本文章已註冊DOI數位物件識別碼

▶ The Use of the California Psychological Inventory in Intensive Study of Family Systems

加州人格品質量表在家庭關系研究上之應用

引用本篇文獻時，請提供DOI資訊，並透過DOI永久網址取得最正確的書目資訊。

To cite this Article, please include the DOI name in your reference data.

請使用本篇文獻DOI永久網址進行連結:

To link to this Article:

http://dx.doi.org/10.29811/PE.196812.0004

DOI是數位物件識別碼（Digital Object Identifier, DOI）的簡稱，
是這篇文章在網路上的唯一識別碼，
用於永久連結及引用該篇文章。

若想得知更多DOI使用資訊，

請參考　http://doi.airiti.com

For more information,

Please see:　http://doi.airiti.com

DOI Enhanced

請往下捲動至下一頁，開始閱讀本篇文獻
PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

THE USE OF THE CALIFORNIA PSYCHOLOGICAL INVENTORY IN INTENSIVE STUDY OF FAMILY SYSTEMS[1]

KENNETH A. ABBOTT M. S. W.

This paper presents some preliminary research findings in order to facilitate consideration of the research utilization of a multiple scale personality test such as the California Personality Inventory (CPI) in the study of family dynamics. Such utilization is consistent with the increasing attention being given to the study of whole families[2]. Role theory[3] is also drawn upon as two of the eighteen scales of the CPI; Dominance (*Do*) and Femininity (*Fe*) are related to Father-husband and Mother-wife roles in the family. This paper is an exposition of research data and makes little effort here to relate data specifically to the theory frame of reference indicated above. This will be done later when more of the data under study has been analyzed. The research discussed here is part of the Chinese Family Life Study[4], a comparative study of family functioning in the families of 35 delinquents, 30 matched nondelinquents and 32 out-standing Chinese-American youth.

In this paper, the family is seen as a social system with interaction patterns being formed by actors in the various roles of the family system[5]. The behavior of these actors is influenced not only by the size, cohesiveness, and other characteristics of the family system itself but also by the cultural values of the society and by the personality systems of each actor. In order to throughly study the family, we approach it through each of the systems—cultural, social and personality—that is found in toto or in part within the family. While the Chinese Family Life Study is concerned with the study of each of these systems, here we are focusing on personality systems as they affect family social system roles and the observance of cultural system values.

---

(1) The content of this paper was first presented publically at the 15th Annual Meeting of the Chinese Association of Psychological Testing on January 14th, 1968 in Taipei.

(2) Handel, Gerald "Psychological Study of Whole Families" in *The Psychosocial Interior of the Family*, edited by Gerald Handel, Aldine Publishing Company, Chicago, 1967, 517-550.

(3) One of the best current summaries of Role Theory can be found in Biddle, Bruce J. and Edwin J. Thomas (ed.) *Role Theory: Concepts and Research*, John Wiley and Sons, Inc. New York, 1966.

(4) Abbott, Kenneth A. *The Chinese Family in San Francisco: Part II* A Group Research Project Under the Faculty Supervision of Kenneth A. Abbott, Univ. of California, School of Social Welfare, Berkeley, June 1967, pp. ii-iv. The scope and personnel of the Chinese Family Life Study are described in these pages. The Study's Principal Investigators are Dr. Wolfram Eberhard, Professor of Sociology, and Dr. George De Vos, Professor the Anthropology (Also a trained clinical psychologist). The study is funded by the Institute of International Studies of the University of California at Berkeley.

(5) Talcott Parsons discusses roles and the family system at many points. One good presentation is made in his "An Outline of the Social System" pp. 36-43 in Vol. I of *Theories of Society*, edited by Talcott Parsons, Edward Shils, Kaspar D. Naegele and Jesse R. Pitts, The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., Glencoe, 1961.

Family roles such as Father-husband and Mother-wife are defined in a society's cultural system and adapted in some variation to each family system. These cultural values become social norms that are enacted in each family in a manner both unique to the family and general to the society. However, a family role can be profoundly influenced by the personality system of its actor and by other actors within the family system. It is this last influence that we are attempting to assess through the use of the CPI.

The CPI has eighteen scales[6]. Each of them is descriptively labeled and is comprised of items that reflect "folk feeling" about generally recognized "favorable and positive" personality characteristics. Each scale was empirically developed and the whole test has undergone many validity and reliability studies. The test has been translated into several languages and is being used extensively in cross-cultural research[7].

For use in the Chinese Family Life Study in San Francisco, the test was translated into Cantonese. The Cantoneses and English for each item was then placed on a small card. When it was certain that the person taking the test spoke English well, he was given an English test booklet. When there was any doubt about either his English or Chinese language ability, he was given the test on the bilingual cards. If he were illiterate, the test was read to him. The test also was used in San Fransisco in order to familiarize testors in a common reading of the test. Here we are concerned with only two of the 18 scales—Dominance (*Do*) and Femininity (*Fe*)[8]. We hypothesize that the Dominance Scale should have a relationship to the Father-husband role and the Femininity Scale to the Mother-wife role. That is, we

---

(6) These are Dominance, Capacity for Status, Sociability, Social Presence, Self-acceptance, Sense of Well-being, Responsibility, Socialization, Self-control, Tolerance, Good-impression, Communality, Achievement via conformity, Achievement via independence, Intellectual efficiency, Psychological-mindedness, Flexibility, and Femininity.

(7) *The Manual for the California Psychological Inventory*, Harrison Gough, Consulting Psychologists Press Inc., Palo Alto, California, 1964 (Revised), includes a 300-item selective bibliography regarding research and analysis done on and with the C. P. I.

(8) The purpose of the *Do* Scale is to "assess factors of leadership ability, dominance, persistence, and Social initiative."

High Scores tend to be seem as "agressive, confident, persistent, and planful; as being persuasive and verbally fluent; as selfreliant and independent; and as having leadership potential and initiative."

Low Scores tend to be seen as "retiring, inhibited, commonplace, indifferent, silent and unassuming; as being slow in thought and action; as avoiding of situations of tension and decision; and lacking in self-confidence."

The purpose of the *Fe* Scale is to "assess the masculinity or femininity of interests. (High scores indicate more feminine interests, low scores more masculine.)"

High Scores tend to be seem as "appreciative, patient, helpful, gentle, moderate, persevering, and sincere; as being respectful and accepting of others; and as behaving in a conscientious and sympathetic way"

Low Scores tend to be seem as "outgoing, hard-headed, ambitious, masculine, active, robust, and restless; as being manipulative and opportunistic in dealing with others; blunt and direct in thinking and action; and impatient with delay, indecision, and reflection."

The Manual for the California Psychological Inventory, p. 10-11.

believe that both Chinese and American values emphasize a Father that is (or should be) dominant in the family in that he takes the family leadership, tends to assert himself more than other family members (including the mother), and is recognized as the head of the family[9]. Fathers therefore should have relatively high Dominance scale scores. On the other hand, we feel that the Femininity scale should be associated more closely with the Mother-wife role in that mothers are (or should be) more appreciative, patient, as well as respectful and accepting of others than other family members (including the Father). Thus, mothers should have relatively high Femininity scores. We further hypothesize that in disorganized families we may find these roles either reversed or confused. For example, if a wife is more or equally dominant as her husband, this upsets both the value and social systems of the family and may affect an adolescent member—particularly in regard to his social behavior in respect to authority. This means that we might expect to find the fathers of delinquents less dominant than their wives. Likewise, husbands who exceed their wives in Femininity scores would cause role confusion in their families and affect the socialization of their sons.

The Chinese Family Life Study and this paper are not primarily concerned with a study of delinquency. The functioning of families of delinquents are being studied because they can be readily identified and thus offered an economical avenue to locating disorganized or psycho-socially mal-functioning families. Of course this means that we accept the assumption that major factors (if not the principal factors) in the etiology of juvenile delinquency are faulty psychological development of the individual, and inadequate socialization of the child within the family[10]. We have defined our delinquent (D) sample in San Francisco as those youth of Chinese-American (or Chinese) extraction between the ages of 13 and 17 who were on probation or placed on probation during our study period from June 1966 till August 1967. As a result of this definition we found that we generally were dealing with youth that had committed more than one delinquent act or at least one serious offence. Our non-delinquent (N) sample was matched to the D-sample according to age and residence. Each N family was randomly drawn from those of a small group of matched youth taken from a large research population of families secured from diverse community sources.

---

(9) Alberta Guerrieri gives several citations from the social science literature concerning this question in "The Role of the Chinese-American Mother", pp. 235-37, in *The Chinese Family in San Francisco, Part II*, pp. 235-281. While the consensus is that the Father is the head of the household, this is not without debate when actual field research results are considered.

(10) Hyman, Rodman and Paul Grams present a definitive discussion of the current literature in this field in their article "Juvenile Delinquency and the Family: A Review and Discussion" in *Task Force Report: Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime*, The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1967, pp. 188-221. The definition, foibles and hardships of delinquency research are set forth in *Delinquency Research*, Hirschi, Travis and Hanan C. Selvin, The Free Press, New York, 1967.

In order to study the hypotheses set forth above, the Dominance and Femininity scores of the members of only those families in the Delinquent (D) and Non-delinquent (N) sub-samples of our San Francisco Chinese Family Study where the Father, Mother and Youth were present and tested were extracted from the total sample. We will now examine the following tables to delineate differences in how family members scored on the *Do* and *Fe* scales of the CPI.

Table 1 shows the Dominance scores of Fathers (A), Mothers (B) and Youth (C) in 24 D families and 22 N families. The Chinese Family Life Study cases missing are incomplete families or, in three instances, faked test results that could not be used. The following six columns in the table show differences between the scores of various family members. Table 2 shows the remininity scores of the same D and N families. Differences between scores are shown in the same manner.

DISCUSSION

The *Do* and *Fe* scores of all three family members will now be analyzed in the following order: first, the relative position of Father and Mother is examined; second, the relative positions of Parents and Youth are looked at, and third, the Father, Mother and Youth are considered as a triad. After each scale is fully considered individually, the two scales are then considered relatively.

An inspection of the (B–A) column in Table 1 shows that the *Do* scale of the mother exceeds or equals her husbands in 12 out of the 24 families in the D sample but in only 5 out of the 22 families in the N sample. Mean scores for family members are extracted from Table 1 and listed below in Table 3 to further illustrate the relative positions of family members in their scoring.

From this table we can see that while the N sample Fathers clearly have a higher mean *Do* score than their wives, that the D sample Fathers have a mean score that is not significantly different from that of their wives.

In the N sample, 10 youth have *Do* scores higher than both of their parents. This compares to the eight D-sample youth that have higher *Do* scores than both of their parents. Although the mean *Do* score of N Youth (23.4) is higher than that of D Youth (21.5) the difference is not as great as that between N and D Fathers. In the N-sample, in every case where the Youth's *Do* Score exceeds his Father's, it also exceeds his Mother's. The N Youth's *Do* scores exceed thir mothers alone in two additional families. The *Do* score patterns in D sample families are not as clearly defined. In three out of the 11 families where the youth's score exceeds or equals his Father's, his score is less than his mother's. In four other families, the youth's *Do* score exceeds his Mother's but not his Father's.

Table 4 presents the *Do* score relationships between Father, Mother, and Youth. First, each triad was ranked—i. e. A>B>C. Then the percentages of each family member falling into first, second, or third position were determined. Inspection of Table 4 reveals that N families present fewer different patterns (6) than D families

Table 1. Dominance Scale Scores of the Family Members of Delinquents and Non-Delinquents and Their Differences

Families of Delinquents

Sample Case No.	Test Scores			Score Differences					
	Father (A)	Mother (B)	Youth (C)	A-B	B-A	A-C	C-A	B-C	C-B
2	25	18	24	7		1			6
3	26	24	16	2		10		8	
4	24	24	23	0	0	1		1	
6	23	17	24	6			1		7
7	23	26	27		3		4		1
8	26	23	20	3		6		3	
9	24	18	20	6		4			2
15	19	20	20		1		1	0	0
17	20	22	18		2	2		4	
19	28	22	16	6		12		8	
20	14	21	21		7		7	0	0
22	17	13	25	4			8		8
23	21	26	21		5	0	0	5	
25	18	23	24		5		6		1
26	16	28	26		12		10	2	
27	29	25	24	4		5		1	
28	21	21	23	0	0		2		2
29	26	21	25	5		1			4
30	21	21	19	0	0	2		2	
31	21	23	17		2	4		6	
32	14	20	17		6		3	3	
33	35	18	17	17		18		1	
34	28	20	23	8		5			3
35	24	22	27	2			3		5
N=24 $\begin{cases}\bar{X}\\S\end{cases}$	22.6 3.4	21.5 3.3	21.5 3.5	x̄d5.8	x̄d4.8	x̄d5.3	x̄d4.5	x̄d3.7	x̄d3.9

Families of Non-delinquents

Sample Case No	Test Scores			Score Differences					
	Father (A)	Mother (B)	Youth (C)	A-B	E-A	A-C	C-A	B-C	C-B
1	25	21	19	4		6		2	
2	25	20	26	5			1		6
3	26	23	39	13			3		13
4	23	23	21	0	0	2		2	
5	17	14	20	3			3		6
7	22	24	25		2		3		1
8	26	24	17	2		9		7	
9	22	18	29	4			7		11
10	16	22	25		6		9		3
11	25	21	35	4			10		14
12	28	26	22	2		6		4	
13	26	15	25	11		1			10
14	25	16	26	9			1		10
17	29	20	20	9		9		0	0
18	27	22	22	5		5		0	0
19	27	22	20	5		7		2	
23	26	17	12	9		13		5	
25	25	25	16	0	0	9		9	
26	20	21	22		1		2		1
28	27	16	25	11		2			9
29	29	24	15	5		14		9	
30	28	22	33	6			5		11
N=22 $\begin{cases}\bar{X}\\S\end{cases}$	25.1 4.2	20.7 3.4	23.4 6.5	x̄d6.3	x̄d3.0	x̄d6.9	x̄d4.4	x̄d5.0	x̄d7.9

Table 2. Femininity Scale Scores of the Family Members of Delinquents and Non-Delinquents and Their Differences.

Families of Delinquents

Sample Case No.	Test Scores			Test Score differences					
	Father (A)	Mother (B)	Youth (C)	A-B	B-A	A-C	C-A	B-C	C-B
2	19	24	19	.	5	0	0	5	
3	20	21	19		1	1		2	
4	16	24	16		8	0	0	8	
6	16	24	21		8		5	3	
7	14	21	21		7		7	0	0
8	19	20	17		1	2		3	
9	20	23	14		3	6		9	
15	18	19	17		1	1		2	
17	22	27	13		5	9		14	
19	18	23	21		5		3	2	
20	27	30	21		3	6		9	
22	29	25	16	4	13			9	
23	20	21	16		1	4		9	
25	23	26	19	3		4		7	
26	19	26	15		7	4		11	
27	19	24	14		5	5		10	
28	23	19	21	4		2			2
29	18	24	20		6		2	4	
30	24	22	17	2		7		5	
31	20	28	17		8	3		11	
32	24	27	17		3	7		10	
33	19	27	12		8	7		15	
34	26	27	21		1	5		6	
35	15	18	18		3		3	0	0
N=24 $\bar{X}$ / S	20.3 / 3.7	23.8 / 3.1	17.6 / 2.8	$\bar{x}$d3.3	$\bar{x}$d4.4	$\bar{x}$d5.2	$\bar{x}$d4.0	$\bar{x}$d7.2	$\bar{x}$d2.0

Families of Non-delinquents

Sample Case No.	Test Scores			Test Score Differences					
	Father (A)	Mother (B)	Youth (C)	A-B	B-A	A-C	C-A	B-C	C-B
1	18	21	17		3	1		4	
2	26	24	21	2		5		3	
3	17	21	19		3		2	2	
4	18	21	17		3	1		4	
5	23	25	16		2	7		9	
7	20	31	14		11	6		17	
8	17	22	19		5		2	3	
9	20	22	19		2	1		3	
10	18	26	19		8		1	7	
11	15	24	14		9	1		10	
12	20	21	17		1	3		4	
13	19	24	16		5	3		8	
14	22	24	22		2	0	0	2	
17	20	27	20		7	0	0	7	
18	23	21	26	2			3	0	5
19	21	16	16	5		5		0	0
23	20	25	10		5	10		15	
25	22	29	15		7	7		14	
26	20	25	15		5	5		10	
28	22	27	21		5	1		6	
29	19	16	18	3		1			2
30	15	19	14		4	1		5	
N=22 $\bar{X}$ / S	19.8 / 2.7	23.2 / 3.7	17.5 / 3.4	$\bar{x}$d3.0	$\bar{x}$d4.8	$\bar{x}$d4.5	$\bar{x}$d2.0	$\bar{x}$d7.9	$\bar{x}$d3.5

Table 3. Mean Scores of D and N Families on the Dominance Scale

Sample	Father		Mother		Youth	
	$\bar{X}$	S	$\bar{X}$	S	$\bar{X}$	S
N	25.1	4.2	20.7	3.4	23.4	6.5
D	22.6	3.4	21.5	3.3	21.5	3.5

Table 4. Family Triad *Do* and *Fe* Score Patterns

	Number of Families	*Do* Score Patterns	Number of Families	*Fe* Scores Patterns
N Sample	6	A>B>C ⎫	13	B>A>C ⎫
	2	(A=B)>C ⎬ 12	3	B>C>A ⎬ 9
	2	A>C>B ⎪	2	B>(A=C) ⎭
	2	A>(B=C) ⎭		
			1	C>A>B 1
	7	C>A>B ⎫ 10	1	A>B>C ⎫
	3	C>B>A ⎭	1	A>(B=C) ⎬ 3
			1	A>C>B ⎭
D Sample	5	A>B>C ⎫	11	B>A>C ⎫
	2	(A=B)>C ⎬ 11	3	B>C>A ⎪
	4	A>C>B ⎭	2	B>(A=C) ⎬ 21
	2	B>A>C ⎫	2	(B=C)>A ⎭
	1	B>(A=C) ⎬ 7	2	A>B>C ⎫ 3
	2	B>C>A ⎪	1	A>C>B ⎭
	2	(B=C)>A ⎭		
	3	C>A>B ⎫		
	2	C>B>A ⎬ 6		
	1	C>(A=B) ⎭		

(10). However, the striking difference is that there are *no* N families which possess triad patterns in which B has a clearly dominant score while in 7 D families—almost one-third of the families—B scores are higher or equal to the highest. When the percentages of family members in each position are determined (Table 5), a clear pattern is determined that is similiar in both D and N samples. Fathers (A) have a preponderance of first place position, Mothers (B) of second place positions, and Youth (C) of third-place position. However, these positions are much more clearly maintained in the N sample than in the D sample. Furthermore, dramatic differences exist between N and D samples at other points; 37% of D mothers are in first place compared with 4% of N mothers (actually a first place shared with her husband) and 45% of N sample youth are in first place compared with 25% of the D sample youth.

Table 2 sets forth the *Fe* scores of both samples. N and D samples are virtually

Table 5. % of A, B, C, in 1, 2, 3, Rank Order in Dominance and Femininity Scores

		D—Sample				N—Sample		
		1	2	3		1	2	3
Femininity	B	87	16	29	B	·81	9	13
	A	12	66	4	A	13	72	22
	C	8	33	77	C	4	27	77
		1	2	3		1	2	3
Dominance	A	45	37	25	A	54	36	13
	B	37	50	33	B	4	59	45
	C	25	37	41	C	45	18	50

*Percentages do not add to 100% since a family member is counted twice if scores are equal.

the same with only four Fathers in each sample having higher *Fe* scores than their wives. Table 6 indicates that the mean *Fe* score of the Mother is significantly higher in both samples. The mean *Fe* scores for Mothers, in both samples is virtually the same as is also the case for Fathers and Youth in both samples.

Table 6. Mean Scores on D and N Families of the Femininity Scale

Sample	Father		Mother		Youth	
	$\bar{X}$	S	$\bar{X}$	S	$\bar{X}$	S
N	19.8	2.7	23.2	3.7	17.5	3.4
D	20.3	3.7	23.8	3.1	17.6	2.8

The relative *Fe* scores of youth compared to parents are approximately the same in both samples—three D youth and 3 N youth having scores equal or greater than their mothers and 7 D youth and 6 N youth having *Fe* scores equal or greater than their Fathers.

When we chart family triad patterns (Table 4) we find that the Mother predominates in first place in the majority of families in both samples—19 out of 22 in the N sample and 21 out 24 families in the D sample. Position percentages (Table 5) show similiar patterns in both samples except that more N Fathers are in third position (22%) as opposed to D fathers (4%) and more D Mothers are in 3rd position (29%) than in the N sample (13%).

Table 7[11] summarizes *Do* and *Fe* Scores from selected groups in order to make cross-cultural comparisons. Mean $(\bar{X})$ *Fe* scores for the Fathers in both N and D samples are higher than for the other groups, *Do* Scores are lower. As for the Mothers, both N and D have lower Mean scores but their Mean *Fe* Scores are approximately the same as most other groups. Differences between the scores of the various groups of youths are not significant.

Table 7. Comparative CPI Scores

Select Groups

Male Adult	N	Dominance Scores		Femininity Scores	
		$\bar{X}$	S	$\bar{X}$	S
Research Scientists	45	31.6	4.7	17.3	2.6
Social Work Graduate Students	87	30.9	5.1	17.1	3.3
Psychology Graduate Students	117	30.1	5.4	16.9	2.9
Correctional Officers	192	27.2	5.5	16.3	6.0
Machine Operators	105	26.5	4.5	16.7	3.1
N-Fathers	22	25.1	4.2	19.8	2.7
D-Fathers	24	22.6	3.4	20.3	3.7

Female Adult	N	Dominance Scores		Femininity Scores	
		$\bar{X}$	S	$\bar{X}$	S
Airline Hostesses	60	29.8	5.9	21.6	3.0
Social Work Graduate Students	324	29.0	5.0	22.3	3.5
Psychology Graduate Students	19	27.5	5.6	23.0	2.1
Nurses	43	26.4	4.8	22.2	3.7
D-Mothers	24	21.5	3.3	23.8	3.1
N-Mothers	22	20.7	3.4	23.2	3.7

Male Youth	N	Dominance Scores		Femininity Scores	
		$\bar{X}$	S	$\bar{X}$	S
N-Youth	22	23.4	6.5	17.5	3.4
High School Students	3,572	23.2	6.0	15.4	3.6
Young Delinquents	142	20.0	5.5	16.5	3.7
D-Youth	24	21.5	3.5	17.6	2.8

CONCLUSION

The Dominance scores of family members are distributed in two patterns. The first pattern is indicated in the N sample by the Fathers' scores exceeding those of their wives in 17 out of 22 families with their $\bar{X}$ of 25.1 exceeding the Mothers' $\bar{X}$

---

(11) Manual for the CPI, pp. 34.

of 20.7. This is consistent with our hypothesis that the Father role requires a personality that exhibits dominance, including his relationship to his wife. This relative dominance presents a clear picture of parental role relationships to youth members of the family. In the D sample, the Fathers' scores exceed their wives in only 12 out of 24 families indicating that in many of these families that the Father's personality system may not provide him with the psychological resources to perform his role in the family social system as determined by cultural values. His failure to so according to social norms provides a poor role model to his son and may be one factor in the development of delinquent-type authority relationships. The second pattern is indicated by the almost equal distribution of relatively higher dominance scores between Fathers and Sons with 13 Fathers and 11 Sons out of the 24 families respectively having higher scores. D sample youth display a pattern of having higher Dominance scores than their fathers about half the time (11 out of 24 families). Their N sample counterparts have a similiar tendency (10 out of 22 families). However, while N sample Youth who exceed their fathers' score also exceed their mothers' scores in six out of the 10 cases, similiar D sample youth exceed their mothers and fathers simultaneously in only 2 families.

The fact that both D and N youth scored higher than their parents much of the time may indicate a generational difference related to residence in the United States. Of 20 male groups reported by Gouth, only problem groups of adults such as psychiatric hospital patients, and prison inmates had Mean *Do* scores lower than his large group of 3,572 high school students. Compared to the high school group's Mean score of 23.2, the other group Mean range from 26.5 for machine operators to 32.0 for salesmen[12]. In other words, American adolescent males seem to have lower Dominance scores than adult males, but in this sample of Chinese-Americans about half of the boys have scores that exceed their fathers.

Finally, a look at the Table 3 showing the Mean Dominance scores of the N families reveal a clear difference between Fathers (25.1) and Mothers (20.7) with the Youth's scores (23.4) falling in between. The Mean Dominance scores of D families indicate a much smaller difference between Fathers (22.4) and Mothers (21.5) with the Youth's (21.5) equal to that of the Mothers. While the Mean Dominance Score of the N Fathers exceeds that of the D Fathers, the Mean Dominance Score of the D Mothers exceeds that of the N Mothers. Therefore it appears that in the D families, relatively high scoring women are married to relatively low scoring men with the result that half the time their scores equal or exceed their husbands.

While the *Fe* Scale does not distinguish between the D and N samples, it does distinguish between parents in both samples. It is interesting to note that in the D sample that A>B *Fe* scores are correlated with B>A *Do* scores while this not true of the N Sample at all. Thus in three of the 12 D-families where a boy

---

(12) op. cit., p. 34.

experiences a mother with more dominant personality characteristics than his father, he also experiences a father with greater *Fe* characteristics than his mother. One could speculate that these three D families possess the greatest role discontinuities in our sample. But, in general, it seems that the *Fe* and *Do* scales do not measure opposite characteristics; that is, a high *Do* score does not necessarily inply a low *Fe* score.

SUMMARY

This paper illustrates the use of the California Psychological Inventory in the study of family roles and dynamics. The scores of the Mother, Father and Youth on the *Dominance* and *Femininity* Scales in two groups are comparatively studied. One group is comparised of 24 Chinese-American delinquents and their parents. The other is made up of 22 matched non-delinquent youth and their parents. Both groups were part of the Chinese Family Life Study in San Francisco which was done under a grant from the Institute of International Studies of the University of California (Berkeley).

It was hypothesized that Fathers would have higher Dominance scores than their wives and that Mothers would have higher Femininity scores than their husbands. It was believed that deviation from this pattern would indicate role confusion and possible delinquent behavior.

Analysis of the data revealed that the families of delinquents did tend to have Mothers with higher Dominance scores when compared to their husbands. However, the Femininity scale did not distinguish between the two groups. Unexpectedly, a significant number of youth in *both* groups scored higher on the Dominance scale than their parents.

The data seems to support our hypothesis that there is a higher incidence of Mothers with "Dominant" personality traits among the families of the delinquents than among the families of the non-delinquents. This may result in role confusion and in the development of attitudes or relationship patterns towards authority figures that are a factor underlying delinquent behavior. Further research is now needed to determine the items on the Dominance scale that distinguish the parents of delinquents from those of non-delinquents.

加州人格品質量表在家庭
關係研究上之應用

安　　健

摘　　要

　　本研究係使用「加州人格品質量表」（CPI）以研究家庭成員在家庭中的地位（role）及其相互間的動態關係，為加州大學國際研究所資助下在美國舊金山市所進行的中國家庭生活研究工作的一部分。受試者分為兩組：其中一組包含二十四個家庭中的華裔美國少年犯及其父母，另一組是以配對法選出的二十二個家庭中的正常少年及其父母。本研究根據這兩組中的少年，父親和母親在「支配性」（Dominance）和「女性化」（Femininity）量表上的分數，進行比較的研究。

　　首先，假定父親應該比母親有較高的「支配性」分數；反之，母親應該比父親有較高的「女性化」分數。如果測驗所得的結果，背離了此一假定的趨向，則表示其家庭地位混雜不清，可能導致少年犯罪行為的產生。

　　本研究測驗所得資料經過統計分析後，顯示在少年犯的家庭中，就「支配性」分數而言，母親確有高於父親的趨勢，但在「女性化」分數的比較中，兩組之間並無差別。此外，兩組中有相當多的少年，在「支配性」分數上，高於他們的父母，實非始料所及。

　　總之，根據本研究的結果，我們可以看出在少年犯的家庭中，具有「支配性」人格特質的母親所佔的比率，高於一般正常少年的家庭，這可能造成家庭角色的混淆，影響該家庭中的少年對權威人物的態度和關係之建立與發展，此可能是少年犯罪行為形成的因素之一。至於進一步的研究，則須再就「支配性」量表中的測驗題項目加以分析，以確定其鑑別的功能。