first as scored by these students on the American College Entrance Examinations. Quantitative, linguistic, and total results were tabulated. (See Appendix II, Table 2, p. 89.)

Analysis of the relationship of father-persons to the students in the sample showed ninety-two own fathers and eight substitute persons. There were only three substitute mother-persons out of the hundred for the sample. (Appendix II, Table 3, p. 90)

Family sizes represented a range from those of the only child to one of nine children. Average size of families represented was 2.76. Birth order was tabulated. (Appendix II, Table 4, p. 90)

Only one of the students was born in Europe. Ninety-nine were born in the United States or its territories, three of whom were born in Hawaii.

Present ages of fathers and mothers of students in the sample were tabulated. Average age of fathers was 51.31. Average age of mothers was 46.43. Parents of men students were approximately two years older than parents of women students. (Appendix II, Tables 5 and 6, p. 91)

Birthplaces of fathers and mothers of the students were predominantly in the United States. Only five fathers and eight mothers were designated as foreign born. (Appendix II, Table 7, p. 72) Of the grandparents, somewhat more than half were American born. Birthplaces were unknown to the students for approximately one-seventh of the grandparents. (Appendix II, Table 8, p. 93)

Educational levels of fathers and mothers of students in the

sample ran the gamut from graduate training down to none. (See Appendix, Table 9, p. 94.)

Occupational classification of the fathers showed them to be distributed predominantly in three categories, Professional-Managerial, Agricultural-Fishery-Forestry, and Skilled. In the main, mothers were housewives who were not employed outside their homes. The classifications used were those of the Dictionary of Occupational Titles and the Occupational Classification of the United States Employment Service. (62) These are probably the most complete and up-to-date classifications in existence. In the tables prepared for this study, additional classifications were made for "housewives" and for "retired or unspecified." Subdivisions of the skilled and unskilled occupations were not used here because these divisions had no special meaning within the framework of the present study. (Appendix II, Table 10, p. 95)

Family income to the nearest thousand for the students in the sample showed a range from \$4,000 to \$2,000. However, a somewhat striking observation was the number of girls (twelve) who did not know family income as compared with the number of boys (four) who did not know. (Appendix II, Table 11, p. 96)

Religious groupings of the parents showed them to be predominantly Protestant. Twenty-one of the two hundred parents reportedly had no religion. There were thirteen cases of differences of religious commitment between spouses in the hundred families of the sample. (Appendix II, Table 12, p. 97)

Evaluations of health status for the fathers and mothers were

almost the same. About three-fourths were described as good and almost one-fourth as fair. (Appendix II, Table 13, p. 97)

Estimate of marital stability of parents of the students in the sample was made principally from comments written in on the forms, evidence of more than one spouse for a partner during life of student, or a low estimate by the student of the marital relationship of his parents. Eighty-nine of the hundred parent couples were believed by the students to be secure and stable in their relationship. Four were indicated to be doubtful and seven as clearly unstable and hurtful.

Six tables appear in Appendix II to show the students' ratings of parental relationship (Table 14, p. 98), of economic status (Table 15, p. 98), of father's affection for the student (Table 16, p. 99), of mother's affection for the student (Table 17, p. 99), of relationships among the children of the family (Table 18, p. 100), and of the contribution of the student himself to the happiness and security of his family (Table 19, p. 100). The information in these six tabulations is self-explanatory.

Method of Obtaining Data

Students who were selected for the sample were invited by letter to come to Room 212 in the Memorial Union Building at Oregon State College at an hour known to be free of class obligations. The selection of the building and room was deliberate. The student activity center was believed to be better for the purpose than an office or classroom. Room 212 is a meeting room with colorful and

movable furnishings. For each group interviewed it was arranged in the same informal way. The number invited for a given hour varied from one to fifteen, but the usual group called together consisted of ten students. It was anticipated that some conflicts, illnesses, lapses of memory, or other factors would reduce the numbers who actually appeared. When the students arrived at the room, they were invited to have a chair and were asked a few casual questions about their studies, place of residence, home town, the weather. While they were assembling and being put at ease, the GENERAL INTRODUCTORY REMARKS ABOUT THE STUDY were placed before them. They were asked not to read until the tape recording began to read with them. When all were ready, the recording was started.

During the reading, two forms for the personal, parental, and family relationships information were placed before each respondent. As soon as the reading of the general remarks ended, students started to fill out the forms. Help was supplied by the investigator when requested. The general remarks were removed and the instruction sheets for the cards for ITEM HARD TO TALK ABOUT WITH PARENTS were distributed.

When the respondents were well along with the item cards, the investigator distributed the instructions and the cards headed REASON FOR DIFFICULTY.

As soon as the student finished, he wrapped the two banded sets of cards in the schedule papers, banded the whole bundle, and dropped the packet into a slotted box near the door on his way out. This was part of the assurance that responses were to be regarded as

completely anonymous. The investigator kept a careful register of persons who responded to the invitation, but he could not identify any cards or forms after they had been deposited in the slotted box. Three students came back after the interviews to say in effect, "You know, a person could really put down what he thought because nobody would know who said it."

The investigator was able to observe while the data were put on the forms. Interest in the subject of the study was apparent. The students were frequently seen to make entries, think them over, erase, and change the response. This seemed to indicate that many of them tried very conscientiously to furnish good data.

Selections of students for the sample were continued and calls were sent out until fifty men students and fifty women students had been interviewed. The numbers, fifty men and fifty women, and the total of one hundred, were arbitrarily set in the design of the study for convenience in handling certain of the statistical processes. It was anticipated that these numbers might or might not be sufficient for the study sample, and at the outset it was understood that if the sample proved to be inadequate statistically, it would have to be increased. A total of sixty-five men and sixty-seven women were invited in order to secure the required number. Second notices were sent. Thus it will be seen that seventy-six percent of those invited came in to give the data.

Collection of the data was begun in the latter part of the fall term in 1954 and concluded in the early part of the winter term 1955.

Thank-you letters were sent to all who contributed data.

Form of the Data

The information for this study was known to be highly qualitative and subjective. To deal with it at all, it had to be converted to quantitative data. In the design of the research, responses were to be accorded numerical ratings. If the respondent regarded an item of discussion as presenting no difficulty, he assigned a zero value to it. If he believed the item to be totally impossible as a subject for discussion with a parent, he assigned the number one hundred to it. If he thought it to be difficult about half the time, he used fifty, and so on. Numbers from zero to one hundred were used rather than other sequences because teen-agers are likely to be familiar with ratings and school grades on this basis.

It was recognized that one student might assign high ratings to all subjects. However, if the sample of one hundred were truly random, it should represent an approximately normal distribution. Thus, for the student who rated all items high, a student who rated every item correspondingly low would be in the sample. The study was to seek answers based on averages for the population, not those based on one or another of the single cases. Answers sought would be likened to actuarial tables of insurance companies. On the average, say such tables, men of certain description will live to the age number seventy-two. In the present study, teen-agers of certain description may be found to have difficulty in talking with father about smoking to the degree indicated by a similar number, on the average.

The data for reasons are similarly in the form of quantitative measurements.

Each item and each reason is rated by each young person for father and for mother separately.

The sets of data for each student included the two sheets of descriptive information, the set of cards about items difficult to discuss, and the set of cards for evaluation of reasons for difficulty. The sets were removed from the slotted box in the form of banded packets.

The investigator opened each packet and immediately assigned a case number to the set of materials for each respondent. Papers and cards were then separated. The cards were inspected. Those with zero responses were removed from the packets for reduction of handling; they were not discarded, however, for the zero response provided important data. The remaining cards on which number ratings appeared were arranged alphabetically for convenience in tabulating.

Tabulation of the Data

Large sheets were constructed for the tabulation of data. One sheet was prepared for the men students and one for the women. Each of the fifty case columns was designed to hold one hundred lines of information. General descriptive information was entered at the top of the column in black. Columns were double width so that the quantitative responses for items and reasons could be entered side by side for the father and mother difficulties and reasons respectively. The quantitative responses indicating the youth's trouble and his reasons

with respect to talk with father were entered in blue. The responses pertinent to mothers were entered in red. In this way, the tabulations made all data available and easily visible on two large sheets.

Coding of all information was next undertaken for entry on International Business Machine cards. At this point, the numerical ratings or quantitative evaluations of from zero to one hundred which had been assigned to the topics and reasons by students were converted to a scale from zero to twenty. This was done to simplify the statistical procedures. Thus 100 became 20, 50 became 10, 20 became 4, 5 became 1, etc. Five cards were used for each case; card 1 took the general descriptive facts; card 2 took responses on the discussion items with father; card 3 held responses for discussion items with mother; card 4 was for reasons for difficulty when talking with father; card 5 contained data on the reasons when talking with mother. Single tabular sheets for each case were designed for the purpose so that the data for all five cards for one respondent could be entered systematically. These sheets were given the same case numbers originally assigned to the sets of data. Thus checking was possible throughout the materials. The coded schedules were presented to the IBM operators for punching the cards and for checking.

Instructions were prepared for the processes of sorting and making of desired tabulations. Five sorting and tabulating steps were helpful on IBM, but it was found that the rest of the processes could be done more cheaply (if not more quickly) by manual work.

The data will be presented in Chapter III.

CHAPTER II

SEARCH OF THE LITERATURE

In the published literature of psychology and family relationships there are numerous references to the problems of young people. Whole volumes have been devoted to adolescents, some addressed directly to the young to counsel them on solving their problems, and others addressed to their parents and teachers. The specialized journals report the results of studious investigations and experiments. Many of the latter are aimed at helping adults in their presumed ignorance or difficulty in serving and living with teenagers. Even popular magazines and newspapers treat the subjects of adolescence and parent-youth relationships voluminously. Humorists and cartoonists, often amazingly sensitive to realities, use these subjects widely because of their universality of appeal.

Evidence of Parent-Adolescent Problems

F. E. Weber, in an article in Education, presents the idea in a half-amusing way that not only do young people have problems, but they are a problem—all adult made! (63, pp. 436-437) Marvin Roof and James Robertson recently summarized the situation by declaring that the task of achieving independence from parents is regarded by many as primary for these adolescents. (54, p. 238) A textbook on adolescence says that it must always be kept in mind that some disagreement between the youths and members of their households is so universal that it can be regarded as normal behavior. (42, p. 412)

The gap between the generations has always been difficult to bridge. This is common knowledge. Biblical and other ancient literature records the fact, but it may be that there are differences because of time and place.

Garrison says that the business of maturing entails many problems. Any period of change is likely to be a problem period, and since adolescence is a time of rather dramatic change, it is a problem period. He goes on to say that our complex age makes this more true than it was in previous times. (23, p. 21) Grant made a survey of the problems, and he concludes that youngsters have "many problems" which are "extremely diversified." He finds them to vary significantly in their frequency in accordance with the nature of the community surroundings and the maturity level of the youngster being observed. He is emphatic in saying there are too many problems and that not enough is being done to provide educational services for their solution. (25, pp. 296-297)

In fact, there are so many problems that study or treatment becomes extremely complex. To illustrate, a study of 1,904 essays by Charlotte Pope, reported in 1943, showed a tabulation of 7,103 problems named by St. Louis high school students. (49, pp. 443-448) In consequence of this plethora of items, efforts at classification have been made. Pope grouped the above items in six areas: (1) study-learning relationships, (2) occupational adjustments, (3) personal adjustments, (4) home-life relationships, (5) social adjustments, and (6) health problems. (49, p. 445) Laycock put them in five categories thus: (1) those relating to psychological, (2) those of

emancipation from family, (3) those of establishing the sex role, (4) those connected with vocation, and (5) those having to do with beliefs and life purposes. (33, p. 32) The Science Research Associates Youth Inventory set up eight groups: (1) my school, (2) after high school, (3) about myself, (4) getting along with others, (5) my home and family, (6) boy meets girl, (7) health, and (8) things in general. (52) The Mooney Problem Check List for grades nine to twelve and for college students uses eleven areas: (1) health and physical development, (2) finances, living conditions, employment, (3) social and recreational activities, (4) social-psychological relations, (5) personal-psychological relations, (6) courtship, sex, marriage, (7) home and family, (8) morals and religion, (9) adjustment to school work, (10) future, vocational and educational, and (11) curriculum and teaching procedures. (44, pp. 218-224) (6, p. 73) There were no doubt logical justifications for these and other classifications for various groups or purposes. It is interesting to note in each of these groupings an important area devoted to home or family relationships.

Williams, writing about personal and familial problems of high school youngsters, urged that more extensive studies should be undertaken to find the types of problems that young people talked to parents about and with what degree of success. (67, p. 284) Garrison said:

Since most studies of adolescents' problems are made by people concerned with or interested in their educational program, problems related to the home are often not discovered or are neglected. These problems, however, are likely to be discovered in the

psychological clinic. The characteristic listed as "parental troubles" ranks first among a list of symptoms manifested by boys and girls referred to the Educational Clinic of City College, New York. (23, p. 27)

He said, further, that there are many problems in growing up which are very significant to the boy or girl despite their seeming triviality to mature adults.

Studies show that home and school problems loom large in the lives of growing boys and girls. (23, p. 34)

The adolescent, as he develops physically and otherwise, awakens to powerful social interests. He is obliged to take on the culture of his peers which is an altered culture from that of the parental generation. Thus the peer group competes with the parental group. (30, p. 343) This situation is frequently reflected, as in the Purdue University Opinion Poll surveying 10,000 high school students in 1948, wherein fifty-six percent thought parents did not understand problems of the youth group. (23, p. 236)

From sociology comes this view:

From the standpoint of the sociologist and the cultural anthropologist the central problem of adolescent behavior is the conflict between the expectations of the family and of the group of adolescents. Systematic studies should be made of the hypotheses suggested by this theory. Examples are: conflicts of the adolescent which arise out of the parent's conception of him as a child and his idea of himself as an adult... conflicts arising from rapid culture change between old-fashioned parents and adolescents influenced by patterns, roles, and expectations presented by the movies, radio, and other sources. (5, pp. 298-299)

Still another source says that adolescents widely experience the problem of becoming capable and free to direct their own activities. In the process, they have to break the ties and controls of adults. Conflict and resistance accompany the shift. The young people tend to follow their own peer and social groups to the detriment of parental relationships. (43, p. 20)

Leary stresses that the task of parents is the assisting of adolescents to independence. He mentions the rather universal stage of the "none-of-your-business" attitude of the high school boys and suggests the related irritations. (34, pp. 358-360) "Greatest parental friction" seems to be the same for girls as for boys, however, and it lies in this area of social relationship with peers. (30, p. 590)

One writer certifies that adolescence is a time when parents need help in understanding and living with these problems. He says also that the teen-agers need help from persons other than parents because parent lives are too closely enmeshed with those of the children. "A parent can be both understanding and compassionate and yet lack this perspective. (For who, indeed, can be objective about his own child?)" (48, p. 24) Another writer illustrates the difficulty in the area of discussion of sexual issues. He says direct communication on this topic is hardest to achieve with the people most loved. Consequently many turn to peers, outsiders, books. For the purpose the "homegrown adult" is "taboo." (51, pp. 7-8) Kuhlen makes a similar statement. He says young people tend to go more often to their friends for help with worries as they grow older.

(30, p. 298) He refers to studies at the Institute of Child Welfare of the University of California in which the "friends" were found to be members of a similar age group but who were not necessarily bound by ties of affectionate relationship. Mrs. Tryon who reported these studies describes a middle phase of adolescence as a time of greatest resistance to adults. She says,

On many issues the highest authority resides in the peer group which becomes a bulwark of strength in combatting adult authority. (61, p. 224)

Evidence That Parent-Youth Problems Have Serious Implications

While it can be said that, "Some conflict between adolescents and their parents is perfectly natural," and that "some struggle is almost inescapable," (60, pp. 19-20) there are possible dangers in the situation for every person involved. In the present study, there is no intention to look for abnormal or socially maladjusted people. Dangers are suspected in the parent-youth problems for everybody involved.

In human relations the tendency of the energies of human conduct are toward complacency, and complacent adjustment is especially desirable in interpersonal relationships. When conflict and/or disturbances arise in such relationships immediate means or patterns for their reduction or elimination should become operative. Otherwise, the parties become maladjusted and their relationships become debilitating and disturbing; if maladjustment persists the wholesomeness of their personalities is reduced and their sanity threatened or actually impaired. It is especially disturbing, therefore, to observe the large quantity of parent-youth conflicts in our culture. (38, p. 227)

S. W. Ginsburg points out that adolescence is hard on everybody and says that

A really disturbed adolescent can create havoc in a household. The hostility of such a youngster may provoke adults in his environment from tolerance and patient forbearance to a retaliating show of strength and often overt hostility. And this establishes a vicious cycle that ultimately involves the child, his brothers and sisters, parents, grandparents, friends, teachers—in short everyone with whom he is in contact.... Such situations are beyond easy understanding and eventually require some kind of treatment. (24, p. 12)

Many teen-agers are said to become pained and angered when adults fail to accept them as grown up. They withdraw, hold to themselves, or remove to groups where there is no need to explain or defend behavior. They seek a place to establish adulthood outside the control of parents. (21, p. 92)

Psychologist Leary reports that every girl who had been to him with serious problems (excepting two whose fathers died early) could trace their problems to absence of correct father-daughter relationship. (35, p. 30)

According to the Purdue study of 15,000 high school people which underpins the Science Research Associates Youth Inventory, about ten percent indicated barriers between self and parent. Also twenty percent could not talk about personal items with parents. About nineteen percent said they had fears about telling parents of wrongdoing. (52, pp. 3-4 of Examiner Manual) When turned around, these statistics afford a favorable view. The meaning would seem to be that about eighty percent of the high school children have no important relationship problems with parents.

Josselyn, in her little book about the adolescent and his world, describes him as struggling for independence, vehemently protesting

against controls by adults, not wanting to be told what to do nor how to do, being impulsive and confused. All this disturbs the interested adults. It also disturbs and frightens the child. Consequently he reverts to some infantile procedures, demanding independence, requiring advice on the very matters about which he does not want to be told. (28, p. 38)

The desire for independence may alternate at times with anxiety about self-sufficiency, sending the adolescent scurrying back to parental shelter. (43, p. 20)

Jurevsky declares that the problem of parent-child relationships is actual from two points of view: practical and scientific. It is obvious, he says, that the family is the most effective instrument for the social development of the young person within his environment. "It moulds him during the most plastic periods" and it bears upon his development for a long period. (29, p. 85)

The focus needs to be increasingly upon problems significant for the enrichment of personal living and for more constructive interpersonal relationships. (43, p. 18)

Interviews with high school youngsters over five years led to a list of fifty items which produce conflicts between youths and mothers. These were reported repeatedly as problems which were at the base of the most disturbing situations in their lives. The fifty problems were set up in a check list and used to investigate experiences of 528 people in seventh through twelfth grades. Most of the conflicts were shown to be due to differences in thinking between adolescents and parents over matters of personal appearance and behavior, vocational and educational and other choices, values in

relation to attainment of goals, and philosophies of behavior. As would be expected, the study showed difference in conflict subjects for boys and girls. Girls appeared to have a higher ratio of disturbances at all levels. Generally, the ratio of problems tended to decrease with advance in grade. "Pestering," "nagging," and "complaining" were the items posted as contributing most often to conflicts. (4, pp. 193-206)

Evidence That One Problem Is Communication Between the Generations

A widely known quip says, "You can tell an adolescent because you can't tell him anything!"

Evelyn Duvall says this:

Getting through to each other across the barrier of age is often difficult, but is important for mutual understanding of common problems. Some parents and young people are able to talk freely and frankly with each other about anything that concerns them. They are usually in the families that through the years have encouraged each person to speak for himself without the threat of punishment or suspicion. This is a two-way process. Parents must be willing to see their children as individuals in their own right. Young people must be able to view their parents as real persons as well as parents. Mutual respect and genuine affection are needed for understanding each other. The process is long. When the gap between the generations is as great as it is today, it takes a while for each to understand the other. (18, pp. 26-27)

Ojemann asks, "How does it happen that he doesn't want to talk things over?" and suggests the alternate question, "How does it happen that he wants to talk over some things and not others?" He wonders if the youth thinks it to be a sign of weakness to discuss plans or problems. Or does he believe his questions too unimportant

to ask? Perhaps he fears that adults will disregard the confidential nature of his revelations. Or is he really just insecure and inadequate, thus needing to prove himself mature by asking no advice, telling none of his plans, and by doing things on his own initiative? (46, pp. 16-17)

"Above all, parents need to develop the art of creative listening," is a key idea put forward by Katherine Whiteside Taylor. She says too little opportunity is made for talk of an intimate or confidential nature. She suggests that secrets of the heart need to be shared and that fireplace discussions or the "protective covering of darkness" produce good opportunities. She means by this that the twilight hours serve to hide some signs of embarrassment and consequently may encourage the freer flow of communication. (60, pp. 120-121)

Mrs. Durland, a mother, candidly discusses the great importance of talk between parent and child in an article in Parents' Magazine. She stresses the point that children frequently have a genuine need to discuss matters which seem pressing to them. (17, pp. 22-23)

Communication is said by Ilka Lewin to be a basic need in the relationship of all people. (37, p. 26) In fact, says this writer, "Good relations depend largely on communication." (37, p. 24)

A study of personal and familial problems of high school students in the North and South reveals that about twenty-five percent of all such students do not talk over their problems with parents. Slightly more than six percent talk them over with members of their own families. "Where serious problems are concerned," Williams

reports, "approximately half our adolescents do not confide in their parents." (67, pp. 279-285)

The extensive studies of child welfare in America which appeared following the White House Conference of 1930 are frequently cited. The following statement is pertinent:

We have noted that confidential relation to the mother is important—that children with such a relation tend to have well balanced personalities and cooperative social relations. Both boys and girls who confide in the father also tend to have relatively good personality adjustment. (66, p. 143)

Kahlen comments on the Middletown study by the Lynds (also cited on page 33 of the present study) as revealing two traits most commonly checked by adolescents as desirable: "(1) fathers should spend more time with their children, and (2) fathers should respect the opinions and judgements of their children." This means that youngsters feel a lack of time or a lack of interest by fathers, and the consequence is a wider gap than necessary.

Both suggestions imply that adolescents would like very much to have more contacts with their parents, to have opportunity to talk things over, to share confidences, to exchange views on various matters.... There is no question of the importance of these points.... (30, p. 569)

From the teen-age view, Fadiman reports a demonstration that talking out problems, even in meetings, is a positive solution. (20, pp. 108-110) From a discussion of this question by a group of adults, indications are recorded that "shutting out" of parents and desire for privacy or independence by teen-agers is relatively universal. Prying and forcing talk may be as destructive of relationships as the moods of sulking and the worry of parents.

However, talking out the problems seems to be helpful when achieved by tactful means. (47, pp. 26-27) Along this line, a psychiatrist in Boston comforts parents with the words of ancient churchmen; when the parents are disturbed by these youth conflicts, he says, "It will pass, it will pass." (41, p. 44)

Related and Qualifying Material

Search of the literature has revealed no study of items of difficulty or reasons for such difficulty in parent-adolescent communication like the one here reported. Many studies have been undertaken, however, which relate and qualify the present findings. Here follow citations to such investigations.

Referring again to the study of Charlotte Pope (49, pp. 443-448), a pertinent ranking of the problem areas is of interest. The purpose of that study was to observe the change of attitude toward problems as youth progressed upward in schooling. Four groups of problems were ranked as follows:

1. Study-learning relationships (i.e. with teachers)
2. Occupational
3. Personal
4. Home

(49, pp. 443-448)

Remmers and Spencer report that a nationwide survey of 15,000 high school students in one hundred schools over the country produced these facts:

- 24% want to discuss personal problems with someone.
 - 20% cannot discuss personal items with parents.
 - 19% indicate fear about telling parents of wrongdoing.
 - 10% admit a barrier between themselves and parents.
- (53, pp. 182-183) (52, p. 16 of Examiner Manual)

Although dated about 1929, the chapter (XI) in the Lynds' Middletown on "Child Rearing" has many revealing entries. It relates parent-youth problems such as number of evenings spent at home, proportion of high school youth involved in "petting parties," proportion having difficulty with parents about spending money, changes apparent in punishment and attitudes of "strict discipline," and others. (39, pp. 131-152) Because that source of related material is widely known, it is not detailed here. Interested students of this subject will also wish to see sources of disagreement between high school youths and their parents. (39, p. 522. Table XIII)

The following statement is noteworthy:

The outstanding fact emerging from the study is the significance of the home for the personality development of the child. Of paramount influence are the subtle, intangible relations of family life such as affection, confiding in parents, trust and loyalty of child to parents (as measured by a statement of no criticism), and control by other means than punishment. (66, pp. 299-300)

And the following tables from the same White House Conference committee report are pertinent.

Tells Father joys and troubles	Adjustment:			
	Boys		Girls	
	Good	Poor	Good	Poor
Almost always	52%	7%	65%	4%
Sometimes	40%	7%	48%	9%
Almost never	33%	18%	33%	19%

Tells Mother joys and troubles	Adjustment:			
	Boys		Girls	
	Good	Poor	Good	Poor
Almost always	49%	7%	53%	7%
Sometimes	34%	9%	41%	17%
Almost never	44%	21%	26%	20%

(66, pp. 274-275, Table I, Urban White Children of American Parents)

Narratives by college students revealed three major criticisms of the ways in which they had been reared: (Ranked)

Girls 1. Lack of companionship
2. Poor sex education
3. Too much punishment as means of control

Boys 1. Poor sex education
2. Lack of companionship
3. Too much punishment as means of control

(66, p. 201)

Ivan Nye found that in answer to the question, "If your children were in trouble could they tell you?" half the mothers believed they had full confidences of their children, but only one-third of the fathers did. One-fifth of the teen-agers lacked this confidence in mothers and one-third lacked it in fathers. Generally more boys confide in fathers and girls in mothers.

In the Nye study, fifty percent of sixteen-seventeen-year-olds believed parents seldom, if ever, consulted with them regarding family problems.

Teen-agers thought mothers had respect for opinions more often than fathers did. One-fourth believed parents usually respected their opinions, thus leaving three-fourths who apparently did not for part or much of the time.

About scolding and nagging, ninety-five percent of parents were indicated to have scolded some. Nagging was not frequently scored, but the results of it were regarded as serious.

To the question, Do parents give honest answers to children's questions? more older boys thought not. Also, especially the older boys thought parents did not follow their own counsel.

Do parents supply sex information? Most of it is supplied by mothers. Four-fifths of the girls had freedom to obtain needed sex information from mothers. Only two-fifths of the boys had access to such help from either parent. (64, p. 113)

In a study of 130 unmarried college men at Oregon State College in 1951, 57.7% named mother as the one with whom they were more able to discuss personal problems, 16.9% named father as preferred, 9.2% marked both, and 16.9% said neither. (3, p. 78)

L. J. Elias reported a study of problems of high school students of Washington State. The sub-title of the report is "The tabulated results of a state-wide survey of the opinions of 5,500 high school youth concerning their schools, their families, their friends, and their futures." The foreword indicates that the study was based on twelve-page inventories filled out by 4,500 high school seniors one month before their graduation from 154 of the 300 high schools of Washington. The inventory was designed with the help of young people to put the items in teen-age vernacular. It sought opinions, problems, complaints, and ambitions. (19)

From the extensive tabulations offered, a few of the most nearly related observations are extracted below.

**Matters Upon Which Students and Their Parents
Frequently Disagree:**

Share of work	29.1%
Spending money	26.3%
No information	25.4%
Outside activities	19.9%
School work	18.7%
Future plans	18.2%
Attitude toward parents	16.7%
Social life	14.8%

Friends 10.0%
 Choice of clothes 9.3% (19, p. 13)

They Agree with Their Parents on Things Concerning the Whole Family:

All the time 7.8%
 Most of the time 71.9%
 About half the time 15.9%
 Seldom agree 2.8%
 Never agree .2%
 No information 1.4% (19, p. 16)

Percentages specifying family problems were as follows:

	Boy	Girl	Total
Getting to use the car	25.4	13.0	18.6
Quarreling in the family	14.5	20.4	17.7
My folks understanding me	12.2	18.8	15.8
Get along with brothers and sisters	12.3	17.5	15.1
Dad understanding my problems	11.8	16.4	14.3
Mom understanding my problems	6.2	14.0	10.5

(Many lesser items were also designated.) (19, p. 35)

Personal problems were never discussed with parents by 5.4% and 20.6% said they seldom talked them over. (19, p. 22) Relative to family problems, talk was more readily undertaken; only 2.4% never discussed these with parents while only 12.7% said they seldom did. (19, p. 16)

In one study, 234 college girls and 128 boys at freshman level answered two questions: What were three problems or situations that disturbed them most in adolescence? How was the matter solved?

Responses were ranked in eight groups for comparison as shown:

Girls		Boys	
Rank	%	Rank	%
1. Physical problems	43.2	1. Boy-girl relationships	38.
2. Social adjustments	36.	2. Social adjustments	36.5
3. Family problems	32.	3. School adjustments	25.5
4. Boy-girl relationships	22.5	4. Financial problems	23.
5. Financial problems	13.	5. Physical problems	21.
6. School adjustment	12.	6. Moral problems	14.
7. Psychological	11.5	7. Family problems	12.5
8. Moral problems	4.	8. Psychological	11.5

(7, pp. 54-55)

In three Catholic high schools in the Middle West, 150 juniors and seniors were surveyed in 1954-55 regarding social adjustment, family relations, use of time, future, personality, part-time jobs and money, and health worries. Under social adjustment, twenty-one percent registered dating problems. Under family relations, thirty-seven percent had lack of understanding between parents and children, twenty-three percent said they had too little time with parents, and thirteen percent disagreed with parents on standards. (57, p. 95)

Roof and Robertson found that

- a. Most youths appreciate parental relationships except for specific problems.
- b. Both boys and girls tend to have more conflict with mothers than with fathers at all ages.
- c. Girls tend to have more problems with both parents than do boys.
- d. Girls' problems tend to be general issues while boys' problems tend to be more specific.
- e. Both sexes had more problems between the ages of puberty and about seventeen to nineteen than later.
- f. Difficulties were slight in the late teens except in isolated cases.

(54, p. 238-240)

When averages are taken, adolescents are better adjusted to their parents in high socio-economic levels than in the lower ones. This is not the only factor of significance, however. Residence, family size, unity of family (as opposed to the "broken home"), age of youth, and sex of youth all have bearing on the family adjustment of young people. (45, p. 349)

About two-thirds of 1,878 city, town, and country young people

in and near Omaha registered no criticism of parents. More were critical of mothers (35.9%) than were critical of fathers (26.2%). Definite connection was seen between criticism of personal conduct of parents and personality development of the youth. (58, pp. 393-414)

Roughly one-third of the youths in another study reported quarrels in the family. No sex difference in the frequencies were noted. "Several thousand" were involved and they were from small high schools (150 to 500) distributed in nine states. About two-fifths of the quarrels related to economic and social life. Also two-fifths related to social life of the children and personal habits of the parents. Parents aged forty-three to fifty-six years quarreled less with children than did younger and older ones. Mothers under forty-three were most often cited, but fathers over fifty-six were cited most often. (50, pp. 507-511)

A study by Leonard was directed to the preparational needs prior to college entrance of two hundred freshmen girls at Syracuse University. Information was taken from girls and mothers. The study bears on the "weaning" process for daughters from their mothers. It shows great need for boy-girl experience, sex knowledge, money experience, separation-from-home experience, and taste training. The unemotional home background is seen to be an aid in the pre-college readying of the girls. (36)

Analysis of data on 438 older students (17 to 24) indicated that men of the group had achieved a much higher degree of emancipation than had women of the group. Greater emancipation was also

measurable for the more intelligent part of the sample. (56, p. 179)

At the South Carolina Agricultural and Mechanical College, Lloyd and five helpers studied a thousand students on five campuses. There were more girls than boys in the sample. Parent-youth conflicts were the subjects of investigation. Conclusions were these:

1. Large dependence of 57.2 percent of youths studied upon parental assistance in social activities planning reflects lack of achievement in self-determination and is potentially dangerous.
2. Parental interference handicaps 30.4 percent of those studied in making heterosexual adjustments; 41.8 percent of them are said to be handicapped in making peer associations because of some failure of parents to provide sex information.
3. Almost half (47.8 percent) of those studied reported "slighted somewhat" or "definitely mistreated." Lloyd says these may "have merely failed to attain emotional emancipation from their parents."
(38, pp. 227-230)

One study from a foreign culture can be cited for interesting comparative value. Jurovsky of the Department of Psychology of Slovak University in Bratislava on the Danube River in Southern Czechoslovakia reported this. The respondents were 575 boys and 200 girls of highest grade in the secondary school. They went to the psychologist from 1934 to 1942 for vocational guidance. Facts for the study were derived from two free-response questions: "What is your father's relation to you and yours to him?" "What is your mother's relation to you and yours to her?" The children were eighteen and nineteen years old. Responses were rated on a scale: Intimate, Good, Reserved, Cool and Strained.

1. ...more than one-third of youths and nearly one-half of maidens depict their relations toward their father as good or even as intimate and friendly; a little over one-fifth of them depict it as reserved (good but with some objections); while one-sixth of the boys and one-eighth of the girls depict it as cool and strained.
2. Sex differences in child-parent relationships have been stated as follows:
 - a. The girls are markedly better in their relations to their fathers than the boys.
 - b. The girls are better also in their relations towards mothers, with one exception in "cool and strained" relations, in which boys are a little better than girls.
 - c. The girls are altogether more often in positive relation to both parents and more seldom reserved and cool towards their mothers than they are towards their fathers.
 - d. The relations of both sexes are more often intimate and good, and more seldom reserved and cool towards their mothers than they are towards their fathers.
3. The relation of older children towards their parents are shaped in different ways with regard to the sex of the children and parents. The chances of a child being in different relations with his father and mother are greater, as it is seldom that children bear the same relations to both parents. The rule seems to be in this respect nearer to compensation than to correlation. (29, pp. 85-100)

Review

Related literature and findings indicate need for the type of study here undertaken. The cited articles and studies also contribute many facts upon which to base interpretations of new findings. No studies of topics difficult for teen-agers to discuss with parents nor of reasons for the blocking of such communication have come to the attention of this investigator.

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION OF THE DATA

The purposes of this study can be stated in three divisions. It was necessary to develop new instruments by which to get the desired data. Therefore the making of the devices and the preparation of instructions for their use was a major purpose. Chapter I explained in some detail the steps followed in the preparation of the instruments. The second constellation of purposes was the securing of observations about the difficulty of certain subjects when discussed by teen-agers with their parents. Multiple sets of facts were wanted. Which of the subjects were most difficult for boys when talking with fathers and when talking with mothers? Which ones were most difficult for girls when talking with their respective parents? The third division of purposes asked similarly what reasons were believed by the teen-agers to be most pertinent? Which reasons were of greatest importance for the boys when they had difficulty in talking with fathers and in talking with mothers? Which ones were in greatest effect when the girls had difficulty in talking with their respective parents? Chapter I also supplied a description of how these data were gathered.

It is the purpose of this chapter to organize and to explain the observations which were obtained. This is done in three sections: one of general observations, one of the uses made of the data, and one of the write-in responses.

General Observations

The information supplied by each student in the sample was not a simple check or a yes-no response to questions. The responses were quantitative measurements from zero to twenty to indicate the degree of difficulty he believed he had with the given subject. Or, with respect to reasons for difficulty when talking to a parent, the numeral assigned was used to show the degree of credence he gave to each specified reason. (The student actually responded with ratings from zero to one hundred, but these ratings were converted to a scale of measurements from zero to twenty. See page 20.)

While the study was designed to produce those quantitative measurements as a basis for the answers to the questions originally posed, simple numerical counts and percentages of those responding in the various items and groupings supply some information of interest.

Every subject in the set of thirty-six used in the study received ratings above zero by some of the students in the sample. Thus it may be seen that every subject in the set presented some degree of difficulty to one or more persons. One student out of the one hundred in the sample assigned zero to every subject in the set (meaning that he could talk with his parents without hesitation about any topic), but ninety-nine assigned numbers to one or more subjects to indicate some trouble with them. Several students indicated a very high degree of trouble with all of the topics, some with father, some with mother, and some with both. Considerable variation occurred in the two sexes. Likewise, variations in

responses appeared with respect to the male or female parent.

Of the thirty-six subject areas offered on the cards, the fifty men students in the sample indicated some difficulty with an average of 12.76 subjects when talking with fathers and 12.88 subjects when talking with mothers. The fifty women students indicated some difficulty with 15.0 of the same subjects as their average when talking with fathers, but 12.48 was their average when talking with mothers.

It may be observed generally that a high percentage of the young people indicated some degree of difficulty in talking about mate-selection topics with parents.

A complete tabulation is shown on the following page of the number of students in the sample who indicated some degree of difficulty with the subjects described on the cards. Full listing and elaboration of the items may be seen in Appendix I, pp. 70-75. For ranking of the various subjects by average of the quantitative measurements for the respective sexes and parents, see Tables 28 to 31 in Appendix III, pp. 110-113.

**NUMBERS OF BOYS, GIRLS, AND ALL YOUNG PEOPLE IN THE SAMPLE OF COLLEGE
FRESHMEN WHO HAD SOME DEGREE OF DIFFICULTY WITH THE THIRTY-
SIX SUBJECTS**

Subjects in alphabetical order	Of 50 boys difficulty with		Of 50 girls difficulty with		Of 100 total difficulty with	
	Fa.	Mo.	Fa.	Mo.	Fa.	Mo.
Ailments	22	22	27	16	49	38
Beliefs	22	17	29	21	51	38
Care of property	9	7	12	10	21	17
Car expenses	14	9	6	5	20	14
Clothing and care	9	15	20	16	29	31
Courtship	27	24	33	28	60	52
Division of work	17	14	17	17	34	31
Drinking	13	16	17	15	30	31
Eating habits	11	16	13	14	24	30
Engagement	19	15	34	30	53	45
Entertaining friends	13	13	12	9	25	21
Failures and defeats	24	22	19	15	43	37
Family finances	13	11	21	15	34	26
Fears	15	11	19	15	34	26
Food I eat	11	16	15	12	26	28
Forms entertainment	17	16	14	11	31	27
Friends of op. sex	23	20	17	14	40	34
Friends of own sex	22	23	19	18	41	41
Health habits	26	25	33	22	59	47
How to dress	14	13	22	10	36	23
Jobs, summer work	12	11	13	9	25	20
Late hours	24	26	29	29	53	55
Life work	12	12	21	17	33	29
Marriage	23	20	33	26	56	46
Misbehavior	24	26	28	28	52	54
Money of my own	17	17	11	14	28	31
My own education	18	15	15	12	33	27
Parents in projects	18	18	25	22	43	40
Petting	39	41	41	34	80	75
Political, civic	7	10	14	18	21	28
Privacy	14	15	18	17	32	32
Relatives	18	15	14	12	32	27
Sex	40	42	45	32	85	74
Smoking	18	20	18	16	36	36
Social behavior	14	13	13	9	27	22
Use of automobile	17	15	14	16	31	31

Double any number in these
columns to obtain percentage

Above nos.
are also
percentages.

To find number who had no difficulty with subject, subtract
the given number from sample number given at heading of column.

Virtually the same general remarks can be made about the reasons for difficulty by teen-agers when talking to parents. Twenty-two reasons were presented on the card sets. Every one of the reasons had credence for some students. No students assigned numbers above zero to all of them, but seven out of the hundred identified none of the offered reasons as accounting for their difficulties, if they had any. On the following page, a complete tabulation is shown of the credence to respective reasons in the set of twenty-two offered. Full listing and elaboration of all reasons used may be seen in Appendix I, pp. 76-80. For ranking of the various reasons by average of the quantitative measurements for the respective sexes and parents, see Tables 32 to 35, Appendix III, pp. 114-117.

NUMBER OF BOYS, GIRLS, AND ALL YOUNG PEOPLE IN THE SAMPLE OF COLLEGE
FRESHMEN WHO GAVE SOME DEGREE OF CREDENCE
TO THE TWENTY-TWO REASONS

Reasons in alphabetical order	Of 50 boys for difficulty with		Of 50 girls for difficulty with		Of 100 total for difficulty with	
	Fa.	No.	Fa.	No.	Fa.	No.
Age difference	15	13	12	12	27	25
Condemned	9	7	13	11	22	18
Confidence violated	7	15	6	14	13	29
Conservatism	20	18	22	19	42	37
Delay	9	7	9	8	18	15
Don't know	11	11	13	9	24	20
Evasion	13	10	15	13	28	23
Fear	22	21	23	21	45	42
Fear of power	12	9	12	11	24	20
Guilt feelings	15	16	19	17	34	33
Inferiority	13	8	2	2	15	10
Nagging	19	18	9	16	28	34
No need	27	27	29	24	56	51
Position	7	13	6	5	13	18
Pride	18	13	19	16	37	29
Rejected	0	1	4	4	4	5
Ridicule	15	11	8	7	23	18
Self-reliance	25	21	20	25	45	46
Signals of discomfort	16	18	17	17	33	35
Superiority	8	8	8	8	16	16
Time	17	14	26	19	43	33
Vocabulary	3	2	6	1	9	3

Double any number in these col-
umns to obtain percentage.

Above nos.
are also
percentages.

To find the number who gave reason no credence,
subtract the given number from sample number
in the heading above the column.

There was greater incidence of write-ins or written comment by the women students than by the men in the sample. Reasons for difficulty received more written comment than did the topics for discussion. Full analysis is made of the write-ins in a separate section of this chapter. (See page 49.)

Use of the Data

From the tabulations of quantitative measurements of the degree of difficulty assigned to the thirty-six subjects by the fifty young men and the fifty young women, divisions were made of the responses as they applied to fathers and to mothers. Analysis of variance tests were then applied to each of the sets of data. (15, pp. 127-134) The calculated F values are shown for each set together with the 5% points of the F -distribution. (15, p. 80) These tests produced results which indicated that at the degree of difficulty the students faced in talking about them, the subjects were significantly different from each other.

Designation of the set of data	Calcu- lated F	Tabu- lated F
Boys' difficult subjects when talking with fathers.	8.89	} 1.43
Girls' difficult subjects when talking with fathers.	14.72	
Boys' difficult subjects when talking with mothers.	15.38	
Girls' difficult subjects when talking with mothers.	9.38	

See the details of the computation of analysis of variance for the above in Tables 20 to 23, Appendix III, pp. 102-105.

The tabulations of quantitative measurements of the degree of credence assigned to the twenty-two reasons were divided and tested

in the same manner. The reasons were also found to be significantly different from each other.

Designation of the set of data	Calcu- lated F	Tabu- lated F
Boys' reasons for difficulty in talk with fathers.	5.00	} 1.56
Girls' reasons for difficulty in talk with fathers.	6.75	
Boys' reasons for difficulty in talk with mothers.	5.43	
Girls' reasons for difficulty in talk with mothers.	4.66	

See the details of the computation of analysis of variance for the above in Tables 24 to 27, Appendix III, pp. 106-109.

The five percent level of significance (15, p. 80) was selected at the time this study was designed, and it was used throughout the statistical treatment of data. However, the calculated *F* values are so large that the results would still be significant even if the half-of-one percent level were used.

For the further tests beyond the analysis of variance, averages of the quantitative measurements for the respective subjects and reasons were ranked. The Duncan multiple range test was then applied. (16, pp. 1-7) Through the use of the Duncan test, an objective selection of the subjects which were significantly important and of the reasons which were significantly important was possible. Answers to the fundamental questions posed at the outset of the investigation were thus obtained without personal bias. See Appendix III, Tables 28 to 35, pp. 110-117 where the successive tables show all subjects and reasons ranked according to the averages of the quantitative measurements of the student responses. In the same tables, the self-explanatory displays show the items and reasons

grouped as of greatest importance, of intermediate importance, and of least importance when such separations are clearly observable within ranges of significance.

It is not the purpose of the present chapter to interpret the data. Here they are only presented. Here explanations are offered for what was done with the data. See Chapter IV for findings and conclusions.

Details of the Write-ins

Provision was made for the writing in of additional subjects when respondents wished to mention items other than those on the cards which gave difficulty in talk with parents. Likewise, blank cards were provided for additional reasons when respondents wished to add to the twenty-two offered on the cards. These provisions were made on the assumption that no lists could be devised which covered the universe of things talked about by youth and parents. Neither could the twenty-two reasons offered cover the varied experiences of all persons in the sample. Semantic difficulties were also anticipated.

Six women students provided write-ins on subject cards and fourteen did so on reason cards. In contrast, one man student offered a write-in on a subject card and six offered reasons or comments on the blanks provided. A total of twenty-two respondents out of one hundred made written notations, five of whom contributed in both areas, subjects and reasons.

Of seven write-ins on subject cards, five are classed as

additional ones while two are comments only. On the reason cards, eight can be classed as new, but the rest are explanatory only. See a complete exhibit of write-ins with notations, Appendix IV, pp. 119-122.

In summary, it can be said that these written notes supply considerable insight into the contribution of data by the students in the sample. Their remarks reflect weaknesses in the list of subjects and reasons, in the words used to state them, and in the detection and measurement of subtle elements in personal relationships. Had these suggested new points been incorporated in the original card sets, they might have produced a modified result in some instances. If the TIME reason had been expanded to include absence and busyness of the respondents as well as of the parents, it might have had a higher average weight. Other examples of omissions which might have yielded meaningful data had they been included in the discussion topics were "faults my parents should and could correct," and "my parents' companions and friends." Most of the new contributions, however, appear to be quite narrowly special for one person out of a great many; consequently they would have produced minor statistical results.

CHAPTER IV

INTERPRETATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

The sets of data presented in Chapter III were obtained from selected students at Oregon State College. In that the sample was selected to represent freshmen on this campus in the year 1954-55, the findings are presumably applicable to the larger group of about two thousand from whom the sample was taken. These findings should not be applied uncritically to other populations, to other age groups, nor to other generations. The students of the sample were attending a college of technical classification. The sample was limited to young people who were in attendance at the college but who were not living with parents at the time of the study. Descriptive information about the students who furnished the data is fully detailed in the tables of Appendix II, pp. 89-100.

The instruments and methods used in the study produced the data which were presented in Chapter III. Results of statistical tests that were applied were also presented there. Use of these instruments and methods in similar circumstances may be expected to produce similar results. The present investigation has to some extent contributed toward the development of instruments and methods and to some extent represents a pilot study. Recommendations are made on page 62 for the further uses of the devices and techniques which have been developed.

The findings of this study are here presented in a fashion consistent with the original design. The fundamental questions for

which answers were sought were stated on page 2.

The Findings of This Study Relative to Difficulty of Subjects

Which of thirty-six subject areas were difficult for teen-aged boys to talk about with their fathers? The fifty college freshmen in the study indicated that for them the two most difficult subjects had been PETTING and SEX, ranked in that order. These two subjects were not significantly different from each other in difficulty, but both were clearly more important than the next ranking topics. In the top ranking ten subjects, the next eight in order were COURTSHIP, MARRIAGE, MISBEHAVIOR, LATE HOURS, FAILURES OR DEFEATS, HEALTH HABITS, PARENT PARTICIPATION IN PROJECTS, and SMOKING. (See full elaboration of subjects in Appendix I, pp. 70-75.) Mate selection topics are seen to predominate at the top. However, the Duncan test (16, pp. 1-7) reveals that subjects ranked from third to thirty-sixth places are not significantly different from each other. Reversing the order and looking at the least difficult items for boys to discuss with fathers, it is observed that CLOTHING AND ITS CARE is least troublesome. Next follow POLITICAL AND CIVIC ISSUES, JOBS, CARE OF PROPERTY, and SOCIAL BEHAVIOR. These topics are not clearly separable with respect to ease of communication from the topics of higher rank excepting the top ten named above. (See Table 28, p. 110.)

Which of thirty-six subject areas were difficult for teen-aged boys to talk about with their mothers? The fifty college freshmen indicated the same topics to be most important as when talking with fathers, SEX and PETTING. The order was reversed. Again these two

subjects were not significantly different in difficulty from each other, but in the Duncan test (16, pp. 1-7) they broke off as clearly harder to talk about than any other subjects listed. The top ten subjects by rank order included MISBEHAVIOR, LATE HOURS, COURTSHIP, DRINKING, SMOKING, FAILURES OR DEFEATS, MARRIAGE, and HEALTH HABITS. The rank position changed somewhat as compared to the boy-to-father talk, though tests showed no clearly significant difference in difficulty for these topics. Also, PARENT PARTICIPATION IN PROJECTS dropped out of the top ten in the mother situation while DRINKING came into higher ranking. At the easy-to-talk-about end of the scale, somewhat different subjects appeared in the mother situation than were present in the father-son relationship. CARE OF PROPERTY was easiest; then followed ENTERTAINING MY FRIENDS AT HOME, CAR EXPENSES, FAMILY FINANCES, and FOOD I EAT. While the overall pattern of difficulty ranking was similar in the boys' father and mother communication situations, some sex role differences showed marked influence. For example, CLOTHING AND ITS CARE, which was in thirty-sixth place in the boy-father situation, moved up to twenty-third place in the boy-mother situation. The mothers' responsibilities for supply, laundering, and mending would likely produce more stress upon this topic than would the role of the fathers with respect to clothing. (See Table 30, p. 112.)

Which of thirty-six subject areas were difficult for teen-aged girls to talk about with their fathers? The significantly most difficult subjects for the fifty girls in the study were SEX and PETTING in first and second rank. The two subjects were not significantly different in difficulty from each other, but they clearly broke away in the

Duncan test as apart from the topics in third to thirty-sixth ranks. A block of seven items appears with reasonable clarity to be of intermediate difficulty for the girls when talking with fathers. In rank order these are MARRIAGE, ENGAGEMENT, HEALTH HABITS, COURTSHIP, LATE HOURS, BELIEFS, and AILMENTS. SMOKING was in tenth place, but it was not significantly different from some of the topics of least difficulty. All of the top seven topics were related to sex and mate selection in the daughter-father discussion difficulties with the exception of HEALTH HABITS at rank five. Reversing the scale, girls talked about CAR EXPENSES with fathers with greatest ease. FORMS OF ENTERTAINMENT, MONEY OF MY OWN, MY OWN EDUCATION, and EATING HABITS followed in the order given. The only item showing similarity to the boys' lists was CAR EXPENSES at the least difficult end of the scale. (Table 29, p. 111)

Which of thirty-six subject areas were difficult for teen-aged girls to talk about with their mothers? In this situation, the fifty freshmen women in the sample indicated PETTING to be of first rank difficulty and SEX to be second. MARRIAGE was third and proved by the Duncan test not to be significantly less difficult than SEX. It was significantly easier for the girls to talk about than PETTING, however. Items of fourth through thirteenth ranks appeared with reasonable clarity to be of intermediate difficulty. These topics were ENGAGEMENT, MISBEHAVIOR, COURTSHIP, LATE HOURS, SMOKING, DRINKING, PARENT PARTICIPATION IN PROJECTS, HEALTH HABITS, BELIEFS, POLITICAL AND CIVIC ISSUES in the order given. Again it is to be noted that items of greatest difficulty were mainly those relating to sex and

mate selection. At the end of the scale showing subjects most easily discussed with mothers, these young women indicated CAR EXPENSES just as they did for fathers. Also included in both sets of the easiest five was FORMS OF ENTERTAINMENT, but the others were varied: SOCIAL BEHAVIOR, ENTERTAINING FRIENDS AT HOME, and JOBS.

(Table 31, p. 113)

Attention can be called to the overall patterns of the Duncan tests. These differ obviously for the boys and girls. Data for the girls are more sensitive to differences of difficulty with the subjects.

MISBEHAVIOR appears in three of the four relationships to be a highly difficult topic, ranking in the top five, but girls apparently find fathers so tolerant that in the daughter-father situation this falls to twentieth place. In a similar way, the subject of AILMENTS was ranked at nine to thirteen in three of the four relationships, but when girls talked about this topic with mothers, it dropped to twenty-fifth place. Perhaps mothers would be more accepting of ailments than fathers would; they would likely be more understanding of girls' ailments.

ENGAGEMENT was at fourth place for girls, but it was fourteenth and sixteenth for the boys. This may reflect the prior involvement in this topic by the girls because of their maturation at an earlier age.

FAILURES OR DEFEATS appeared in the top ten of difficult subjects for boys, but it apparently fell to the least difficult group for girls. Perhaps this reflects in part the fact that the roles expected of boys by society are more aggressive.

FORMS OF ENTERTAINMENT as a topic was among the five least troublesome for girls to talk about, but it was somewhat more troublesome for boys at ranks of twenty and twenty-three.

Boys had somewhat higher ranking for the item FRIENDS OF OPPOSITE SEX (twelfth) than did the girls (twenty-fourth and twenty-sixth). The girls had somewhat less difficulty in talking about MY OWN EDUCATION than did the boys (difference in rank of approximately ten places).

Findings of the Study Relative to Reasons for Difficulty

Originally the question was asked: Which reasons for difficulty are importantly operative? To this question, four sets of answers can now be given for the respective relationships examined.

Which reasons were given credence by boys when talk with father was difficult? Ranked as the four highest of the twenty-two reasons offered on the cards, the fifty freshmen males indicated NO NEED, SELF-RELIANCE, FEAR, and CONSERVATISM OF PARENTS in the order given. In the Duncan test (16, pp. 1-7), these were not all significantly different from some others at lower rank. (Table 32, p. 114) The top four reasons were significantly different and more important than the lowest ranked four on the list. The least important reason for the boys in the father situation was REJECTED. Then followed VOCABULARY, SUPERIORITY, and CONFIDENCE VIOLATED. Apparently the boys felt secure with fathers, had the word power needed, did not feel greatly superior to the fathers, and could trust the fathers to keep their communications to themselves. (See details of the reason cards in Appendix I, pp.

76-80.)

Which reasons were given credence by boys when talk with mother was difficult? Clearly the most important reasons in the mother-son relationship were SELF-RELIANCE and NO NEED. The two were not significantly different from each other, but in the Duncan test they broke apart from the reasons of lesser rank. CONSERVATISM OF PARENTS in third rank was not only very high but was significantly greater than the seven lowest ranked reasons. At the lower extreme, four reasons of least importance in the boy-mother situation appeared to be REJECTED, VOCABULARY, INFERIORITY, SUPERIORITY in the order given. These four were significantly different from those in the top nine ranking places. (Table 34, p. 116)

Which reasons were given credence by girls when talk with father was difficult? Clearly and significantly most important were the reasons NO NEED and TIME. (Table 33, p. 115) At the lowest end of the scale for the twenty-two reasons in the father-daughter situation was INFERIORITY. Then followed VOCABULARY, POSITION, and CONFIDENCE VIOLATED.

Which reasons were given credence by girls when talk with mothers was difficult? Seven reasons of highest rank were not found by the Duncan test to be significantly different from each other. NO NEED was first in rank, and SELF-RELIANCE was second. TIME, GUILT FEELINGS, SIGNALS OF DISCOMFORT, CONSERVATISM OF PARENTS, and FEAR were next in order of importance to the fifty college women. In this situation, the mother-daughter relationship, VOCABULARY was the reason of least importance for difficulty. The girls did not credit

INFERIORITY to mothers as a very important reason. Her position in the community also had slight bearing. Neither did they think their mothers were unable to converse for the reason that the mothers DON'T KNOW the subjects or answers. (Table 35, p. 117)

General reasons for the blocking of communication between teenagers and parents can now be stated. The college freshmen studied here revealed a high degree of emancipation. To them, NO NEED was probably the best answer. The desire for and the actual achievement of SELF-RELIANCE was also high on the scale of reasons. These facts are probably to be interpreted as wholesome conditions. Parents may detect in the resistance to talk an advancing maturity, independence, ability to use varied resources on the part of youth. Understanding and acceptance of these facts may improve relationships. Armed with this knowledge, parents will not force talk which might impair the movement toward the popularly desired self-reliance of young adults.

The fact that in modern family life there was not TIME for talk with parents was of higher importance for girls than for boys. This reason was in second place for girls as it related to father difficulties and in third place as it related to mother difficulties. For boys this reason was in sixth place and ninth respectively. In this finding there may be the indication that mothers and especially fathers need to reserve time and create opportunity for communication with the daughters. While the sons apparently assign TIME as an intermediately important reason, they can be with the father while he is at work or play more readily than can the daughters. Leary's

article, "A girl needs her father" is borne out here, but the mother relationship apparently needs strengthening too.

In all four relationships, FEAR was rated as more important than FEAR OF POWER. Because of the difference in meaning of these two card entries, it becomes apparent that the fear of anger and scoldings is a real and current condition rather than a hold-over from childhood disciplinary experience. FEAR ranked third for boys in the father relationship, fourth in the mother relationship. For girls it was seventh with either parent. FEAR OF POWER of parents to punish as held over from childhood fell to a range of tenth to eighteenth ranks among the twenty-two reasons.

CONSERVATISM OF PARENTS was found to be a strong reason in all situations, probably being one of the most important in the father-son and mother-daughter relationships.

GUILT FEELINGS within the youth and SIGNALS OF DISCOMFORT which would indicate conditions for blocking the communications within the parent do not appear to be significantly different in the Duncan tests. In fact, these two reasons rank close to each other in all instances.

AGE DIFFERENCE was regarded by the boys as a reason of intermediate importance as related to either parent, but it was indicated by the girls to be of little importance.

NAGGING appeared to be of intermediate importance in all relationships except in the father-daughter difficulties where it was of slight importance (ranked eighteenth of twenty-two).

POSITION of the parent in the community, as when he or she was college president or minister or socially prominent, was more

important to the boys (rank thirteen for both parents) than to the girls (rank twenty for both parents).

Fathers' EVASION of girls' questions or problems was higher at the rank of eight than this reason was in other relationships.

Mothers were believed by both boys and girls to be guilty of CONFIDENCE VIOLATED at intermediate ranks (eighth and eleventh respectively) whereas this reason was rated at slight importance for fathers (nineteenth).

A stronger signal of INFERIORITY was given by boys when comparing themselves to fathers than was given in the other three situations. Girls signified a higher rating of their SUPERIORITY over both parents than did boys, but the INFERIORITY and SUPERIORITY reasons were universally of little importance in the Duncan groupings.

Boys rated the REJECTED reason at twenty-second rank whereas girls put this at the seventeenth position. Thus the college men evinced a great deal of security with parents, the women somewhat less.

It appears that the young people suffered from virtually no lack of words with which to talk to parents. VOCABULARY was not a serious reason for difficulty.

Findings of the Present Study Related to Other Investigations and Statements

The present study provides evidence that one of the problems of adolescents in parent relationships is that of communication. Of the one hundred college freshmen who provided data, ninety-nine

indicated that they experienced some degree of difficulty with one or more of the subjects. On the average they had difficulty with about twelve or thirteen of the thirty-six subjects investigated.

It will be seen that there is a central tendency for all of the young people in the sample to have difficulty with a number of the subjects. The relative universality of difficulties in communication between adolescents and parents as indicated by Malm and Jamison (42, p. 412), Leary (34, pp. 358-360) and others (47, pp. 26-27) is sustained by the present study. According to the Purdue study (52), the White House Conference report (66, pp. 274-275), the Nye study (64, p. 113), the Elias study (19, p. 22), and others, about one-fifth to one-fourth of the adolescents acknowledge a problem in this area. Thus, while difficulties may be relatively universal, these difficulties may be usual and acceptable for about three-fourths to four-fifths of the young people.

The difficulties of young people in talking about the sexual issues as noted by Redl (51, pp. 7-8) are substantiated here in the findings that SEX and PETTING are most troublesome in all four of the parent-child relationships. However, an abnormal emphasis may be prevented if several other subjects are noted as being difficult: MISBEHAVIOR, HEALTH HABITS, and others in the various relationships.

The observation by Redl (51, pp. 7-8) along with that of Kuhlen (30, p. 298) and that of Tryon (61, p. 224) that youth turns increasingly to peers instead of to parents as he matures in the modern scene is corroborated here. The high credence given to reason, NO NEED, which included the elaboration that "...I have my friends to

talk to..." tends to contribute the same information.

Further Research Indicated

Information similar to that obtained in this study for the Oregon State College freshmen in a given year would be desirable from other classifications of young people, from groups in other locations, and from same groups in succeeding periods. No wide application of the findings of this pilot study may confidently be made. It would be valuable to have such studies made at several age levels: pre-pubertal, early adolescence, and middle adolescence.

A study and comparison of parents' estimates of their children's responses on topics of difficulty and reasons for difficulty in parent-child communications might yield valuable information.

Using these techniques or similar ones, it might be very valuable to make studies of the relationship of difficulties of delinquent youths and to compare them with the difficulties of non-delinquents. This kind of research might also prove helpful in the understanding of other areas where relationship maladjustment occurs. Blocked communication in husband-wife conflicts is suspect where divorce and separation result. Other human relationships, such as foreman-worker, teacher-learner, and the like, might be studied through similar procedures.

Experimentation with randomized questions on shuffled cards, as employed in this study, and comparison with results of the same items on the typical questionnaire might yield valuable information.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Averill, Lawrence Augustus. Adolescence. Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1936. 495p.
2. Baruch, Dorothy. How to live with your teenager. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1953. 261p.
3. Benjamin, Dayton. Attitudes of 130 single college men toward certain aspects of parenthood. Master's thesis. Corvallis, Oregon state college, 1952. 94 numb. leaves.
4. Block, Virginia Lee. Conflicts of adolescents with their mothers. Journal of abnormal and social psychology 32:193-206. 1937.
5. Burgess, Ernest W. and Harvey J. Locke. The family. New York, American Book Company. 1945. 800p.
6. Buros, Oscar Krisen (ed.) Fourth mental measurement yearbook. Highland Park, N. J., Gryphon Press, 1953. 1163p.
7. Carter, Charles, Alyce Carter and Frank Haar. Insight into teenage problems. Journal of school health 25:54-57. 1955.
8. Cass, Loretta K. Parent-child relationships and delinquency. Journal of abnormal and social psychology 47:101-104. 1952.
9. Cole, Luella. Psychology of childhood and adolescence. 4th ed. New York, Rinehart, 1954. 712p.
10. Connor, Ruth, Theodore B. Johannis, Jr. and James Walters. Parent-adolescent relationships. Journal of home economics 46:183-191. 1954.
11. Cosgrove, Marjorie C. About you. (Family living series, vol.1) Chicago, Science Research Associates, 1952. 80p.
12. Crawford, John Edmund. Teens, how to meet your problems. New York, Woman's Press, 1951. 162p.
13. Cruse, Wendell Wayne. Adolescent psychology and development. New York, Ronald, 1953. 557p.
14. Dahle, T. L. Transmitting information to employees. Personnel 31:243-346. 1954.

15. Dixon, Wilfrid J. and Frank J. Massey, Jr. Introduction to statistical analysis. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1951. 370p.
16. Duncan, David B. Multiple range and multiple F tests. Reprint series no. 49. Virginia polytechnic institute. Reprinted from *Biometrics* 11(1) March 1955. 42p.
17. Durland, F. Can they talk to you? *Parents' magazine* 19:22-23. Dec. 1944.
18. Duvall, Evelyn. Keeping up with teen-agers. New York, Public affairs committee, 1947. 31p. (Pan. no. 127)
19. Elias, L. J. High school youth look at their problems. Pullman, Wash., College book store, 1949.
20. Fadiman, P. E. R. Life with parents; a teen-age view. *Child study* 22(3):108-110. 1945.
21. Fedder, E. Teens need your help. *Parents' magazine* 25:46-47. Nov. 1950.
22. Frank, K. L. Introduction; adolescence as a period of transition. Chicago, University of Chicago press, 1944. 358p. (National society for the study of education, forty-third year-book, Part 1)
23. Garrison, Karl Glandius. Psychology of adolescence. 4th ed. New York, Prentice-Hall, 1951. 510p.
24. Ginsburg, S. W. Adolescence is hard on everyone. *Child study* 28(1):12-14. 1950.
25. Grant, B. Survey of studies on problems of adolescents. *California journal of secondary education* 28:293-297. 1953.
26. Hall, V. R. Parent child relationships. *Education* 72:149-150. 1951.
27. Hart, Hornell and Ella B. Hart. Personality and the family. Rev. ed. Boston, D. C. Heath, 1941. 526p.
28. Jesselyn, Irene Milliken. The adolescent and his world. New York, Family service association of America, 1952. 124p.
29. Jurovsky, A. Relations of older children to their parents. *Journal of genetic psychology* 72:85-100. Mar. 1948.
30. Kuhlen, Raymond Gerhardt. The psychology of adolescent development. New York, Harper, 1952. 675p.

31. Landis, Paul Henry. Adolescence and youth. 2d ed. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1952. 461p.
32. Langford, L. M. and O. W. Alm. Comparison of parent judgement and child feelings concerning the self-adjustment and social adjustment of twelve-year-old children. Journal of genetic psychology 85:39-46. Sept. 1954.
33. Laycock, S. R. Helping adolescents solve their problems. Educational digest 8:32. Nov. 1942.
34. Leary, Lewis Caston. The fine art of letting go. Scribner's 91:358-360. 1932.
35. Leary, Lewis Caston. A girl needs her father. Parents' magazine 11:30. Ap. 1936.
36. Leonard, Eugenie Andruss. Problems of freshmen college girls. New York, Bureau of publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1932. 139p.
37. Lewin, Ilka. Communication between the generations. Child study 30(2):246. 1953.
38. Lloyd, R. G. Parent-youth conflicts of college students. Sociology and social research 36:227-230. 1952.
39. Lynd, R. S. and Helen M. Lynd. Middletown. New York, Harcourt, 1929. 550p.
40. Lynd, R. S. and Helen M. Lynd. Middletown in transition. New York, Harcourt, 1937. 604p.
41. Mackenzie, C. Teen-age critics. New York Times magazine, Dec. 7, 1947, p. 44.
42. Malm, Marguerite and O. G. Jamison. Adolescence. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1952. 512p.
43. Monroe, Walter S. (ed.) Encyclopedia of educational research. New York, MacMillan, 1950. 1520p.
44. Mooney, Ross L. Exploratory research on students' problems. Journal of educational research 37:218-224. 1943.
45. Nye, Ivan. Adolescent-parent adjustment--socio-economic level as a variable. American sociological review 16:341-349.
46. Ojemann, Ralph H. All we can do is counsel. National parent teacher 46:15-17. Nov. 1951.

47. Parents speaking; what shall we do when our teenagers shut us out? *Child study* 32(2):26-27. 1955.
48. Periman, H. H. Where can they go for counsel? *National parent teacher* 48:24-26. Oct. 1953.
49. Pope, Charlotte. Personal problems of high school pupils. *School and society* 57:443-448. 1943.
50. Funke, Harold H. High school youth and family quarrels. *School and society* 58:507-511. 1943.
51. Redl, Frits. Sex education: unfinished business. *Child study* 32(1):4-11. 1954-55.
52. Remmers, H. H. and Benjamin Shimberg. SRA youth inventory (Form A). Chicago, Science research associates, inc., 1949.
53. Remmers, H. H. and Lyle M. Spencer. All young people have problems. *National education association journal* 39:182-183. 1950.
54. Roof, Marvin G. and James Robertson. Emancipation in adolescence. *Progressive education* 31:238-240. 1954.
55. Schneiders, Alexander Aloysius. The psychology of adolescence. Milwaukee, Bruce, 1951. 550p.
56. Sherman, Arthur Wesley, Jr. Emancipation status of college students. *Pedagogical seminary and journal of genetic psychology* 68:171-179. 1946.
57. Sister Theodore. Do teen-agers have problems? *Catholic school journal* 55:95. Mar. 1955.
58. Scott, Leland H. Adolescents' dislikes regarding parental behavior and their significance. *Pedagogical seminary and journal of genetic psychology* 57:393-414. 1940.
59. Tallman, P. F. Fathers and daughters. *Child study* 30(1): 8-10. 1952.
60. Taylor, Katherine Whiteside. Do adolescents need parents? New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, inc., 1938. 380p.
61. Tryon, C. M. Adolescent peer culture. Chicago, University of Chicago press, 1944. 358p. (National society for the study of education, forty-third yearbook. Part 1)

62. United States employment service, Division of occupational analysis. Dictionary of occupational titles, definitions of titles, occupational classifications. 3 vols. 2d ed. Washington, D. C., U. S. Government printing office, 1949.
63. Weber, F. E. Teen-agers are born not made. Education 74: 436-437. 1954.
64. What teen-agers think of their parents. Practical home economics 30:113. 1952.
65. Wheeler, Lyle Mary. The adjustment problems of high school students in Astoria, Oregon. Master's thesis. Corvallis, Oregon state college, 1953. 119 mm. leaves.
66. White House conference on child health and protection. Sec. 3: education and training (committee on the family and parent education, E. W. Burgess, Ph. D., chairman). The adolescent in the family. New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, inc., 1934. 473p.
67. Williams, Melvin J. Personal and familial problems of high school youths. Social forces 27:279-285. 1949.

APPENDIX I

FORMS AND INSTRUCTIONS USED

The Item Cards (Subject Cards)

One model card for items hard to talk about with parents is shown below. Each one was set up with the heading line and with the scoring spaces. The thirty-five other items are listed in alphabetical order without being illustrated in full as they appeared on the separate cards. A model of the write-in card is included at the end of this list.

<p style="text-align: center;">ITEM HARD TO TALK ABOUT WITH PARENTS:</p> <p>AILMENTS. Physical or mental, real or suspected.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">F _____ M _____</p>
--

BELIEFS. My personal philosophy of life, religious ideas, ideas of right and wrong, etc.

CARE OF PROPERTY. Care of my own or family's possessions. Use and care of tools, equipment, or furnishings. Also the personal items (camera, gun, etc.), heirlooms.

CAR EXPENSES. Who pays for gasoline, services to car, extensive repairs, Cost of insurance and licenses.

CLOTHING AND ITS CARE. My clothing needs, what I have to wear, picking up and hanging up, repair and laundering, etc.

COURTSHIP. Going steady, frequency of dates, how long a courtship should be, being alone with my date, giving and receiving gifts, etc.

DIVISION OF WORK. Chores I have to do, my share of the jobs about the home, fair distribution of tasks among family members.

DRINKING. Use of beer or other alcoholic beverages.

EATING HABITS. Eating too fast, slow eating, eating between meals, midnight raids on the refrigerator, going without breakfast, etc.

ENGAGEMENT. Length of time before marriage, seriousness and certainty, the ring, behavior during engagement, the announcement, etc.

ENTERTAINING MY FRIENDS AT HOME. Having my own friends in for talk, for meals, for an evening of fun, for overnight, etc.

FAILURES OR DEFEATS. My inability to do certain tasks or assignments. My inability to win at some games or events.

FAMILY FINANCES. Any or all matters of family income, savings, insurance, costs of living, budget, what each member is expected to contribute, etc.

FEARS. Things I am afraid of such as the dark, criminals or insane persons, animals, snakes, war, diseases, loss of my mind, being in an accident, etc.

FOOD I EAT. What to eat. My diet. What I like or do not like. The amount I eat.

FORMS OF ENTERTAINMENT. My hobbies, the sports I enter, what I read, moving pictures I see, radio and television programs, dances, places of amusement, etc.

FRIENDS OF OPPOSITE SEX. Persons with whom I wish to play, study, or work. Groups I wish to join. Our activities, meeting places, amounts of time spent with these friends, freedom to visit them.

FRIENDS OF OWN SEX. Persons I "run around with," the gang, separate friends. What we do, where we go, who pays, etc. Character of my companions.

HEALTH HABITS. Personal hygiene, cleanliness, adequate clothing, regular elimination, anxieties, prevention of diseases, worry about defects, over-exertion or other self-abuse, use of drugs, lack of sleep, emotional storms, the "blues."

HOW TO DRESS. What I am supposed to wear. Styles. How to dress for play, work, or special occasions.

JOBS, PART-TIME, SUMMER WORK. What I do, how much I earn, conditions and hours on the job, my working companions, etc.

LATE HOURS. Coming in late at night, being away without parents' knowing where I go, inability to get up in the morning, etc.

LIFE WORK. What I want to do or be, my goals, place to work, compensation, etc.

MARRIAGE. The person I want to marry or the one parents want me to wed, readiness for marriage, plans for wedding, anticipated problems of in-laws and children, etc.

MISBEHAVIOR. Disobedience, "juvenile delinquency," acts I have committed which are forbidden by law or by parents, discourtesies, acts of destruction, petty thefts, "fibs" and lies, etc.

MONEY OF MY OWN. Allowances, spending money, savings, earning my own way.

MY OWN EDUCATION. Choice of schools. Subjects to be studied. Fields of specialization. Grades. Extra-curricular activities. School failures. School problems.

PARENT PARTICIPATION IN MY PROJECTS. Wanting parents to do things with me, such as camping, gardening, making something, etc. Or wanting parent to keep out of my project or interest.

PETTING. Any part of the subject, or consideration of morals, etc. Sex play.

POLITICAL AND CIVIC ISSUES. Party politics, persons in office, local and world problems, welfare, national defense, taxation, United Nations, foreign relations, etc.

PRIVACY. My own place, my room, my closet, boxes and drawers, my diary, my personal mail, telephone conversations, etc.

RELATIVES. My brothers, sisters, aunts, uncles, cousins, grandparents--relatives living at home or elsewhere. My attitudes toward them or my relationships with them.

SEX. The sex organs, functions of the sex organs, worries about habits or ignorance, hygiene, my own attitudes and codes of behavior toward others in sex matters.

SMOKING. Any use of tobacco, habitual smoking, excessive use, cost of it, dangers to health, ashes and dirt caused, etc.

SOCIAL BEHAVIOR. How I speak to people, table manners, courtesies toward my elders, parlor and street etiquette, etc.

USE OF AUTOMOBILE. Use of family car for rides, for taking my date to a social affair, etc. Owning my own car, driving a hot-rod, driving in "drag" races, etc. License to drive.

ADDITIONAL SUBJECTS: _____

F _____ M _____

F _____ M _____

The Reason Cards

One model card for reasons for difficulty when talking with parents is shown below. Each one was set up with the heading line and with scoring spaces. The twenty-one other reasons in the set are listed alphabetically without being illustrated in full as they were presented on the cards. A model of the write-in card is included at the end of this list.

REASON FOR DIFFICULTY:

AGE DIFFERENCE. I do not discuss things with my parents readily because they are older; they regard me as a child rather than as an adult or as an equal.

F _____ M _____

CONDEMNED. In talking with my parents, especially about some subjects, I feel that I am condemned or held in contempt. When I feel this way, I become speechless.

CONFIDENCE VIOLATED. I do not talk to my parents readily because of their failure to keep the confidences, to keep my secrets and intimate matters to themselves. They "blab it all," or tell others who have no business to know.

CONSERVATISM. My parents are somewhat old-fashioned and conservative. I cannot tell my parents what I do or believe because they object to my more modern ideas and ways of doing things.

DELAY. I cannot talk to my parents readily about certain things. They do not seem to want me to know about them. They put me off and tell me to wait for the answer until I am older.

DON'T KNOW. My parents are not educated nor experienced along lines which concern me. They cannot discuss topics that I wish to talk about. They say, "I don't know."

EVASION. My parents will not take responsibility to answer, to give decisions, to face issues which I present. They shift the problem back to me, to each other, or to someone else.

FEAR. I do not tell my parents about certain topics because I fear the anger and scoldings of which they are capable.

FEAR OF POWER. From a lifetime of being punished or penalized by parents who were bigger and more powerful than I was as a child, I continue to have an attitude of respect for their power to punish me. This attitude or habit blocks my talk about certain topics.

GUILT FEELINGS. My parents have said that—or acted as if some subjects were sinful or "hush-hush." I become ashamed or guilty when I try to deal with such subjects. I avoid them or stop and change the subject, etc.

INFERIORITY. I feel inferior to my parents. Consequently I do not feel like talking with them about my ideas, problems, or interests.

NAGGING. My parents nag at me and find fault with much that I say or do. I therefore find it very hard to talk to them.

NO NEED. I do not talk to my parents about things readily because I do not need to; I have my friends to talk to and I have other sources for information I need such as books, etc.

POSITION. Because of the position of my parents in a profession or in community affairs, some subjects simply cannot be discussed with them. I feel that there is no use.

PRIDE. I do not talk to my parents about some things simply because I do not wish to show them my ignorance.

REJECTED. I do not talk with my parents readily because I do not believe they like me. I am rejected, unwanted, in the way, etc.

RIDICULE. My parents tend to make fun of the things I talk about, to laugh at me, to belittle what I think is important or interesting, to tease me, etc. Consequently I do not tell them about my interests or problems, nor do I enter into their talk.

SELF-RELIANCE. I do not talk to my parents readily because I do not longer wish to submit to their domination. I want to be in charge of my own life and its affairs. I want to be independent.

SIGNALS OF DISCOMFORT. When I try to talk to my parents, little signals like tones of voice or facial expression indicate that the discussion is giving discomfort. When I get such signals, I stop or change the subject.

SUPERIORITY. My parents have not had experience, training, nor opportunities equal to mine; I do not discuss things with them because they are not capable of understanding at my level.

TIME. I cannot find times or opportunities to talk at length to my parents about subjects or problems which concern me. They are gone or busy much of the time. There just is not time for it.

VOCABULARY. I cannot discuss things with my parents because I use the words that my youthful friends use. My parents do not understand my talk. We just do not use the same "language" or vocabulary.

OTHER REASONS: _____

F _____ M _____

F _____ M _____

SUBJECT CARD DIRECTIONS

This packet of cards is made up of thirty-six items or subject areas which may be discussed with parents. Some of them may be very easy to talk about, giving no difficulty whatsoever; others may be hard to talk about with parents--in fact, some may be virtually impossible for some young people.

By DIFFICULTY or HARD TO TALK ABOUT is meant any small or great amount of choking up, holding back, painfulness, embarrassment, feelings of shyness, inadequacy, not knowing what to say or how to say it, fears, beliefs that talks would be futile, or similar things. Some persons have experienced difficulty (or believe they would if they tried to talk about these things) with nearly every subject; others would have trouble with few or none.

Please go through the cards, reading each item to estimate its degree of difficulty as you have experienced it during your teen years, or as you think you would if you discussed it with your father or mother. Assign a number, any number between zero and one hundred in the space provided near the bottom of the card. If you can talk about the item with Father with no difficulty whatsoever, put a zero after F. If the same item causes a great deal of stress with Mother, perhaps you should place 80 or 90 after M. If the item is absolutely impossible to talk about with Father, enter 100 after F. If about half the time a subject can be discussed with either parent and half the time it cannot, enter 50 after F and 50 after M. Assign any numbers which seem to you to indicate the best estimate of difficulty; 10, 25, 40, 75, 90, or any number between 0 and 100.

In case other subjects come to your mind which have caused you trouble or which you think ought to be included in such a list as this, please enter them on blanks provided. Give value numbers to these also.

When you have finished this set, replace the rubber band securely and go ahead with the other set of cards. See directions before starting.

DIRECTIONS FOR REASON CARDS

This packet of cards is made up of twenty-two possible REASONS for difficulty which a young person might have in talking about things with his or her parents. Some of the reasons may be applicable in your case while others may not. Provision is made for evaluating the IMPORTANCE of each reason in relation to your FATHER or your MOTHER.

If a reason does not apply at all in your case relating to talk with Father, place 0 after F, but if it applies to Mother about half the time, or seems to be of medium importance in relation to her, place 50 after M. Use numbers from 0 to 100 to indicate the value of each reason as to its frequency-intensity. If a reason seems to you to be exactly as stated and if it operates in every instance, it gets 100. One of the stated causes may seem to you to operate with Father about once in ten times (then give 10 to F.) and at the same time may be of an intensity near absolute with Mother (give about 90 or 95 to M.)

Study each reason card carefully and assign a number to each F and M blank, please. Then if other reasons occur to you which have not been included on the cards, write in such reasons on the blanks provided. Give numbers to these reasons of your own, too.

When completed, replace rubber band on this set of cards. Then wrap the two sets of cards in the direction sheets and information schedule. Put a rubber band around the whole package and drop it in the slotted box.

THANK YOU!

GENERAL INTRODUCTORY REMARKS ABOUT THE STUDY

My name is Marvin Dubbe'. I am a member of the English Department at Oregon State College. I am also working for my doctor of education degree here in the School of Education. The study I am undertaking here is part of the work required of me by the Graduate School. Also cooperating in the study is the E. C. Brown Trust for Social Hygiene Education. The title of the project is the following:

SUBJECTS WHICH ONE HUNDRED SELECTED COLLEGE STUDENTS FOUND DIFFICULT TO DISCUSS WITH THEIR PARENTS AND REASONS FOR THESE DIFFICULTIES.

I have invited you to participate with me in the investigation and to contribute some information. Let me tell you more about it.

A great deal of information is still needed to make human living easier and better. Especially do we need to know more about intimate face-to-face relationships within our basic living units, our families. I mean, for example, such fundamental relationships as those between parents and children. Why do conflicts arise between a father and his teen-aged son? Why do daughters fail to talk out their troubles or problems with mothers and fathers? Some young persons have said to me, "It's impossible to talk to Dad." And some parents have said to me, "My youngsters won't talk to me. I can't discuss certain things with them. They will talk to other people but not to me."

The problem of communication between parents and young people may be serious. We know relatively little about it. Consequently this study is being attempted for the purpose of learning something more about this important matter. Your cooperation will be regarded as a splendid contribution to wisdom. The values of such a study as here proposed may be very great for parents, for education and guidance, for psychology, and for young people.

The research is designed to find out which topics or subjects cause trouble. It will also seek reasons for the failure of communication between young persons and their parents.

Because information sought is very intimate and personal, safeguards have been devised to preserve the rights of all persons who contribute data. NO NAMES OR NUMBERS WILL BE USED ON ANY FORMS TO IDENTIFY ANY PERSON. It is hoped that the participants in the study will be completely free to answer without hesitation, that

they will have no fear of being exposed or discovered in any way, and that they will make their best contribution to human wisdom by being wholly candid. The simple truth is the only thing valuable here.

There will be three easy tasks to perform. You will probably complete these in less than an hour. Please take enough time to be thorough.

The first task is the filling out of a schedule regarding yourself, your parents, and family relationships. Do not put your name or any identification on the paper.

The second task is the working through of a little packet of cards. This part is the evaluation of topics which give you some difficulty in talking with your parents, if you have any such difficulty. Directions are supplied with the cards. Please follow them carefully.

The third part is a similar set of cards designed to discover reasons and to give weights to the various reasons for trouble in parent-youth communication.

YOU MAY ASK QUESTIONS OF THE INVESTIGATOR IF YOU WISH.

If desired, interviews with the investigator may be arranged by appointment for discussion of the general field of study or of any personal problems related to it.

You will receive a letter expressing thanks for your cooperation. Your help is sincerely appreciated.

CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION ABOUT SELF, PARENTS, AND FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS

Please supply all facts requested.

Your present age.....Underline your sex: MALE FEMALE

Indicate your position among brothers and sisters. Begin with eldest at left. Put S in box for Sister, B in box for Brother, X in box for yourself. Show how old each one is in spaces above each box.

How old?	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
Birth order	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
Location?	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:

To show where each one lived during most of past year, place H under box if at Home, A if in Armed Forces. Draw circle inside box of each married one.

If you were adopted, at what age?.....Where were you born?.....

Facts about parents with whom you have lived most of your recent years:

Own

Step.....Father's age?.....Where born?.....

Foster.....

Highest school grade or degree?.....

His occupation?.....Yearly income?(About).....

His religion?.....Health; good, fair, or poor?.....

His father born where?.....His mother?.....

He married what year?.....If divorced, when?.....

Separated, when?.....Number of previous marriages?.....

If deceased, what year?.....

Own.....

Step.....Mother's age?.....Where born?.....

Foster.....

If employed outside home, what work?.....

Approx. yearly income?.....Highest school grade or degree?.....

Her religion?.....Health; good, fair, or poor?.....

Her father born where?.....Her mother?.....

If your mother was unmarried, check here...Married what year?...

If divorced, when?.....If separated, when....Times married?....

If deceased, what year?.....

FOR EACH EVALUATION QUESTION BELOW, SUPPLY NUMBER OF BEST
DESCRIPTIVE PHRASE

- I. Do you feel that the marital relationship in your parental home is (1) ideal, (2) very good, (3) average, (4) below average, (5) extremely poor?
- II. Do you feel your parents are (1) very wealthy, (2) apparently well-to-do, (3) have enough to live on but no more, (4) have to go without some of their needs, (5) are dependent upon outside financial aid?
- III. Do you feel that your father (1) has great affection for you, (2) likes you somewhat as a companion, (3) tolerates you but shows no liking for you, (4) rejects you considerably, (5) despises you and wishes you did not exist?
- IV. Do you feel that your mother (1) has great affection for you, (2) likes you somewhat as a companion, (3) tolerates you but shows no liking for you, (4) rejects you considerably, (5) despises you and wishes you did not exist?
- V. Do you feel that generally your relationship with brothers and sisters is (1) very cooperative and happy, (2) friendly for the most part, (3) just tolerable, (4) painful much of the time, (5) unbearable? (If you have none, leave blank.)
- VI. Do you feel that in order to make your family relationships happy and secure (1) that you make extreme personal efforts and sacrifices, (2) that you just do a few things to help out, (3) that affairs roll along satisfactorily without your concern one way or another, (4) that you just keep out of the way and remain quiet, (5) that you have to complain and demand changes?

ENTER EXPLANATIONS OR MODIFICATIONS OF YOUR ANSWERS HERE IF YOU WISH:

APPENDIX II**TABLES DESCRIBING THE STUDENTS IN THE SAMPLE**

TABLE 1

AGES OF COLLEGE FRESHMEN IN THE SAMPLE

Age	Number of Women	Number of Men	Totals
17	9	4	13
18	35	21	56
19	4	10	14
20	0	3	3
21	2	1	3
22	0	3	3
23	0	2	2
24	0	2	2
older	0	4	4
	<u>50</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>100</u>

Average age of women students: 18

Average age of men students: 19.76

Average age of all students: 18.89

TABLE 2

DECILE DISTRIBUTIONS OF COLLEGE FRESHMEN IN SAMPLE
BY SCORES ON AMERICAN COLLEGE ENTRANCE EXAMINATIONS

Deciles	Quantitative	Linguistic	Total
	Number	Number	Number
10	9	4	4
9	13	18	21
8	12	10	11
7	14	15	7
6	8	8	15
5	5	14	8
4	12	6	11
3	8	6	6
2	14	8	8
1	5	11	8
	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>

TABLE 3

RELATIONSHIP OF PARENTS DURING TEEN YEARS
TO COLLEGE FRESHMEN IN SAMPLE

Father-Persons		Mother-Persons	
Own fathers	92	Own mothers	97
Foster fathers	2	Foster mothers	3
Step fathers	5	Step mothers	0
Grandfathers	1		100
	<u>100</u>		

TABLE 4

FAMILY SIZES AND BIRTH POSITIONS REPRESENTED
BY COLLEGE FRESHMEN IN SAMPLE

Number of children in family	Position in Birth Order (Women)								Totals
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	
only child	5								5
2	9	12							21
3	7	5	3						15
4		1		1					2
5	1	1	1	1					4
6	1								1
7									
8							1		1
9									
Totals	<u>21</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>50</u>

Average size of families of women students: 2.84

Number of children in family	Position in Birth Order (Men)								Totals
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	
only child	6								6
2	8	11							19
3	9	5	4						18
4		1		1					2
5	1	1		1	1				4
6									
7									
Totals	<u>23</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>50</u>

Average size of families of men in sample: 2.66

Average size of families represented was 2.76

TABLE 5

PRESENT AGES OF FATHERS OF COLLEGE FRESHMEN IN SAMPLE

	Of Women	Of Men	Totals
30-35	0	1 (step)	1
36-40	2	0	2
41-45	13	8	21
46-50	19	15	34
51-55	9	10	19
56-60	4	6	10
61-65	2	4	6
66-70	1	2	3
71-75	0	1	1
unknown	0	2	2
deceased	0	1	1
	<u>50</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>100</u>

Average age of fathers of women students: 50.32

Average age of fathers of men students: 52.34

Average age of all fathers: 51.31

TABLE 6

PRESENT AGES OF MOTHERS OF COLLEGE FRESHMEN IN SAMPLE

	Of Women	Of Men	Totals
30-35	0	2	2
36-40	10	8	18
41-45	23	12	35
46-50	10	12	22
51-55	5	6	11
56-60	2	7	9
61-65	0	1	1
66-70	0	0	0
71-75	0	1	1
unknown	0	1	1
	<u>50</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>100</u>

Average age of mothers of women students: 45.12

Average age of mothers of men students: 47.78

Average age of all mothers: 46.43

TABLE 7

BIRTHPLACE OF PARENTS OF COLLEGE FRESHMEN IN SAMPLE

Fathers	
Born in U. S.	94 (2 in Territory of Hawaii)
Foreign born	5
Unknown	$\frac{1}{100}$
Mothers	
Born in U. S.	90 (2 in Territory of Hawaii)
Foreign born	8
Unknown	$\frac{2}{100}$

TABLE 8

BIRTHPLACE OF PATERNAL GRANDPARENTS
OF COLLEGE FRESHMEN IN SAMPLE

Of Grandfathers:

Born in U. S.	51 (1 in Territory of Hawaii)
Foreign born	30
Unknown	<u>19</u>
	100

Of Grandmothers:

Born in U. S.	56 (1 in Territory of Hawaii)
Foreign born	27
Unknown	<u>17</u>
	100

BIRTHPLACE OF MATERNAL GRANDPARENTS
OF COLLEGE FRESHMEN IN SAMPLE

Of Grandfathers:

Born in U. S.	57 (1 in Territory of Hawaii)
Foreign born	31
Unknown	<u>12</u>
	100

Of Grandmothers:

Born in U. S.	69 (2 in Territory of Hawaii)
Foreign born	20
Unknown	<u>11</u>
	100

TABLE 9

EDUCATIONAL LEVELS OF PARENTS OF COLLEGE FRESHMEN IN SAMPLE

Of Fathers:	Of Women	Of Men	Totals
Graduate training	5	1	6
Four years college	9	5	14
Some college	8	5	13
High school graduate	8	14	22
Part high school	5	11	16
Completed grades	9	9	18
Part grades	2	3	5
None	2	0	2
Unknown	2	2	4
	<u>50</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>100</u>

Of Mothers:	Of Women	Of Men	Totals
Graduate training	1	0	1
Four years college	11	3	14
Some college	11	9	20
High school graduate	14	25	39
Part high school	5	8	13
Completed grades	5	2	7
Part grades	0	1	1
None	1	0	1
Unknown	2	2	4
	<u>50</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>100</u>

TABLE 10

OCCUPATIONAL CLASSIFICATION OF PARENTS OF COLLEGE FRESHMEN IN SAMPLE

Of Fathers:

Professional and Managerial Occupations	41
Clerical and Sales	6
Service	0
Agricultural, Fishery, Forestry, and Kindred Lines	21
Skilled Occupations	24
Semiskilled	4
Unskilled Occupations	1
Retired or Unspecified*	3
	<u>100</u>

Of Mothers:

Professional and Managerial	10
Clerical and Sales	14
Service	9
Agricultural, Fishery, Forestry, and Kindred Lines	1
Skilled Occupations	1
Semiskilled	1
Unskilled	0
Housewives not employed out of own homes**	63**
Retired or Unspecified*	1
	<u>100</u>

* Special classifications added

** One mother did baby sitting out of home to extent of \$500 per year.

Classification is based on the widely used Dictionary of Occupational Titles, definitions of titles, Vol. 1, second edition, of the Division of Occupational Analysis of the United States Employment Service. Also Vol. 2, Occupational Classification. (62)

TABLE 11

FAMILY INCOME TO NEAREST \$1000 FOR COLLEGE FRESHMEN IN SAMPLE

	Of Women	Of Men	Totals
Over \$25,000	0	1	1
25,000	1	3	4
15,000	2	1	3
14,000	1	0	1
13,000	1	1	2
12,000	0	3	3
11,000	2	1	3
10,000	5	7	12
9,000	2	3	5
8,000	4	4	8
7,000	2	5	7
6,000	5	3	8
5,000	6	6	12
4,000	3	5	8
3,000	3	0	3
2,000	1	3	4
Unknown to student	$\frac{12}{50}$	$\frac{4}{50}$	$\frac{16}{100}$

TABLE 12

RELIGIOUS GROUPINGS OF PARENTS OF COLLEGE FRESHMEN IN SAMPLE

Of Fathers:	Of Women	Of Men	Totals
Protestant	41	35	76
Catholic	3	7	10
Jewish	0	1	1
None	6	7	13
	<u>50</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>100</u>

Of Mothers:	Of Women	Of Men	Totals
Protestant	43	39	82
Catholic	3	5	8
Jewish	0	1	1
None	4	5	9
	<u>50</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>100</u>

Number whose affiliation or lack of religion differed from spouse:

6	7	13
---	---	----

TABLE 13

HEALTH CONDITION OF PARENTS OF COLLEGE FRESHMEN IN SAMPLE

	Of Fathers	Of Mothers
Good	75	76
Fair	21	22
Poor	3	1
Deceased	1	1
	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>

TABLE 14

STUDENT RATINGS OF THE PARENTAL RELATIONSHIP
OF THEIR PARENTS BY ONE HUNDRED COLLEGE FRESHMEN

	Women	Men	Totals
Ideal	22	9	31
Very good	18	23	41
Average	9	13	22
Below average	1	4	5
Extremely poor	$\frac{0}{50}$	$\frac{1}{50}$	$\frac{1}{100}$

TABLE 15

STUDENT RATINGS OF ECONOMIC STATUS OF OWN
FAMILY BY ONE HUNDRED COLLEGE FRESHMEN

	Women	Men	Totals
Very wealthy	0	0	0
Apparently well to do	18	24	42
Entries between*	4	3	7
Have enough to live on but no more	27	21	48
Have to go without some needs	1	2	3
Dependent upon outside financial aid	$\frac{0}{50}$	$\frac{0}{50}$	$\frac{0}{100}$

*Several students rated economic status between "enough" and "well to do."

TABLE 16

RATINGS OF FATHER'S AFFECTION FOR THE STUDENT
BY ONE HUNDRED COLLEGE FRESHMEN

	Women	Men	Totals
Great Affection	44	43	87
Entries between*	1	1	2
Likes somewhat as companion	3	4	7
Tolerates but shows no liking	2	1	3
Rejects somewhat	0	1	1
Despises	$\frac{0}{50}$	$\frac{0}{50}$	$\frac{0}{100}$

*Two students scored between first and second level.

TABLE 17

RATINGS OF MOTHER'S AFFECTION FOR THE STUDENT
BY ONE HUNDRED COLLEGE FRESHMEN

	Women	Men	Totals
Great affection	44	45	89
Entries between*	1	0	1
Likes somewhat as a companion	5	2	7
Tolerates but shows no liking	0	3	3
Rejects somewhat	0	0	0
Despises	$\frac{0}{50}$	$\frac{0}{50}$	$\frac{0}{100}$

*One student scored between first and second level.

TABLE 18

RATINGS OF SIBLING RELATIONSHIPS BY ONE HUNDRED COLLEGE FRESHMEN

	Women	Men	Totals
Very cooperative and happy	27	32	59
Entries between*	1	0	1
Friendly for the most part	14	11	25
Just tolerable	3	1	4
Painful much of the time	0	0	0
Unbearable	0	0	0
Have none	$\frac{5}{50}$	$\frac{6}{50}$	$\frac{11}{100}$

*One student scored between first and second level.

TABLE 19

RATINGS OF SELF CONTRIBUTION TO FAMILY HAPPINESS AND SECURITY
BY ONE HUNDRED COLLEGE FRESHMEN

	Women	Men	Totals
Extreme personal efforts and sacrifices	5	7	12
Not extreme but a great deal*	2	1	3
Just do a few things to help out	38	30	68
No concern one way or the other	1	9	10
Just keep out of the way and keep quiet	3	2	5
Have to complain and demand changes	$\frac{1}{50}$	$\frac{1}{50}$	$\frac{2}{100}$

*Some students required score between levels given.

APPENDIX III

PRESENTATION OF DATA

TABLE 20

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

BOYS' DIFFICULT SUBJECTS WHEN TALKING WITH FATHERS
FOR FIFTY FRESHMEN AT OREGON STATE COLLEGE

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F	Tabulated F	
					5%	1%
Students	16,997.07	49	346.88	19.12	1.35	1.53
Subjects	5,643.29	35	161.24	8.89	1.43	1.65
Error	31,120.63	1715	18.15			
Total	53,760.99	1799				

(See 15, pp. 127-134 for method, pp. 310 and 312 for F distributions.)

TABLE 21

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

GIRLS' DIFFICULT SUBJECTS WHEN TALKING WITH FATHERS
FOR FIFTY FRESHMEN AT OREGON STATE COLLEGE

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F	Tabulated F	
					5%	1%
Students	26,418.17	49	694.82	27.92	1.35	1.53
Subjects	12,820.65	35	366.30	14.72	1.43	1.65
Error	42,680.49	1715	24.89			
Total	83,919.31	1719				

(See 15, pp. 127-134 for method, pp. 310 and 312 for F distributions.)

TABLE 22

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

BOYS' DIFFICULT SUBJECTS WHEN TALKING WITH MOTHERS
FOR FIFTY FRESHMEN AT OREGON STATE COLLEGE

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F	Tabulated F	
					5%	1%
Students	16,977.57	49	346.48	22.76	1.35	1.53
Subjects	8,191.62	35	234.05	15.37	1.43	1.65
Error	26,106.43	1715	15.22			
Total	51,275.62	1799				

(See 15, pp. 127-134 for method, pp. 310 and 312 for F distributions.)

TABLE 23

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

GIRLS' DIFFICULT SUBJECTS WHEN TALKING WITH MOTHERS
FOR FIFTY FRESHMEN AT OREGON STATE COLLEGE

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F	Tabulated F	
					5%	1%
Students	24,825.72	49	506.65	26.15	1.35	1.53
Subjects	6,359.44	35	181.70	9.38	1.43	1.65
Error	33,232.12	1715	19.38			
Total	64,417.28	1799				

(See 15, pp. 127-134 for method, pp. 310 and 312 for F distributions.)

TABLE 24

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

BOYS' REASONS FOR DIFFICULTY WHEN TALKING WITH FATHERS
FOR FIFTY FRESHMEN AT OREGON STATE COLLEGE

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F	Tabulated F	
					5%	1%
Students	5,569.93	49	113.67	8.73	1.35	1.53
Reasons	1,369.18	21	65.20	5.00	1.56	1.86
Error	13,399.05	1029	13.08			
Total	20,338.16	1099				

(See 15, pp. 127-134 for method, pp. 310 and 312 for F distributions.)

TABLE 25

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

GIRLS' REASONS FOR DIFFICULTY WHEN TALKING WITH FATHERS
FOR FIFTY FRESHMEN AT OREGON STATE COLLEGE

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F	Tabulated F	
					5%	1%
Students	3,940.40	49	80.42	3.03	1.35	1.53
Reasons	2,268.05	21	108.00	6.75	1.56	1.86
Error	16,452.54	1029	15.99			
Total	22,660.99	1099				

(See 15, pp. 127-134 for method, pp. 310 and 312 for F distributions.)

TABLE 26

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

BOYS' REASONS FOR DIFFICULTY WHEN TALKING WITH MOTHERS
FOR FIFTY FRESHMEN AT OREGON STATE COLLEGE

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F	Tabulated F	
					5%	1%
Students	3,840.59	49	78.38	8.29	1.35	1.53
Reasons	1,079.67	21	51.41	5.43	1.56	1.86
Error	9,725.33	1029	9.45			
Total	14,645.59	1099				

(See 15, pp. 127-134 for method, pp. 310 and 312 for F distributions.)

TABLE 27

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

GIRLS' REASONS FOR DIFFICULTY WHEN TALKING WITH MOTHERS
FOR FIFTY FRESHMEN AT OREGON STATE COLLEGE

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F	Tabulated F	
					5%	1%
Students	4,819.62	49	98.97	7.04	1.35	1.53
Reasons	1,376.68	21	65.57	4.66	1.56	1.86
Error	14,462.56	1029	14.05			
Total	20,689.06	1099				

(See 15, pp. 127-134 for method, pp. 310 and 312 for F distributions.)

TABLE 28

ITEMS WHICH BOYS FIND HARD TO TALK ABOUT WITH FATHERS

Rank		
1	Petting	} Most difficult items
2	Sex	
3	Courtship	
4	Marriage	
5	Misbehavior	
6	Late hours	
7	Failures or defeats	
8	Health habits	
9	Parent participation in projects	
10	Smoking	
11	Drinking	
12	Friends of opposite sex	
13	Ailments	
14	Friends of own sex	
15	Beliefs	
16	Engagement	
17	Money of my own	
18	Relatives	
19	Fears	
20	My own education	
21	Use of automobile	
22	How to dress	
23	Forms of entertainment	
24	Division of work	
25	Family finances	
26	Entertaining my friends at home	
27	Privacy	
28	Car expenses	
29	Food I eat	
30	Life work	
31	Eating habits	
32	Social behavior	
33	Care of property	
34	Jobs, part-time, summer work	
35	Political and civic issues	
36	Clothing and its care	

Items are ranked in order of the means of weighted responses. Duncan multiple range test is also applied. Any two items not touched by the same line at the left are significantly different at the 5% level. Any two items touched by the same line are not significantly different. (16, pp. 1-7)

TABLE 29

ITEMS WHICH GIRLS FIND HARD TO TALK ABOUT WITH FATHERS

Rank		
1	Sex	} Most difficult items
2	Petting	
3	Marriage	} Items of intermediate difficulty
4	Engagement	
5	Health habits	
6	Courtship	
7	Late hours	
8	Beliefs	
9	Ailments	
10	Smoking	} Least difficult items
11	Parent participation in projects	
12	Drinking	
13	Family finances	
14	Clothing and its care	
15	How to dress	
16	Fears	
17	Failures and defeats	
18	Friends of own sex	
19	Life work	
20	Misbehavior	
21	Food I eat	
22	Relatives	
23	Use of automobile	
24	Division of work	
25	Political and civic issues	
26	Friends of opposite sex	
27	Privacy	
28	Jobs, part-time, summer work	
29	Care of property	
30	Entertaining my friends at home	
31	Social behavior	
32	Eating habits	
33	My own education	
34	Money of my own	
35	Forms of entertainment	
36	Car expenses	

Items ranked in order of the means of weighted responses. Duncan multiple range test is also applied. Any two items not touched by the same line at the left are significantly different at the 5% level. Any two items touched by the same line are not significantly different. (16, pp. 1-7)

TABLE 30

ITEMS WHICH BOYS FIND HARD TO TALK ABOUT WITH MOTHERS

Rank		
1	Sex	} Most difficult items
2	Petting	
3	Misbehavior	
4	Late hours	
5	Courtship	
6	Drinking	
7	Smoking	
8	Failures or defeats	
9	Marriage	
10	Health habits	
11	Ailments	
12	Friends of opposite sex	
13	Friends of own sex	
14	Engagement	
15	Parent participation in projects	
16	Use of automobile	
17	Money of my own	
18	Beliefs	
19	Division of work	
20	Forms of entertainment	
21	My own education	
22	How to dress	
23	Clothing and its care	
24	Relatives	
25	Life work	
26	Privacy	
27	Social behavior	
28	Eating habits	
29	Political and civic issues	
30	Fears	
31	Jobs, part-time, summer work	
32	Food I eat	
33	Family finances	
34	Car expenses	
35	Entertaining my friends at home	
36	Care of property	

Items are ranked in order of the means of weighted responses. Duncan multiple range test is also applied. Any two items not touched by the same line at the left are significantly different at the 5% level. Any two items touched by the same line are not significantly different. (16, pp. 1-7)

TABLE 31

ITEMS WHICH GIRLS FIND HARD TO TALK ABOUT WITH MOTHERS

<u>Rank</u>		
1	Petting	} Most difficult items
2	Sex	
3	Marriage	} Items of intermediate difficulty
4	Engagement	
5	Misbehavior	
6	Courtship	
7	Late hours	
8	Smoking	
9	Drinking	
10	Parent participation in projects	
11	Health habits	
12	Beliefs	
13	Political and civic issues	} Least difficult items
14	Failures or defeats	
15	Fears	
16	Use of automobile	
17	Division of work	
18	Food I eat	
19	Eating habits	
20	Life work	
21	Privacy	
22	Friends of own sex	
23	Family finances	
24	Friends of opposite sex	
25	Ailments	
26	Relatives	
27	Clothing and its care	
28	Care of property	
29	How to dress	
30	Money of my own	
31	My own education	
32	Jobs, part-time, summer work	
33	Forms of entertainment	
34	Entertaining my friends at home	
35	Social behavior	
36	Car expense	

Items are ranked in order of the means of weighted responses. Duncan multiple range test is also applied. Any two items not touched by the same line at the left are significantly different at the 5% level. Any two items touched by the same line are not significantly different. (16, pp. 1-7)

TABLE 32

BOYS' REASONS FOR DIFFICULTY WHEN TALKING WITH FATHERS

1	No need	} Probably most important reasons, but not clearly more significant than some others below
2	Self-reliance	
3	Fear	
4	Conservatism of parents	
5	Pride	} Reasons of intermediate importance. Not clearly cut from those above or below
6	Time	
7	Signals of discomfort	
8	Guilt feelings	
9	Age difference	
10	Nagging	
11	Fear of power	} Reasons of least importance
12	Ridicule	
13	Position	
14	Inferiority	
15	Condemned	
16	Don't know (parents)	
17	Evasion	
18	Delay	
19	Confidence violated	
20	Superiority	
21	Vocabulary	
22	Rejected	

Reasons are ranked in order of means of weighted responses. Duncan multiple range test is also applied. Any two reasons not touched by the same line at the left are significantly different at the 5% level. Any two items touched by the same line are not significantly different. (16, pp. 1-7)

TABLE 33

GIRLS' REASONS FOR DIFFICULTY WHEN TALKING WITH FATHERS

1	No need	} Clearly most important reasons
2	Time	
3	Guilt feelings	} Reasons of intermediate importance
4	Self-reliance	
5	Conservatism of parents	
6	Signals of discomfort	
7	Fear	
8	Evasion	
9	Pride	} Reasons of least importance
10	Fear of power	
11	Condemned	
12	Don't know (parents)	
13	Delay	
14	Superiority	
15	Age difference	
16	Ridicule	
17	Rejected	
18	Nagging	
19	Confidence violated	
20	Position	
21	Vocabulary	
22	Inferiority	

Reasons are ranked in order of means of weighted responses. Duncan multiple range test is also applied. Any two reasons not touched by the same line at the left are significantly different at the 5% level. Any two items touched by the same line are not significantly different. (16, pp. 1-7)

TABLE 34

BOYS' REASONS FOR DIFFICULTY WHEN TALKING WITH MOTHERS

1	Self-reliance	} Clearly most important reasons
2	No need	
3	Conservatism of parents	} Reasons of intermediate importance
4	Fear	
5	Signals of discomfort	
6	Guilt feelings	
7	Pride	
8	Confidence violated	
9	Time	
10	Don't know (parents)	
11	nagging	
12	Ridicule	
13	Position	} Reasons of least importance
14	Age difference	
15	Delay	
16	Condemned	
17	Evasion	
18	Fear of power	
19	Superiority	
20	Inferiority	
21	Vocabulary	
22	Rejected	

Reasons are ranked in order of means of weighted responses. Duncan multiple range test is also applied. Any two reasons not touched by the same line at the left are significantly different at the 5% level. Any two reasons touched by the same line are not significantly different. (16, pp. 1-7)

TABLE 35

GIRLS' REASONS FOR DIFFICULTY WHEN TALKING WITH MOTHERS

1	No need	} Probably most important reasons, but not clearly more significant than some others below
2	Self-reliance	
3	Time	
4	Guilt feelings	
5	Signals of discomfort	
6	Conservatism of parents	
7	Fear	
8	Condemned	} Reasons of intermediate importance
9	Nagging	
10	Pride	
11	Confidence violated	
12	Evasion	} Reasons of least importance
13	Fear of power	
14	Delay	
15	Age difference	
16	Superiority	
17	Rejected	
18	Ridicule	
19	Don't know (parents)	
20	Position	
21	Inferiority	
22	Vocabulary	

Reasons are ranked in order of means of weighted responses. Duncan multiple range test is also applied. Any two reasons not touched by the same line at the left are significantly different at the 5% level. Any two reasons touched by the same line are not significantly different. (16, pp. 1-7)

APPENDIX IV

DISPLAY OF THE WRITE-INS

Detailed analysis of the write-ins follows below. The letter N at the left is used when the subject or reason is regarded as new, but the letter C at the left is used if the material is comment only. Parenthetical note after each quoted contribution shows score assigned, if any, and comparison to related cards in the sets when possible. Spelling is in original form.

Write-ins Contributed by Woman Students on Subject Cards

- C My parents have brought me up with the knowledge of what is right or wrong. If I do anything they might disapprove of it would be impossible for me to tell them.
(This received no score. Girl scored MISBEHAVIOR at F 100 M 100. Therefore this is just comment on a given item.)
- N race prejudices
(Scored F 80 M 0. This topic was not in list.)
- C More about marriage; My parents are afraid that I will quit college to get married as my brother did—but I still try to impress on them the fact that Nursing is my first goal—
(Scored F 25 M 100, same as on MARRIAGE card.)
- N Right to make my own choice about which church I wish to join.
(Scored F 100 M 100. The BELIEFS card was scored at F 50 M 50. Regard this as a new item.)
- N Criticizing faults I think my parents should and could correct.
(Scored F 100 M 100. The RELATIVES card had F 80 M 80.)
- N Going steady.
(Scored F 90 M 80. COURTSHIP card was F 75 M 50. Card for ENGAGEMENT was scored the same. Person required division of topic.)

Write-in Contributed by Man Student on Subject Card

- N My opinion of my parents' companions and friends.
(Scored F 50 M 15. No comparable item was offered in the set.)

Write-ins Contributed by Women Students on Reason Cards

C Because my parents enjoy social life & drinking a great deal, my brother and I have had to raise ourselves which makes us apart from our parents. I feel like I don't have any basis of communication with them because our interests are so different.
(No score given. Card for REJECTED had F 50 M 50 and notation, "I believe they are not interested enough.")

N Some times they won't talk to me about things because they are afraid I will tell other people.
(Scored F 50 M 25. This reverses CONFIDENCE VIOLATED.)

C I want them to be proud of me—not think I've gone against their wishes. I can talk about anything except things which would disappoint them if they knew.
(No score on this. SIGNALS OF DISCOMFORT was scored at F 90 M 50. Regard this as comment.)

N Sometimes parents who have children of the opposite sex do not understand them as well as if they were of the same sex.
(Scored F 50 M 0. No comparable reason was offered.)

C My parents do not listen to my ideas on family problems many times because they believe I am immature.
(No score. AGE DIFFERENCE received F 20 M 10; therefore regard this as comment.)

N I feel that problems are too silly to bother with.
(Scored F 50 M). No comparable reasons were offered.)

C My dad jokes around and teases me constantly; therefore sometimes it's hard to discuss current events.
(Scored F 90 M 0. Also scored RIDICULE F 80 M 0. This is comment.)

C Time—I can't find time or opportunity to have lengthy talks with parents for I'm busy or gone most of the time. Often I don't tell them about experiences for I don't want to take out time or I've told others about it & I'm tired of talking about it. Sometimes it makes me mad when they ask, out of curiosity, "Where have you been & what have you been doing?" This is wrong but I know almost all teenagers feel this way.
(No score assigned to this or any comparable reasons; it must be regarded as comment.)

N My folks think they know more than I do and thus they will not listen to my arguments.
(Scored F 100 M 50. No related items were given score. Count as new reason.)

C Since my mother is home more, she knows more about my dates, etc. My sister and I naturally talk more easily with her about marriage and sex because of this.

(No score. TIME card was scored F 20 M 0.)

C I feel that my parents may lower their estimation of my intelligence and standard if I attempted to discuss my problems with them.

(Scored F 25 M 25. The PRIDE card was also scored F 20 M 20. This is probably another interpretation of same reason.)

C None of these reasons seemed to fit my case. My parents would answer my questions but I am too embarrassed to ask them.

(No score. GUILT FEELINGS had score F 10 M 10.)

C Embarrassment—Sometimes especially with Dad, we both get a little embarrassed, but I can still tell Mom anything.

(No score. Regard as explanatory.)

C I get embarrassed and just cannot seem to say what I want even though I know they will understand.

(Scored F 90 M 75. Also scored GUILT FEELINGS F 75 M 75. This is probably emphasis rather than new item.)

N I naturally have a tendency to keep things to myself.

(No score. However, no comparable reason was offered.)

Write-ins Contributed by Men Students on Reason Cards

C I feel they don't approve of a certain act although they say so.

(Scored F 45 M 5. This seems to be about the same as FEAR OF POWER which the respondent scored F 50 M 0.)

C I do not talk to my parents at times because they don't consider my point of view but their own.

(Scored F 75 M 75. This probably reinforces his weighting on CONSERVATISM and SELF-RELIANCE. Both had similar score.)

N I was (am) rather hard headed and many discussions with parents led to arguments therefore I avoided as many as possible.

(Scored F 100 M 100. Also, he assigned very high scores to PRIDE and SELF-RELIANCE, but the desire to avoid argument may be a separate reason.)

N For many years I resented my stepfather even though he did everything possible for me and therefore I would not discuss anything with him.

(Scored F 100 M 0. This is a special reason caused by special circumstances. It was not offered in the set.)

C If the question had been "reasons we don't talk well together, these cards would have been different. My dad & I have argued tooth and nail until early in the morning about flying saucers and etc. He laughs them off & I get infuriated--But we laugh afterwards about it--

(No score. This is comment only. The same student made several penciled entries on the cards which provide some insight. He scored the CONSERVATISM card F 100 M 40 and added the word, "Bingo!" He gave no score to CONDEMNED but penciled, "Never! I would then argue until I was blue in the face." He crossed out the last half of the detail on the AGE DIFFERENCE card and added, "They don't seem to grasp many modern concepts--going steady, hot rods, etc." This he scored F 20 M 15. SUPERIORITY was not given score, but after the suggestion that parents are not capable of understanding at my level, he added, "only Physics and they're eager to know (not learn) what I've learned." DON'T KNOW was scored F 20 M 0 and it bore this comment; "My pop says 'Pshaw' to a space satellite. He won't discuss stuff like that--saucers, too.")

N Because of being apart from each other through working.
(Scored F 60 M 20. This is a different reason than one presented on card for TIME. This refers to youth's time whereas card refers to parent's time.)

C Age difference (explanation) I believe at the time when I wanted to talk to my parents this and their conservatism were the principle reasons preventing easy approach and understanding between us. My parents were 40 & 39 when I was born.

(No score. Both AGE DIFFERENCE and CONSERVATISM were scored F 90 M 90.)