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ABSTRACT

The present study was designed to investigate the manifest content of early recollections of resilient and nonresilient individuals. The purpose of the study was to determine if adults who have undergone extreme childhood trauma, who were considered at-risk, and developed into successful independent adults (resilient), have significantly different manifest content in their ERs as compared to unsuccessful adults (nonresilient) who have not overcome many of the at-risk obstacles they encountered as children. More specifically, the purpose of the study was to determine if lifestyle reflected in the manifest content of memories recalled from childhood could serve to differentiate between adults who were resilient and those who were nonresilient on the 42 variables of the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual (Manaster & Perryman, 1974).

A total of 80 subjects participated in this study (N=80). The participants comprised two groups, resilient and nonresilient. The resilient group was composed of 16 males and 24 females (n=40). The nonresilient group consisted of 14 males and 26 females (n=40). A total of 30 males and 50 females participated in the study. Each participant was instructed to complete a questionnaire that listed specific life experiences as a child and as an adult that were used to operationally define the two groups. The participants who
met the operational definition of resilient or nonresilient were then instructed to provide three written early recollections.

Significant differences between the two groups were found on ten of the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollection Scoring Manual variables. The resilient group mentioned the mother character, father character, visual concern with detail, outside in the participant's neighborhood setting, and had more neutral affect in their early recollections. The nonresilient group mentioned the character variable of groups, the mastery theme, the mutuality theme, the motor concern with detail, and had a greater number of themes in their early recollections.

Several conclusions were drawn from this study. One major conclusion of this study was that Early Recollections were a useful tool in differentiating resilient and nonresilient groups. Implications for practice and future research were also discussed.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The stress associated with traumatic events that occurred in childhood have enduring and often devastating consequences for people throughout their lives. Many have never overcome these traumas and, thus, they have not achieved fully functioning and satisfying adulthoods. Others appear to have achieved autonomy and success as adults even though they experienced similar childhood trauma (Rutter, 1979). The ability to recover from and adjust to misfortune or sustained life stress has been referred to as resiliency (Werner, 1984). The term resiliency implies one's ability to endure, develop, and even excel, despite the impact of stresses (Richmond & Beardslee, 1988). The phenomenon of resiliency facilitated in the development of a research question focused on the differences between individuals who have overcome childhood misfortune and lead successful adult lives (resilient adults), and individuals who were unable to overcome childhood misfortune and subsequently have dysfunctional adult lives (nonresilient adults). One way this phenomenon could be investigated was to study the long-standing personality differences between the resilient and
nonresilient groups.

Thus far, the majority of research on resiliency has been conducted primarily with children. Resiliency research (O'Connell-Higgins, 1983) findings have suggested that resilient children have at least four salient personality characteristics in common:

1. an active, evocative approach toward solving life's problems that allows them to successfully negotiate emotionally harmful experiences;

2. a tendency to perceive both positive and negative experiences constructively;

3. the ability, from infancy on, to gain positive attention from others;

4. the strong ability to use faith to maintain a vision of meaningfulness in life.

In the present study, an attempt was made to more fully understand the concept of resiliency by researching personality characteristics of resilient and nonresilient adults. The projective technique of Early Recollections was utilized in this study for the purpose of obtaining insight into a participant's current perception of self, others, and the world.

Adler stated that the significance of the technique of early recollections was one of the most important findings of Individual Psychology (Ansbacher & Ansbacher, 1956). Adler believed that what was remembered was necessitated by adaptation. Without memories of past events, we would not be
prepared for future events. In addition, Adler did not believe that early recollections were random; rather, he believed that events were remembered because they were consistent with one's current perception of one's self, significant others, and of the world in general. Adler (1931) was interested in the manifest content of early memories. He believed that the content of the memory that was clearly obvious was more useful than the latent content. Adler (1927) also believed that every memory was dominated by a goal idea that directed the person. Theoretically, the revelation of what resilient individuals regarded as important values and attitudes would illuminate the ways these individuals found, early on in their lives, of meeting their world.

**Purpose of the Study**

A review of early recollections literature revealed a considerable amount of information regarding the many aspects of this assessment technique. Early recollections have been investigated for the purposes of educational/vocational exploration, as a projective instrument, and as a differential diagnostic tool. Prior to the current study, studies of early recollections of resilient and nonresilient individuals had not been found in the literature.

Resiliency research was lacking in the area of the concept of resiliency enduring into adulthood. Only a few studies had been conducted with adults who had undergone
childhood misfortunes and who were living successful adult lives (Moskowitz, 1983; Felsman & Vaillant, 1987; Flach, 1988). Therefore, research on resiliency was limited in the area of resilient children who have grown up and become successful adults.

Through the process of combining the concepts of resiliency and the projective quality of Early Recollections (ERs), the literature for each topic can be augmented. Early recollections as a projective technique is a viable means to study personality characteristics of resilient and nonresilient adults. The Early Recollections literature can be enhanced by demonstrating whether the projective technique of Early Recollections is a viable means of differentiating resilient and nonresilient adults.

**Statement of the Problem**

The purpose of this study was to determine if adults who have undergone extreme childhood trauma, who were considered at-risk, and developed into successful, independent adults (resilient), have significantly different manifest content in their ERs as compared to unsuccessful adults (nonresilient) who have not overcome many of the at-risk obstacles they encountered as children. More specifically, the purpose of the study was to determine if personality factors reflected in the manifest content of memories recalled from childhood could serve to differentiate between adults who were resilient and those who were nonresilient on the 42 variables
of the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual (Manaster & Perryman, 1974).

Null Hypothesis

The following was the general null hypothesis of this study.

There are no significant differences in the manifest content of Early Recollections of adults who were considered at-risk as children who have been successful in their adult lives (resilient adults) compared to those who were at-risk as children and continue to display problems in adulthood (nonresilient adults).

Delimitations

The following were delimitations in the study:

1. The sample used in this study was delimited to male and female resilient and nonresilient individuals as operationally defined.

2. The study was delimited to the nomothetic scoring method of Early Recollections manifest content as outlined by Manaster and Perryman (1974).

Definition of Terms

To facilitate a better understanding of the various terms utilized in the current study, operational definitions of each term are presented below.

1. Early Recollections: Memories of unique specific events that can be visualized or vividly recalled and are
described as single events which occurred before the age of eight years (Dreikurs, 1952; Mosak, 1958).

2. **Manifest Content**: The clear and obvious content of an ER based on the 42 manifest content variables of the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollection Scoring Manual (Manaster & Perryman, 1974).

3. **At-risk**: Those individuals who experienced one or more of the following extreme circumstances as a child: (a) family received welfare benefits; (b) received physical abuse that resulted in a need for medical treatment; (c) one or both parents displayed emotional difficulties that significantly impaired their ability to meet the psychological and physical needs of their child; (d) was a victim of sexual abuse; (e) one or both parents used alcohol and/or drugs to excess; as evidenced by frequent intoxication or withdrawal symptoms when expected to fulfill major role obligations at work, school, or home (e.g., did not go to work because of being "hung over," went to school or work "high," intoxicated while taking care of his or her children).

4. **Resilient Adult**: Those individuals who met the operationally defined criteria for at-risk as children and, who, as adults, met the following criteria: (a) did not receive welfare benefits; (b) graduated from high school; (c) had no history of physical or sexual abuse towards others; (d) held a full time job, either inside or outside of the home, that fulfilled his/her financial obligations; (e) does
not currently use alcohol or drugs to excess as evidenced by intoxication or withdrawal symptoms when expected to fulfill role obligations at work, school, or home. All criteria must be met in order for the individual to be considered a resilient adult.

5. Nonresilient Adult: Those persons who met the above criteria for at-risk as children, and met three or more of the criteria for a nonresilient adult: (a) received welfare benefits; (b) did not graduate from high school; (c) had a history of physical or sexual abuse towards others; (d) did not hold a full time job inside or outside of the home that fulfilled his/her financial obligations; (e) used alcohol or drugs to excess as evidenced by intoxication or withdrawal symptoms when expected to fulfill role obligations at work, school, or home.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were pertinent to the current study:

1. The defined groups were representative of resilient adults and nonresilient adults;

2. The participants would candidly respond to the questions presented and would understand the intended meaning of those questions;

3. Adler's concept of early recollections is a valid means to assess personality characteristics;

4. The Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early
Recollections Scoring Manual (Manaster & Perryman, 1974) accurately assesses the manifest content of ERs.

Summary

This study was designed to investigate the manifest content of the early recollections of adults who were at-risk as children and who have either been successful or unsuccessful in their adult lives. By combining the concepts of resiliency and early recollections, it was hoped that this study would enhance the literature in both realms, and that the resiliency literature could be augmented by adding to the common characteristics of resilient children as researched by O'Connell-Higgins (1983) and provide another research study with resilient adults. The early recollections research could be enhanced by providing yet another example of its utility in the ability to study groups (resilient and nonresilient).
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

There is an old saying, "Into every life some rain must fall," yet an intriguing question may be raised as to why some individuals seem to wither under the lightest of spring showers, whereas others stand firm in the face of the fiercest monsoons. Participants in this study were children who grew up under horrendous home conditions involving abuse, neglect, parental mental illness, or poverty; and managed not only to survive but even to thrive. These individuals who stood firm under the most severe circumstances are termed resilient. The counterpart to the resilient individual is the person who has undergone a similar stressful childhood experience and who has been unable to successfully achieve a healthy lifestyle. These individuals are more vulnerable to the strain of their experiences and are termed nonresilient.

This chapter presents a review of the literature on resiliency and on the projective technique of Early Recollections. The review is organized into the following sections:

1. Individual Psychology;
2. Theoretical Aspects of Early Recollections;
3. Projective Personality Measure;
4. Nomothetic Scoring Manuals;
5. Diagnostic Purposes;
6. Occupational and Educational Interests;
7. Early Recollections Research Summary and Conclusions;
8. Early Recollections and Resiliency;
9. Resiliency;
10. Definitions of Resiliency;
11. Contributions from Stress Theory;
12. The Concept of Invulnerability;
13. Risk Variables;
14. Internal Variables;
15. Research with Child Populations;
16. Resilient Children as Adults;
17. Resiliency Research Summary and Conclusions.

**Individual Psychology**

Adler's (1927) theory of Individual Psychology is based on the premise that humans are motivated primarily by social urges and that humans were inherently social beings. He believed that social interest is inborn, although the specific types of relationships with people and social interactions that develop are due to environmental learning. The innate social interest coupled with the environmental influences results in the individual's unique style of life. Adler formulated that the style of life is the principle system by which the individual personality functions, the whole that commands the parts (Hall & Lindzey, 1978). Adler (1931) believed that the style of life is formed by the age
of four or five and experiences are assimilated and utilized according to one's unique style of life. Additionally, Adler believed that one's basic attitudes, feelings, and perceptions become fixed and mechanized at an early age and thus it becomes practically impossible for the style of life to change thereafter (Hall & Lindzey, 1978).

Adler's theory of Individual Psychology is also based on the premise that individuals have an innate drive to strive for superiority which encompasses the three goals of humans: to be aggressive, to be powerful, and to be superior. Adler's view of superiority means that one is striving for perfect completion and competence (Hall and Lindzey, 1978). Furthermore, Adler acknowledged that striving for superiority can manifest itself in a multitude of ways that can include egoistic or selfish goals such as power and self-aggrandizement or goals that are primarily social in character (Hall & Lindzey, 1978).

Adler's concept of the creative self was his crowning achievement as a personality theorist (Hall & Lindzey, 1978). The doctrine of the creative self asserted that humans make their own personalities by constructing them out of the raw material of heredity and experience. Adler (1935) stated:

Hereditity only endows him (man) with certain abilities. Environment only gives him certain impressions. These abilities and impressions, and the manner in which he experiences them, that is to say, the interpretation he makes of these experiences, are the bricks, or in other words his attitudes toward life, which determines this relationship to the outside world. (p. 5)

The creative self is conceptualized as that part of an
individual that gives meaning to life and creates the goals and the means to achieve these goals. The creative self is the active principle of human life, and is not unlike the older concept of the soul (Hall and Lindzey, 1978).

Adler's concept of fictional finalism was influenced by the writings of Hans Vaihinger (1925) who proposed the intriguing notion that humans live by purely fictional ideas that have no counterpart in reality. A few examples of these fictional ideas include, All men are created equal, Honesty is the best policy, and The end justifies the means. Adler believed that these ideas enable humans to deal more effectively with reality and are the subjective causation of psychological events (Hall & Lindzey, 1978). The final goal in life may be a fiction, that is an ideal that is impossible to realize, but which is nevertheless a human striving and the ultimate explanation of behavior. Adler believed that that the normal person can be free from the influence of these fictional goals and face reality when necessary.

**Theoretical Aspects of Early Recollections**

The significance of early childhood memories has been a subject of general interest in psychological literature for approximately a century. Early recollections were first used for clinical purposes in the early 1900's; however, it has been only in recent years that early recollections as defined by Dreikurs (1952) and Mosak (1958) have been included in the literature. Over a span of ninety years, the viewpoints of
researchers and clinicians emerged into two major positions: (a) a psychoanalytic viewpoint, and (b) an Adlerian viewpoint. The cognitive perceptual theoretical viewpoint of ERs emerged in the 1980's.

Freud (1950) believed that the manifest content of early memories was an irrelevant screen that served to conceal the meaningful latent content. Freudians, who referred to ERs as screen memories, believed that the latent content was useful in finding the repressed information about the individual's past.

Adler (1927) suggested that memory was an adaptive function of the mind. Memories are physically determined for the purpose of aiding adaptation and are used to select present and future choices of behavior (Adler, 1927). Adler (1937) stated:

The function of memory is dominated by the necessity of adaptation. Without memories it would be impossible to exercise any precautions for the future. Memories are not fortuitous phenomena but speak clearly the language of encouragement and warning. There are no indifferent or nonsensical recollections. (pp. 48-49)

Adler (1958) believed that early childhood recollections are significant because they show the style of life in its origins and in the simplest expression. Adlerians were interested in the manifest content of the memories and believe that early recollections (ERs) revealed the individual's central life style themes (Olsen, 1979). Adler (1937) also suggested that ERs can help an individual understand the kind of world one lives in and recognize the ways one found, early on, to meet that world. Adler (1937)
presented this belief:

When rightly understood in relation to the rest of an individual's life, his early recollections are found always to have a bearing on the central interests of that person's life. Early recollections give us hints and clues which are most valuable to follow when attempting the task of finding the direction of a person's striving. They are most helpful in revealing what one regards as values to be aimed for and what one senses as dangers to be avoided. They help us to see the kind of world which a particular person feels he is living in, and the ways he early found of meeting that world. They illuminate the origins of the style of life. The basic attitudes which have guided an individual throughout his life and which prevail, likewise, in his present situation, are reflected in those fragments which he has selected to epitomize his feeling about life, and to cherish in his memory as reminders. He has preserved these as his early recollections. (p. 283)

Of the different approaches to interpreting early memories, Adlerian oriented research has demonstrated a substantial increase in the past ten years as compared to other early memory interpretive theories (Watkins, 1992). Watkins reviewed Adlerian-oriented, early-memory research conducted between 1981-1990. In the 30 studies he examined, several deficits were identified. Based upon his observations and conclusions, Watkins emphasized several critical points regarding recommendations for future research. His suggestions included using two or more raters, utilizing non-college populations, clearly specifying and controlling for the age, gender, race and SES of the participants, and also sampling non-middle class subjects.

**Projective Personality Measure**

In this study, early recollections were utilized as a
means to elicit information about the participants current perceptions of self, other and the world. The essential feature of any projective technique is that it evokes information in various ways that is expressive of the individual's private world and personality process (Frank, 1948). Lindzey (1961) noted criteria that he believed characterized projective techniques which included sensitivity to covert or unconscious aspects of behavior and the ability to evoke unusually rich data with a minimum of the individual's awareness concerning the purpose of the test. Mosak (1958) pointed out the following about ERs as a projective instrument:

ERs, like dreams and free drawings, are a completely unstructured projective technique. No external stimulus is offered to the individual, unlike the Rorschach or TAT. All memories are selected and contain omissions and distortions. Whether the ER is faithful to reality or highly distorted is not of importance for the purpose of using the technique. The ERs will all be consistent with each other so that ERs which seem to make contradictory statements, will, when put together, prove to be statements about the same issue. (p. 24)

Studying ERs as a projective device probably began in the 1940's when Kadis and Lazarsfeld (1948) described the "images" that subjects were asked to construct of a specific person when the subject was a certain age (Shulman & Mosak, 1988). When a individual was prompted to recall a memory about a certain person, the memory centered specifically upon the image of the recalled person. An example from Kadis and Lazarsfeld (1948) describes a 16-year-old girl who stated that her older sister, who had always been kind to her, was her role model. When asked to give her earliest image of her
sister, the girl gave the following memory:

I was to be a flower girl at my favorite aunt's wedding. The night before the wedding my sister chopped my hair off. I couldn't go to the wedding.

The girl's memory of her sister was not congruent with the description she gave of her sister being "kind." The incongruency between what was consciously reported and that which may be covert or unconscious was revealed through her ER.

Hedvig (1963) was interested in the influence of situational factors on ERs in order to discern whether or not the technique of ERs has the ability to project an individual's true personality. He discovered that ERs do not appear to be influenced by the situation of success/failure or of hostility/friendliness, as compared to the TAT (p < .05). Hedvig studied 180 male and 180 female undergraduates in a general psychology course. Students were subjected to situations in which they experienced either success or failure, and encountered either a hostile or friendly examiner. Hedvig found that varying the experimental condition through the process of telling the individual in a hostile or in a friendly manner that he/she was succeeding or failing changed the themes of the TAT stories given by a subject, but not the ERs. These results may indicate that ERs reveal more stable information about personality characteristics than the TAT (Hedvig, 1963).

In 1967, Dreikurs hypothesized that Early Recollections offered information regarding an individual's cognitive
structure, private logic, and concepts of operation. Harder (1979) used this idea to study ERs as an integrative projective technique. Harder constructed scales utilizing the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT), the Rorschach, and ERs. He attempted to assess the subject's narcissistic character style. Forty male college students volunteered as participants.

The primary aim of Harder's (1979) study was to evaluate the reliability and validity of the scales. A secondary goal was to demonstrate the feasibility of assessing particular character styles with projective tests commonly available to clinicians and researchers. The overall reliability of the three scales was found to be acceptable. The scales were then tested for validity in two separate ways. The method utilized was to intercorrelate the scales, with findings demonstrating a pattern suggesting that they were significantly intercorrelated. Additional analyses were interpreted as suggesting that the scales successfully differentiated subjects rated by clinically trained raters as narcissistic in style from those rated as non-narcissistic.

Jackson and Sechrest (1962) concluded that using ERs as a projective technique can assist a clinician in confirming and supporting the findings of other projectives. Early Recollections may also serve as a rapid valuable sample of the type of data elicited from more time-consuming projective batteries.

Nomothetic Scoring Techniques

Through the process of reviewing Adler's writings, one
can deduce that he used both a nomothetic and an idiosyncratic way of looking at ERs. In Adler's anecdotal writings, he often began with the presenting problem and then examined the client's ERs in order to find guiding lines that could explain the client's present situation. The explanation would describe the client's typical manner of coping with life, so that ERs and present situations were seen as containing similar ideographic themes. On the other hand, when Adler said that ERs which focused on the nurturing mother were indicative of a pampered childhood or that ERs which focused on dangerous situations were evidence of insecurity in life, he was suggesting that any ERs with a specific content could indicate a specific trait or historical experience which would be indicative of a nomothetic approach (Shulman & Mosak, 1988).

Presently, there are two nomothetic scoring techniques that are frequently utilized in ER research; the Early Recollections Rating Scale (ERRS), (Altman, 1973) and the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual, (MPCMERSM) (Manaster & Perryman, 1974). Olsen (1979) believed that the development of scales such as the MPCMERSM could lead to the discovery of basic nomothetic data which would enhance the value of the ideographic interpretation used by the clinician. Presently, nomothetic scoring manuals simply serve to identify certain themes, not to interpret them.

Manaster and Perryman (1974) developed a manual for
scoring the contents of early recollections that contained 42 variables. They utilized the existing literature regarding the scoring and interpretation of ERs of both Adlerian and non-Adlerian perspectives to develop a manifest content scoring manual. Twenty-two articles by nineteen separate authors were examined in order to find similar trends in the manner in which the authors used to score and interpret ERs. Their investigation identified variables that could be divided into seven separate categories that included the following: characters (persons mentioned in the ER), themes (what the ER was about), concern with detail (visual, auditory, or motor detail), setting (location and place where the ER took place), active/passive (whether the individual's action was active or passive in the ER), internal/external control (what type of control did the individual take in the ER), and affect (positive, negative, or neutral affect). Additionally, the manual allowed for a variable entitled "other," if a subject's ER did not fit into any of the following three variable categories: characters, themes and settings.

Manaster and Perryman (1974) believed that their scoring manual could be utilized to differentiate the manifest content of early recollections between persons choosing different occupations. In the Manaster and Perryman study (1974), written ERs were elicited from 81 upper-level undergraduates and graduate students majoring in one of the following occupational areas: teaching, counseling, nursing
or medicine, biological science, business or accounting. The occupational groups varied in size. For example, the teaching group had 28 subjects while the biological science group had only eight subjects. The subjects were upper division undergraduates and graduate students and had not actually ever worked in the desired occupational fields. Additionally, the gender of the subjects was not controlled; thus, results may, in part, be due to the differences in gender for the particular occupations (i.e., only one male in the nursing/medical occupation as compared to 15 females).

Three ERs from each of the 81 participants were scored by two independent raters. These raters had a 93% level of agreement. Although the interrater reliability (93% agreement) was high, there was no mention as to whether the independent raters were blind to the conditions to which the subjects had been assigned.

The results of the Manaster and Perryman study (1974) indicated that the nursing/medical and counseling graduate students mentioned the mother character variable significantly more than the participants in the other majors. This finding was interpreted as suggesting that these subjects had lifestyles in which the mother image was important and that this mother-helper-supporter role was reinforced by their occupational choices. The neutral affect was significantly higher for the biological science, business, and teaching subjects. This was interpreted as a less emotional degree of involvement as compared to the
nursing/medical and counseling groups.

Manaster and Perryman (1974) found a significantly higher number of teaching and nursing/medical groups subjects mentioned non-family members more often than did the biology and business groups subjects. The researchers related this finding to their careers being oriented to working with larger numbers of non-family members. Nursing/medical subjects scored significantly higher on the total number of characters as compared to the remaining groups. This finding was expected due to the direction of the results on non-family members. Finally, the researchers suggested that their manifest content scoring manual could be an efficient system for other researchers to utilize.

Altman (1973) estimated the reliability of ER interpretations using a different nomothetic approach. She developed the Early Recollection Rating Scale (ERRS) that rated nine independent basic attitudes, each on a bipolar scale containing seven numerical categories. Four of the nine ratings consisted of a subject's behavior toward the environment:

1. withdrawngregarious;
2. passiveactive;
3. competitivecooperative;
4. dependentindependent.

The remaining five ratings measured an individual's affect or feelings towards the environment including the following bipolar scales:
5. hostile-friendly;
6. rejected-accepted;
7. discouraged-self-confident;
8. depressed-cheerful; and,
9. mistreated-befriended.

Nine separate scores and one total score were the end result of the scoring procedure for each subject. Altman (1973) obtained inter-rater reliability estimates on each of the ERRS for the nine bipolar variables, with coefficients ranging from .56 to .79, all of which were significant (p < .001).

Altman's research did not encompass other aspects of the ERs other than the individual's behaviors toward, and feelings about, the environment. Additionally, the bipolar variables did not allow for the ER to have other characteristics or themes outside of the nine that Altman proposed. Finally, the level of interrater reliability on the ERRS may have unintentionally been influenced by the bipolar choice that exists for this manual, resulting in an inflated score.

In comparison to the ERRS, the MPMECERSM has been used in more of the ER research; thus, it has a greater data base with which to draw comparisons. For example, the Manaster-Perryman scoring system has been used in 15 of the 30 ER research articles appearing in the literature over the past 10 years (Watkins, 1992). The Early Recollection Rating Scale, however, was utilized in only two of the 30 articles
appearing in the literature over the same period of time.

**Diagnostic Purposes**

A number of early recollection studies have dealt with the relationship of ER content and psychiatric diagnostic categories. This diagnostic use began years before the development of the two nomothetic scoring methods cited above. Plewa (1935) characterized specific diagnostic categories as having their own distinctive ER features. In his study of hundreds of patients, he observed the following ER characteristics: psychosomatic disorders: concern with illness; masochistic disorders: punishments; anxiety hysteria: being frightened; conversion disorders: repression; obsessive-compulsive disorders: strong threats and prohibition; depressive syndrome: being abandoned; homosexual perversions: homosexual themes even when the patient had been overtly homosexual for years; and schizoid and schizophrenic patients: trauma, rage, and frustration. Although examples of these memories were cited, there was no statistical analysis conducted.

 Appropriately, 30 years later Jackson and Sechrest (1962) conducted an experiment in which they tested four of Plewa's prior observations by advancing four hypotheses:

1. ERs of patients with anxiety-reaction would show fear.

2. Depressed patients would give more memories of abandonment.
3. Obsessive-compulsives would recall strong prohibitions in their ERs.

4. The ERs of patients with gastrointestinal disorders such as ulcers and colitis would report more gastrointestinal distress.

Seventy-seven patients' earliest memories were analyzed for major themes by identified Adlerian therapists. All categories yielded the greatest frequency for the themes hypothesized; however, the size of the occurrence was so small that the only significant findings were in a binomial test for all hypotheses occurring merely by chance, with probability of chance occurrence being .01. Jackson and Sechrest (1962) reported that anxiety neurotics were characterized by themes of fear, whereas depressed patients were characterized by themes of abandonment and gastrointestinal difficulties. Jackson and Sechrest also concluded that while Plewa's observations were probably valid, the low rate of occurrence of the ER themes made this an inadequate diagnostic technique for these categories.

The two studies by Plewa (1935) and Jackson and Sechrest (1962) were interpreted without the use of any standardized manifest content rating scale. Manaster and Perryman developed their nomothetic scoring manual in 1974 to objectively view the manifest content of the participants' ERs in their study.

Hafner, Fakouri, Ollendick, and Corotto (1979) used Manaster and Perryman's scoring manual to study the early
recollections of paranoid schizophrenics. The purpose of their study was to determine whether schizophrenics had significantly different memories compared to normals, and to also facilitate lifestyle analysis and differential diagnosis. Two early recollections were collected from individuals in both the normal and paranoid schizophrenic groups through an interview process with a psychologist. The psychologist gave instructions for subjects to close their eyes and to visualize the recollection. These instructions may have biased the type of recollections recalled by setting a stage for a visual-sensory-modality memory. This study included an equal number of both males and females, thus gender of the subject was controlled. Additionally, the female paranoid schizophrenic group had a mean age that was nine years older than both the male schizophrenic and the normal group. The researchers (Hafner et al., 1979) used a cut-off age of eight years or younger for the ERs as Mosak (1958) had previously suggested in his work.

Two independent raters were used to score the subjects' ERs as set forth by Manaster and Perryman (1974) in their article. The ERs were scored using five of the seven categories of the Manaster-Perryman Content Early Recollection Scoring Manual. The results were analyzed using a chi-square test of independence.

The results of the study (Hafner et al., 1979) revealed that the theme cluster was significantly different between the two groups. Specifically, the theme cluster for the
paranoid schizophrenic group was more varied than that of the normal groups. Furthermore, the normal group mentioned themes of injury/illness and attention-getting incidents more frequently.

Hafner et al. (1979) concluded, on the basis of their data, that the themes from the normal group were of more dramatic events, whereas the paranoid group themes were more varied and innocuous. The researchers' observations were explained by a statement made by Mosak (1958):

The more dramatic an incident, the less significance is attached to the interpretation of the incident since the retention of the incident is at least dictated externally; the more innocuous an incident, the greater the likelihood the recollection is dictated by the individual's needs. (p. 307)

The researchers concluded that the results supported Adler's approach to better understanding the client's life; however, this study did not provide a strong case for the use of ERs for differential diagnosis.

Hafner, Corotto, and Fakouri (1980) further studied the aspect of ERs facilitating differential diagnosis. This time they sampled 43 males and 47 females with various diagnoses of schizophrenia. They hypothesized that the ER themes of the various groups would be significantly different. The researchers collected early recollections from hospitalized individuals who were given the diagnosis from one of the following three categories: chronic undifferentiated type, paranoid type, and schizoid-affective type. Participants' ERs were scored using the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Scoring Manual that contained the following four main
clusters of variables: characters, themes, concern with detail, and affect. An interrater reliability of 93% was reported.

Results of the study revealed that the theme clusters significantly differentiated the three groups. For example, individuals diagnosed with paranoid schizophrenia mentioned new situations more frequently; whereas, individuals with a chronic undifferentiated type mentioned new situations least. Hafner et al. (1980) encouraged more research in the area of differential diagnosis.

Hyer, Woods, & Boudewyns (1989) examined the phenomenology and personality correlates of the early recollections of 61 male Vietnam War veterans. All participants were receiving inpatient treatment for post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) at a large Veterans Administration Medical Center. The researchers believed that ERs could prove useful in the context of PTSD among these veterans because it was unclear as to whether their problems were a direct result of Vietnam stressors or if they were a function of pre-existing problems. This study was relevant to the current study because it attempted to discern whether these individuals had long standing personality characteristics that later contributed to their problems in Vietnam. These Vietnam War veterans may share commonalities with the nonresilient group used in the current study.

Multiple measures were utilized to score the ERs of the veterans in the Hyer et al. (1989) study. The first method
used was first described by Kadis, Greene, and Freeman (1979) and required that the researchers score the ERs on a series of seven goal options. The second method utilized was the Early Recollection Rating Scale (ERRS), (Altman, 1973). The ERs were also rated on the Sections B (theme category) and E (active-passive bi-polar scale) of the Manaster Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollection Scale. Two raters scored each category independently. Their overall rating agreement included the following list: Goals - 95%, ERRS .82 (inter-rater reliability coefficient) and Manaster-Perryman MCER Scale Section B - 92% and Section E - 98%. Finally, the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory and the Million Clinical Multiphasic Inventory were administered.

Analysis of the ER transcripts suggested that the Vietnam War veteran participants' ERs reflected the following list of themes: less social interest, pursuit of goals in a more devious social manner, an active instrumental style, more negative affect and themes including trauma (threatening situation, injury/illness, and mastery). The ERs appeared to have an independent relationship to the objective personality scales utilized. The most important question, whether the ERs obtained in this study were reflective of long-standing problems, was left unanswered. The researchers hypothesized that either premorbid negative life-styles existed or current negative apperceptions of early life events due to trauma resulted. They discussed the possibility that the transaction between premorbid factors, combat, and current
problems were the result of a repeating self-defeating pattern of the individual's life-style.

Additional findings supporting the differential diagnosis capabilities of ERs resulted from a study by Hafner, Fakouri, and Labrentz (1982). These researchers reported a significant difference between normal and alcoholic individuals in regard to locus of control and early recollection themes. Thirty males and females comprised the treatment and the control groups. A psychologist interviewed each subject and obtained two ERs by giving the instructions, "close your eyes and visualize the earliest incident you can remember." These researchers gave instructions for subjects to "visualize" their earliest memory, thus possibly confounding the sensory modality choice in the subjects' recall.

ERs were scored using the Manaster-Perryman scoring manual. It was concluded that alcoholics were more externally motivated and emitted fewer themes of mutuality compared to the normal group. Additionally, the chi-square tests did not reach the conventional level of significance (p. <.10); however, normals mentioned more visual content while alcoholics reported more motor content.

Another research study sampled 45 white male alcoholics who were receiving alcohol and drug treatment at a Veterans Administration Medical Center and a comparison group of 45 non-alcoholics (Chaplin & Orlofsky, 1991). The researchers utilized the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early
Recollection Scoring Manual (Manaster & Perryman, 1979) to rate the participants ERs. The results of the study supported the use of ERs as a projective technique capable of revealing personality traits thought to characterize alcoholics. The results detected differences between the groups on social interest and locus of control. Specifically, the alcoholic group had significantly more ERs with external locus of control, and significantly fewer ERs with themes of mutuality (cooperative experiences) and givingness (displays of generosity) and more themes of misdeeds (knowingly doing something wrong).

**Occupational and Educational Interests**

Early recollections have also been used to assist in making vocational choices and identifying educational interests. Adler (1931) noted the following in regard to vocational choices and ERs:

> Events remembered from childhood must be very near to the main interest of the individual. It is this fact which makes early recollections of such value in vocational guidance. (p. 74)

Coram and Shields (1987) collected early recollections of 40 criminal justice majors and 40 noncriminal justice majors. The subjects were randomly selected and controlled for gender. Subjects were primarily of middle socioeconomic status and did not encompass older adults (i.e., subjects ages ranged from 18 to 35 years). The researchers also employed two independent raters who were blind to each subject's condition. The raters used 37 out of the 42

The chi-square analysis indicated that criminal justice majors had particular feelings regarding the following seven variables: mother, visual concern for detail, illness and injury themes, new situation themes, outdoor settings, travel setting, and settings that were in the homes of non-family members. Specifically, the researchers suggested that the mother figure mentioned by the criminal justice majors could be a function of their interest in control and authority. They believed that the mother character could be viewed as a figure to dominate without the fear of retaliation.

The themes of the criminal justice majors in Coram and Shield's (1987) study were significantly different from the group of noncriminal justice majors. These researchers concluded that such differences might suggest personality variables associated with interest in the criminal justice system. They suggested that additional research should focus on developing an instrument for selection of criminal justice personnel.

In a follow-up study, early recollections of 35 female registered nurses and 35 female medical technologists were collected by McFarland (1988). The sample was drawn from practicing professionals, and gender was again controlled. Two written ERs were obtained from each participant and scored using the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollection Scoring Manual. Two independent judges scored
the early recollections; an inter-rater agreement of 94.8% was reached. Discriminant functional analysis, using F statistics consisting of 16 variables, revealed that 64 out of the 70 participants were correctly classified according to their occupational groups.

Statistical analysis indicated that seven of the 42 variables on the Manaster and Perryman (1974) scoring manual were statistically significant between the two groups. Specific results identified the following five variables for the medical technicians: non-family member characters, mastery themes, visual concern with detail, internal control, and settings that were in homes of non-family members. For the remaining two variables, nurses had significantly more ERs that occurred in a hospital or doctor's office, as well as more external control. The primary hypothesis that the manifest content of ERs of both groups could be differentiated was supported. These results suggested that ERs could be a useful tool in career guidance (McFarland, 1988).

Fakouri, Fakouri, and Hafner (1986) compared the recollections of 35 nursing students and 38 non-nursing students. They did not, however, sample subjects who were actual nurses working in the field as in McFarland's (1988) study. Fakouri et al. (1986) utilized all 42 variables from the Manaster-Perryman Early Recollections Scoring Manual. Two independent judges were utilized and their interrater agreement was .89. The groups were compared by a series of 2
X 2 Chi square tests.

The researchers reported that the ERs of nursing students indicated more mastery and vigorous physical movement (motor detail) (p < .05), less frequent settings occurring at home (p < .05), and that their actions were usually the result of their own decisions (internal control) (p < .05). These findings, however, were not consistent with McFarland's (1988) research. This discrepancy may, in part, be a function of the different samples utilized in the two studies; subjects in McFarland's study were registered nurses, while Fakouri et al. (1986) sampled nursing students.

Hafner, Fakouri, and Etzler (1986) compared the manifest content of early recollections of students preparing for careers in chemical, electrical, and mechanical engineering. They sought to discover personality differences that may be significant for vocational choices and lifestyles. Participants were 90 male, senior undergraduates from each discipline who were asked to share two early recollections and to give their age at the time of the event. The variables of gender, race, and SES were all controlled, ERs were written, and Mosak's (1958) criteria for ERs was utilized.

Results revealed that chemical engineering majors expressed significantly more external control and were significantly more unclear about the setting as compared to the other two engineering groups. Electrical engineering majors reported ERs that mentioned a group or groups of
people, illness/injury to self, another person or an animal significantly more often than the other engineering groups. Mechanical engineering majors mentioned family situations and hostility significantly more often than the other engineering groups. It was concluded that the manifest content of ERs had some value in distinguishing among occupational groups. (Hafner, Fakouri, & Etzler, 1986).

**Early Recollections Research Summary and Conclusions**

In one sense, the majority of research of ERs has been validity studies, in that they were designed to show that ER data were related to, and predictive of, a wide range of normal and pathological personality features. In the studies reviewed, nomothetic interpretive methodologies were employed to understand the subjects' early recollections. Additionally, the literature has shown consistent reliability findings (Manaster & Perryman, 1974; Altman, 1973).

Studies regarding diagnostic capabilities yielded significant differences in theme variation for Vietnam War veterans (Hyer, Woods, & Boudewyns, 1989) and individuals given the diagnosis of paranoid schizophrenia (Hafner, Fakouri, Ollendick, & Corotto, 1979). Alcoholic Individuals also tended to display significant differences compared to a normal group in regard to theme variation and locus-of-control (Hafner, Fakouri, & Labrentz, 1982,).

Early recollections have also been used to assist in vocational and educational choices. Manaster and Perryman,
(1974) and Hafner and Fafouri, (1984) have reported a strong positive relationship between preferred types of ERs and eventual vocational choice and employment satisfaction.

Finally, ERs have been used as a supplement to projective techniques or as a means for efficiently gathering information similar to information obtained from more lengthy and time consuming projective techniques. Furthermore, early recollections have been found to be resistant to some influences when compared to the TAT (Hedvig, 1963). This information suggests that ERs might reveal more stable information about personality characteristics than the TAT.

Early recollections, by virtue of their uniqueness, specificity, and universality, appear to have qualities characteristic of an ideal vehicle for studying personality. Early recollections have been studied through both nomothetic and idiographic means. Although interpretive methodologies of ERs are numerous, they have been inconsistently utilized throughout the literature. In addition, interpretations of subjects' ERs appear to have varied as a function of the obtained data and the individual preferences of the researchers. Many researchers have encouraged more research utilizing ERs as a tool in clinical practice. This type of research would be valuable; however, it appears evident that a greater degree of reliability and validity of ERs as a technique could be reached if researchers utilized the same interpretive methodology.
Early Recollections and Resiliency

Early recollections have been studied across a variety of different populations. Thus far, however, early recollections of resilient individuals have not been collected. A resilient population has previously been operationally defined as a group of individuals who have experienced significant life trauma and stress and have shown remarkable ability to both recover and eventually lead productive lives (Rutter, 1979).

Resiliency

Resilience has been referred to as the ability to recover from, and adjust to, misfortune or sustained life stress (Werner, 1984). The concept of resiliency has been a source of innovative research over the past 20 years. Researchers have often asked, "What is right about these individuals?" and "What can we learn from them in order to help others?", Rutter (1979) wrote:

There is a regrettable tendency to focus gloomily on the ills of mankind and on all that can and does go wrong. The potential for prevention surely lies in increasing our knowledge and understanding of the reasons why some children are not damaged by deprivation. (p. 49)

Definitions of Resiliency

There are numerous definitions of the term resiliency. According to Anthony (1987), Cohler (1987), and Garmezy (1983), resiliency originated in a conceptual and empirical amalgamation of psychodynamic theory, ego psychology, and psychopathology. Resiliency can imply one's ability to
endure, develop, and even master, despite the impact of stresses (Richmond & Beardslee, 1988). Cowen and Work (1988) described resiliency as individuals reared in a society marked by chronic buffettings in the form of environmental and familial stresses. Rutter (1983) proposed that resilience referred to individual variations in response to risk and should be conceptualized as a fixed attribute.

Felsman and Vaillant (1987) believed that resiliency was not a static state but rather a process on a continuum in which disruption and reintegration were a necessary part of the person's adaptation to change (Flach, 1988). Anthony made an important contribution to resiliency with his definition and explanation of "pseudo-resilience." He described pseudo-resilient individuals as characterized by overdeveloped counterphobic defenses and exhibitionism. These "pseudoheroes" (Anthony, 1987) needed to demonstrate prowess and strength by carrying out difficult tasks which often require great risk and effort. Anthony stated that the compulsiveness of their acts suggested they may, in reality, be brittle and timid.

Another perspective of resilience has been drawn from therapists who have counseled individuals who have undergone significant trauma in their lives. Individuals who have undergone traumatic experiences have often been referred to as "survivors." Lew (1988) distinguished between the term "victim" and "survivor" in his book about men recovering from sexual molestation. A "victim," according to Lew (1988, pp.
30-31), "is one who suffers through no fault of his own or one who is made to suffer by persons or forces beyond his control." A "survivor" is one who not only endures "until something better comes along" but "learns to live a more satisfying life" (Lew, 1988). Des Pres (1977) eloquently captured the concept of the survivor in his observation:

Survivors do not choose their fate and would escape it if they could. They are trapped in a world of total domination, a world hostile to life and any sign of dignity and resistance, here to remain alive and human demands a certain kind of action, but also a radical shift in the sense of selfhood. Survivors are uncommonly conscious of limits and foundations, of the sustaining power which life itself provides when all else has been stripped away. From this experience comes a special integrity, a clearness of vision indispensable to those for whom, outwardly, helplessness and victimization are major facts of existence. (p. 13)

The definition of "survivor" suggested by Lew (1988) implies a proactive posture toward life. This proactive nature could account for the significant differences found between the resilient and nonresilient individual.

Overall, definitions of resiliency vary in their scope and conceptualization. The numerous definitions of resiliency have led to a multitude of different empirical definitions utilized by various authors. This limitation has unfortunately resulted in an unclear definition of resilience for future researchers.

Contributions from Stress Theory

Anthony (1987) noted that the concept of resilience, in the past, emerged out of stress theory. The term "stress" was used as early as the 14th century (Rutter, 1983); by the
17th century, the term "stress" implied hardship or adversity (Hinkle, 1973). During the 18th and 19th centuries the term took on a more scientific description as an external force or pressure imposed on an object or person (Hinkle, 1973). This definition eventually was used as a precisely defined scientific term in the areas of physics and engineering. By the early 20th century, the term, stress, was finding its way into the medical and mental health fields. For example, in 1910, Osler pointed out the deleterious effects of such stressful experiences as hard work and worrying on one's physical and mental well-being (cited in Hinkle, 1973).

The work of Cannon in the early part of the 20th century related observations of bodily changes which were connected to physical sensations and emotional reactions (Dohrenwend & Dohrenwend, 1974). Cannon (1929) viewed living organisms as striving to maintain a homeostatic condition and seeking restoration to this desirable original state after any disturbing external force became apparent.

Seyle (1980) advanced Cannon's work by detailing the response of laboratory animals to a variety of threatening stimuli including heat, cold and trauma. He described the concept of stress as a pattern of physiological responses which he termed the "general adaptive syndrome" (GAS). Seyle formally viewed stress as the specific biological result of any non-specific demand upon the body. He labeled such demands as "stressors" and defined them as situations, events, or people who produce the stress reaction. The
stressors had such effects as "wear and tear" on the person's body which required an extra effort of adaptation (Selye, 1980).

Selye (1974) made an important distinction when he suggested that a stimulus should be considered a stressor only if it resulted in a biological stress reaction. In this complex formulation, such apparent circularity may have ultimately proved to be the theory's greatest explanatory strength. Selye also noted that stressors could result in either positive or negative behavioral effects. Researchers reported that certain types of early experiences inoculated individuals against later stressful events and also perhaps increased their resilience (Bornstein, Clayton, Halikas, Maurice, & Robins, 1973). This concept is also noted in the Chinese character for the word "crisis" which can be used to denote both danger and opportunity. Selye's double-edge sword viewpoint brought forth the possible role of individual differences in determining stressful reactions. Although Selye's early formulations did not readily account for psychological stressors, they did seem to lay the conceptual groundwork for this type of future studies.

Thirteen years later, Anthony (1987) noted that a small percentage of laboratory rats placed in various types of extreme environments not only survived but also thrived, as evidenced by their greater maze-running resourcefulness and their augmented exploratory behavior. Anthony concluded that stress research may have contributed to the study of
resiliency in his statement, "Stress investigators coming from varied theoretical and empirical backgrounds may currently be converging on a central group of factors related to both stress-induced illness and resilience" (p. 6). In addition, epidemiological studies on susceptibility to heart disease had previously shown that a small number of individuals were significantly more resilient than others in that they remained comparatively more healthy and showed less psychological reactions to events that caused others intense reactions (Hinkle, 1974).

In a review of literature regarding the general topic of stress, Honig (1986) distinguished different types and sources of stress. Honig speculated that acute stresses were isolated instances that arose suddenly and their impact was usually associated with only short-term emotional disturbance. In contrast, the impact of chronic stresses were considered to be cumulative, impairing even the most well-adjusted child and eventually leading to long-term disturbances. This was noted by Neiman (1988) in her research findings that nonresilient children were more restless and demonstrated wild and aggressive behavior. Honig believed that the following variables were linked to stress:

1. Sex: compared to female children, male children were more vulnerable to stress, having higher rates of bed-wetting, dyslexia, delinquency, drug use, more likely to be targets for child abuse, having higher levels of classroom
disruption as well as higher levels of adjustment problems when their parents divorced;

2. Housing and Neighborhood: living environments characterized by high levels of crime and/or crowded household living conditions were associated with higher levels of stress in children; and,

3. Poverty: low socioeconomic status was considered to have a pernicious effect on several indicators of effective family functioning.

The Concept of Invulnerability

Stress theory (Seyle, 1974) was influenced by psychosomatic medicine and contributed to the notion of invulnerability in both animal and human subjects. The notion of invulnerability dates back to the mythology of ancient man where immunity from illness and injury was granted or obtained by specific individuals (Anthony, 1974). These myths comprised two general categories. The first was invulnerability as fostered by a mother who was usually overprotective and able to manipulate and insulate her child's environment. The story of the warrior Achilles fits this profile. According to the legend, when Achilles was a child his mother dipped him into the River Styx to make him invulnerable except for the heel by which his mother held him. The other category of myths was comprised of heroes who were continually exposed to various risks rather than protected from them. Overcoming each risk strengthened the
hero's confidence and competence, thus, self-generating greater levels of immunity. The story of Hercules is an example of this category. Hercule's life was threatened by his stepmother from infancy to adulthood. Each time he succeeded in overcoming difficult tasks, he grew stronger and more powerful.

A contemporary fictional analysis of the vulnerability-invulnerability continuum was provided by Jacques May, a disease ecologist, who described three dolls (Anthony, 1974). One doll was made of glass, one of plastic, and the third of steel. As each was exposed to an equally strong blow from a hammer, the glass doll shattered into pieces, the plastic doll evidenced a permanent scar, and the steel doll remained intact. In this analogy, vulnerability was represented as a function of the intensity of the external risk (impact of the hammer) interacting with the internal constitutional characteristics of the dolls. For this particular external threat, the glass doll's constitution placed it in a highly vulnerable state. Furthermore, past experiences such as being chipped or cracked due to mishandling could have left it in an even greater state of susceptibility. Vulnerability was seen as stemming from an accumulation of risk experiences which interacted with internal constitutional factors. To complicate matters, one could alter the level of vulnerability for any of the dolls by applying a protective coating or by changing the nature of the external threat. In this context, if the risk stemmed from a massive temperature
change instead of a hammer blow, the level of vulnerability for each doll would need to be reassessed.

With the recent burgeoning of risk research, increased interest has been seen in the study of stress-resistant children. In recent years, these children and their adult counterparts have been described as "invulnerable" (Anthony, 1974; Garmezy, 1974). Garmezy (1974) noted two key components in the lives and psychological make-up of such children; the presence of sustained and intense life stresses and the maintenance of mastery and competence despite the exposure to stress.

**Risk Variables**

The risk research field has only recently been recognized as a viable area of study. Vaillant (1977) noted in his longitudinal study of healthy individuals that all human beings are exposed to various hazards throughout their lives; thus, all humans are at risk at certain times. A similar study concluded that "no especially blessed individual turned up in this assessment; the luckiest of the lives here studied had its full share of difficulty and private despair" (Vaillant, 1977, p. 3).

The incidence of such environmental stressors as neglect, abuse, loss, disruption, and trauma has been found to be statistically higher for psychiatric than for nonpsychiatric populations (Gersten, Langner, Eisenberg, and Simcha-Fagan, 1977). Research studies have not fared well in
predicting which vulnerable individuals among a high-risk population would adapt and which would succumb to deviant outcomes (Garmezy & Nuechterlein, 1972). Favorable outcomes for children exposed to various forms of intense risk (pathological parenting, family turmoil, poverty, abuse, and death of a parent) have also been surprisingly common, yet again difficult to predict (Garmezy, 1975).

In Rutter's (1979) review of the literature, he identified six at-risk family variables believed to be strongly and significantly associated with child psychiatric disorders. The variables Rutter identified include:

1. severe marital discord,
2. low social status,
3. overcrowding or large family size,
4. paternal criminality,
5. maternal psychiatric disorder, and
6. admission into the care of the local welfare authority.

Furthermore, Rutter (1979) compared rates of psychiatric disorders in children with at-risk variables in their lives with those children who had no at-risk variables impacting upon them. When more than two at-risk variables occurred together, the risk of psychiatric disorders in children rose several times higher compared to the children who were not at-risk or one at-risk variable populations. Rutter concluded, "The stresses potentiated each other so that the combination of chronic stresses provided very much more than
a summation of the effects of the separate stresses considered singly" (p. 56).

Internal Variables

A growing body of literature attests to the importance of people's concepts and feelings about themselves, their social environments, and their abilities to deal with life's challenges and to control what is happening to them. These concepts include both cognition and affect, and have many terms to describe them including "self-esteem," (Harter, 1983) "self-efficacy," (Bandura, 1977) and the "self-concept," (Epstein, 1980). There is considerable empirical support for the mediating role of cognitive processes in psychological stress (Gersten et al., 1977). Individual perceptions of threat vary widely and a variety of psychological stimuli could potentially result in similar stress responses. Lazarus (1966) argued that other than intense universal stressors such as death of a loved one and war combat, the individual's cognitive appraisal of the situation or event determines its stressfulness. John Milton (1962) sums up this notion in his 17th century epic, Paradise Lost: "The mind is its own place and in itself can make a heaven of hell, and a hell of heaven."

Research with Child Populations

To date, research on resiliency has focused primarily on children. Several longitudinal studies have followed the same groups of children from infancy through adolescence
(Murphy & Moriarty, 1976; Werner & Smith, 1982). Other researchers have studied specific situations, including, chronic poverty and discrimination (Clark, 1983; Gandara, 1982; Garmezy, 1983), resilient offspring of psychotic patients (Anthony, 1987; Garmezy, 1975), the coping patterns of children of divorce (Wallerstein & Kelly, 1980), and uprooted children of contemporary wars (Ayala-Canales, 1984; Rosenblatt, 1983).

Murphy and Moriarty (1976) conducted a comprehensive longitudinal study of very young to adolescent children to determine how children coped with their own problems and to explore the "relation of these efforts to aspects of temperament and resources for growth" (p. xi). These researchers described resiliency as the ability to recover readily from adversity. What emerged from this study was a profile of "good copers," that is, some children over a period of time were cognitively capable, affectively expressive and effective. These children had generally good feelings about themselves, good insights into situations, realistic evaluation of situations, flexibility and creativity.

Anthony (1987) reiterated this conclusion through studies that looked at children at risk for psychosis. He concluded:

The resilient child is characterized by sound normal defenses, a wide range of coping skills, many available competencies, constructive and even creative capacities that provided imaginative ways of dealing with frightening realities and an inherent robustness that enables him to generate psychoimmunity. (p. 148)
Garmezy's (1975) early studies of children of schizophrenic parents indicated the critical importance of developing social support systems, enhancing the child's level of self-esteem, enhancing resistance to stress by generating cognitive competencies, and increasing role-taking skills as a means of facilitating social maturity.

A common finding across all of these studies has been that these resilient children demonstrated unusual psychological strength, despite a history of severe stress (Werner, 1984). Research on these children has suggested four common personality characteristics (O'Connell-Higgins, 1983):

1. an active approach toward problem-solving that enabled them to successfully negotiate harmful experiences;
2. a tendency to perceive both positive and negative experiences constructively;
3. the ability to gain others' positive attention; and,
4. the ability to use faith to maintain meaningfulness in one's life.

**Resilient Children as Adults**

An abundance of information has been reported that has facilitated insight into prevention strategies. However, the literature is sparse regarding the topic of resilient children who are now adults (resilient adults). The literature on investigations of adults who experienced severe stress as children consists of only a few studies.
In one study, the researcher (Moskovitz, 1985) interviewed 24 adult survivors who lived as children in the Lingfield Children's Home in England. Three salient factors that significantly contributed to the resilience of these survivors were: adaptability, appeal to adults, and assertiveness. The findings of Moskovitz's (1985) study indicated a congruence between the personality characteristics identified in the resilient literature using children and the salient factors in the adults she studied. Moskovitz concluded:

Vulnerability and resilience over the life span is an area of study in its infancy. We cannot afford to continue to ignore the rich instructive treasure of their lives. (p. 10)

Felsman and Vaillant (1987) completed a 40 year study of resilient children as adults. The researchers observed that those who emerged as being resilient were not "super kids" or geniuses." On the contrary, these researchers made the following observations:

We found courageous individuals who have demonstrated long term patterns (including periods of limitation and setbacks) of continued mastery and competency, despite the multiple factors working against them. It is the sustained maintenance of these characteristics in the face of enormous odds that distinguishes them from their peers. (p. 305)

Looking at adults who had entered psychological treatment, Flach (1988) made some observations of what he viewed as certain personality traits of resilient persons that included the following list:

1. creativity;

2. ability to tolerate pain;
3. insight into oneself and what is happening at a particular time;
4. independence of spirit;
5. ability to restore self-esteem when it is diminished or temporarily lost;
6. capacity for learning;
7. ability to make and keep friends;
8. freedom to depend on others, with the skill to set proper limits on the depth of dependency;
9. perspective of life that offers a vital evolving philosophy within which they find personal meaning in all experiences;
10. high level of personal discipline and a sense of responsibility;
11. receptivity to new ideas;
12. keen sense of humor.

Resiliency Research Summary and Conclusions

The concept of resiliency originated from the three fields of psychodynamic theory, ego psychology, and psychopathology (Anthony, 1987). Later it was discovered that Stress Theory (Seyle, 1974) was another major contributor to the concept of resiliency. Multiple definitions of resiliency have been proposed by various authors (Rutter, 1983; Anthony, 1987; Cohler, 1987; Felsman & Vaillant, 1987; Garmezy, 1983; Richmond & Beardslee, 1988; Cowen & Work, 1988; Flach, 1988). This multiplicity of
resiliency definitions have been a major limitation in prior research, frequently resulting in unclear and poorly defined definitions. Despite this limitation, however, resiliency has generally been referred to as the ability to recover from, and adjust to, misfortune or sustained life stress (Werner, 1984).

To date, resiliency research has focused primarily on children (Murphy & Moriarty, 1976; Werner & Smith, 1982; Clark, 1983; Gandara, 1982; Garmezy, 1975; Garmezy, 1983; Anthony, 1987; Wallerstein & Kelly, 1980; Ayala-Canales, 1984; Rosenblatt, 1983). Review of the literature (Honig, 1986) indicates that certain variables have been linked to the effects of stress on children: sex of child, housing and neighborhood, and poverty. In addition, Rutter (1979) identified six at-risk family variables which were believed to be significantly associated with child psychiatric disorders. These six variables include: severe marital discord, low social status, overcrowding or large family size, paternal criminality, maternal psychiatric disorder, and admission into the care of the local welfare authority. Common personality characteristics of the children sampled across the various resilient populations seem to include the following four factors: an active approach toward problem-solving that enabled them to successfully negotiate harmful experiences; a tendency to perceive both positive and negative experiences constructively; the ability to gain positive attention from
others; and, the ability to use faith to maintain meaningfulness in one's life (O'Connell-Higgins, 1983).

Research investigating resilient children who are now adults is much more limited (Moskowitz, 1985; Felsman & Vaillant, 1987; Flach, 1988). Findings from these studies seem to suggest some congruence between personality characteristics identified in the resiliency literature using children, and salient factors also identified in resilient adults. However, research investigating vulnerability and resilience over the life span continues to be an area of study still in its infancy.

As indicated in the preceding review of the literature, Early Recollections may be a useful tool to explore and to identify those personality characteristics that persevere from childhood into adulthood. The present study was specifically designed to investigate personality characteristics of resilient and nonresilient adults by scoring the manifest content of their ERs.
Chapter 3

SAMPLE, INSTRUMENTATION, AND PROCEDURE

This chapter will review the population sampled, instrumentation, procedures and analysis of the data utilized in this study.

SAMPLE

A total of 80 subjects participated in this study (N = 80). The participants were composed of two groups, resilient and nonresilient. The resilient group was comprised of 16 males and 24 females (n = 40). The nonresilient group consisted of 14 males and 26 females (n=40). A total of 30 males and 50 females participated in the study.

Table 1 contains the frequency of resilient, nonresilient, and total number of participants who endorsed the demographic information pertaining to age, education, marital status, and employment. A review of Table 1 indicates a total of 80 subjects participated in this study (N = 80). The participants were composed of two groups, resilient (n = 40) and nonresilient (n = 40). The resilient and nonresilient groups were approximately equal with respect to the following three variables: gender, age, and marital
status.

The groups differed with respect to employment and educational attainment; however, the two groups had an equal number of participants with some college education. The resilient group had a greater number of college graduates and individuals who obtained advanced degrees. The nonresilient group had a greater number of individuals with 12 years of schooling or less. The resilient group had a greater number of white collar workers. The nonresilient group had a greater number of blue collar workers and unemployed individuals.

Table 1

Frequency Counts of the Demographic Information for the Resilient, Nonresilient and Total Number of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resilient</td>
<td>Nonresilient</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td>23-58</td>
<td>19-55</td>
<td>19-58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Age</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior High</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some High School</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Degree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Collar</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Collar</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 contains the frequency and percentage of participants who endorsed each item on the Child Section of the Life Situation Questionnaire information for the resilient, nonresilient, and total number of participants. There was a trend for the nonresilient participants to report a higher frequency of childhood trauma on four of the five life situations. These four categories were: family on welfare, parent(s) had emotional problems, experienced physical beatings requiring medical attention, and sexual abuse. The resilient group had a higher frequency of participants reporting that their parents were substance abusers.

Table 2

Frequency Counts and Percentages of Endorsed Items on the Child Section of the Life Situation Questionnaire for the Resilient, Nonresilient, and Total Number of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Childhood Experience</th>
<th>Frequency and Percentage</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resilient</td>
<td>Nonresilient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family on welfare</td>
<td>06 (15%)</td>
<td>09 (22.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent(s) had emotional problems</td>
<td>17 (42.5%)</td>
<td>22 (55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced physical beating</td>
<td>05 (12.5%)</td>
<td>09 (22.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent(s) abused alcohol/drugs</td>
<td>27 (67.5%)</td>
<td>21 (52.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexually abused</td>
<td>11 (27.5%)</td>
<td>17 (42.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 contains the frequency and percentages of the number of endorsed items on the child section of the Life Situation Questionnaire for the resilient, nonresilient and total number of participants. There was a trend for both
groups to endorse multiple items less frequently on the Life Situation Questionnaire. The nonresilient group, however, tended to endorse multiple items more frequently than the resilient group.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Section of Life Situation Questionnaire</th>
<th>Frequency of Endorsed Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resilient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 childhood experience</td>
<td>20 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 childhood experiences</td>
<td>14 (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 childhood experiences</td>
<td>05 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 childhood experiences</td>
<td>01 (2.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 childhood experiences</td>
<td>00 (00%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 contains the frequency and percentages of Endorsed Items on the Adult Section of the Life Situation Questionnaire for the resilient group, nonresilient group, and total number of participants. The two groups differed with respect to the following six variables: did not receive welfare benefits, graduated from high school, attended college or trade school, no complaints or charges filed for abuse of others, gainful employment, and did not use drugs or alcohol to an excess.

One hundred percent of the resilient participants endorsed five of these six variables. The one exception was
for the category of having attended college or trade school, for which 90% of the participants responded positively. In comparison, approximately 50% of the nonresilient participants indicated that they were currently receiving welfare benefits, had not graduated from high school, had not attended college, had previously had complaints filed against them for abuse of others, were not gainfully employed, and were currently abusing alcohol or drugs.

Table 4

**Frequency Counts and Percentages of Endorsed Items on the Adult Section of the Life Situation Questionnaire for the Resilient, Nonresilient, and Total Number of Participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adult Section of Life Situation Questionnaire</th>
<th>Resilient</th>
<th>Nonresilient</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not receive welfare benefits</td>
<td>40 (100%)</td>
<td>20 (50%)</td>
<td>60 (75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated from high school</td>
<td>40 (100%)</td>
<td>21 (52.5%)</td>
<td>61 (76.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended college or trade school</td>
<td>36 (90%)</td>
<td>16 (40%)</td>
<td>52 (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No complaints or charge filed for abuse of others</td>
<td>40 (100%)</td>
<td>20 (50%)</td>
<td>60 (75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time job that fulfills financial obligations</td>
<td>40 (100%)</td>
<td>19 (47.5%)</td>
<td>59 (73.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not use drugs or alcohol to an excess</td>
<td>40 (100%)</td>
<td>15 (37.5%)</td>
<td>55 (68.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 contains the frequency and percentages of the number of endorsed items on the adult section of the Life Situation Questionnaire for the resilient, nonresilient and total number of participants. One hundred percent of the
resilient group endorsed five or more items on the Adult Section of the Life Situation Questionnaire. In contrast, only 15% of the nonresilient participants endorsed five adult experiences; thus 85% of this group endorsed only four items or less.

Table 5

**Frequency Counts and Percentages of Number of Endorsed Items on the Adult Section of the Life Situation Questionnaire for the Resilient, Nonresilient, and Total Number of Participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adult Section of the Life Situation Questionnaire</th>
<th>Frequency of Endorsed Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resilient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No adult experiences</td>
<td>00 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 adult experience</td>
<td>00 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 adult experiences</td>
<td>00 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 adult experiences</td>
<td>00 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 adult experiences</td>
<td>00 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 adult experiences</td>
<td>04 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 adult experiences</td>
<td>36 (90%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All potential subjects were advised about the requirements of the study and asked to sign a participation consent form if they agreed to complete the surveys. See Appendix E.

Subjects who comprised the two groups, resilient and nonresilient, were obtained in two different manners. Some individuals were given the questionnaires in the following groups: law enforcement recruits, graduate students, and
staff and outpatients at a large midwestern medical hospital. Individuals whose responses met the criteria for resilient or nonresilient, as operationally defined in this study, were included in the sample.

The second manner by which participants were obtained was through a network process. These individuals were identified by friends, therapists, teachers, family members, and so forth, as being resilient or nonresilient from the operationally defined definitions designed by the researcher. Questionnaires were mailed to these prospective participants with written instructions to complete them and send them back should they choose to participate. Those participants who met the criteria for resiliency or nonresiliency were included as subjects in the study.

Research Description

The study employed two levels of the independent variable (resiliency and nonresiliency) and 42 dependent variables. There was a total of two groups, consisting of 80 participants (Resilient = 40, Nonresilient = 40). The 42 dependent variables (refer to Appendix A) addressed seven primary categories. These seven categories included the following: characters, themes, concern for detail, setting, active-passive, control, and affect.

Instrumentation

The purpose of this study was to determine if resilient and nonresilient individuals differed with respect to the
manifest content of their early recollections. The instrument selected was the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollection Scoring Manual. It was chosen on the basis of its interrater agreement and its use in previous research.

**The Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollection Scoring Manual:**

Early recollections were scored using the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollection Scoring Manual. This nomothetic scoring manual contains 42 variables divided into seven theme clusters. In the current study, the early recollections were scored on the presence or absence of each variable (Manaster & Perryman, 1974) except in the case of three variables which were assigned a number count (i.e., number of characters, number of themes, and number of settings). The process of rating all 42 variables in a dichotomous fashion deviated from Manaster and Perryman's (1974) scoring manual in the following manner. In previous studies, the following groups of variables were rated either one or the other (i.e., active/passive, internal/external, and positive/negative/neutral). The method of scoring the variables dichotomously was selected because it allowed all 42 variables to be analyzed using the chi-square test of independence statistic.

Written recollections were judged by two independent raters who were blind to the experimental condition of the participants. The raters used the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollection Scoring Manual (Appendix A). The
independent raters were graduate students in counseling
previously trained in the use of the Manaster-Perryman Early
Recollection Scoring Manual. The training consisted of
education regarding the scoring manual and scoring practice
sessions until a .90 or better interrater reliability was
achieved. A reliability test was conducted on the ERs of 10
randomly selected subjects. The raters were asked to score
the ERs using the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early
Recollection Scoring Manual (Manaster & Perryman, 1974). The
ratings were reviewed by the examiner and the raters; the
interrater agreement was determined to be 94.5%.

Manaster & Perryman (1974) collected early recollections
from students who planned to enter each of the following
occupational areas: teaching, counseling, nursing/medicine,
biological science, and business/accounting. Analysis
revealed a number of significant differences on the early
recollection variables between the groups of students in the
various college majors. As a result of the findings, their
scoring manual was recommended for use with other types of
groups.

The Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early
Recollection Scoring Manual has shown significant differences
in groups in the study of differential diagnosis (Hafner,
Nomothetic studies, using the Manaster-Perryman Manifest
Content Early Recollection Scoring manual, also demonstrated
significance in differentiating individuals in various
occupations and educational interests (Manaster & Perryman, 1974; Hafner, Fakouri, & Etzler, 1986; Fakouri, Fakouri, & Hafner, 1986). In the studies that utilized the Manaster-Perryman interpretation manual, the interrater reliability coefficient was between .86 and .98 (Manaster & Perryman, 1974; Fakouri, et al., 1986; Hafner & Fakouri, 1978; Hafner et al. 1980).

**Demographic Questionnaire:**

The Demographic Questionnaire (DQ) (refer to Appendix C) was developed by the researcher and consisted of demographic questions including age, gender, marital status, number of marriages, occupation, and formal education. This information was used to determine whether the two groups were comparable with respect to these demographics.

**Life Situation Questionnaire:**

The Life Situation Questionnaire (LSQ) (refer to Appendix B) was developed by the researcher and consisted of statements that were affirmed or not affirmed by the participants regarding situations that occurred when they were children and situations that were present in their adult lives. The LSQ was developed in order to determine if the participant met the requirements for resiliency or nonresiliency.

A list of five childhood situations was presented that included the following: family received welfare benefits, one or both parents had emotional problems that made it difficult or impossible to fulfill the parental role,
physical beating occurred that required medical attention, one or both parents abused drugs or alcohol, and the experience of sexual abuse. A list of six statements relating to the participants' adult life included the following: not receiving welfare benefits, graduation from high school, attendance in college or trade school, complaints or charges of abuse of others have not been filed, able to hold a full time job, and the absence of alcohol or drug abuse.

**Early Recollection Questionnaire:**

This questionnaire (ERQ) (refer to Appendix D) was developed by the researcher and consisted of instructions to write in detail three early experiences that occurred before the age of eight years of age. Three questions were listed after each early recollection instruction and included: the age of the participant when the experience occurred, the feelings associated with the experience, and what part of the memory stood out for the participant. The age of the participant was asked so that the early recollections were consistent with Adler's definition of occurring before the age of eight years of age. The other two questions were asked in order to obtain relevant information needed to score the ER on the variables listed on the Manaster-Perryman Early Recollection Scoring Manual (Manaster & Perryman, 1974). For example, the question pertaining to the participant's feelings was used in the scoring of the affect variables on the MPMCERSM. The question pertaining to the aspect of the
recolletion that stood out the most, was intended to obtain additional information that could provide further assistance when rating the ER.

**Procedure**

A human subject's consent form (refer to Appendix E) was given to all participants and the instructions to read it thoroughly before signing was verbalized to the participants. The consent forms were collected before the other material was given to the participants. Each participant was then instructed to complete the Life Situation Questionnaire (Appendix A) and the Demographic Questionnaire (Appendix B). Next, each participant was instructed to provide three written early recollections as outlined on the Early Recollections Questionnaire (Appendix C). A verbatim reading of the instructions and material by the researcher was utilized if the participant was unable to read.

Mailings were utilized for individuals who were not physically present and written instructions were provided as well as two separate envelopes to mail back the data and the consent form. The prospective participants were instructed to read the subject's consent form thoroughly before signing. They were also given further written instructions to complete the questionnaires and to mail the consent form and the questionnaires in separate envelopes in order to preserve anonymity.
Analysis of Data

The subjects' responses for the three early recollections solicited were scored by two trained graduate students in a dichotomized fashion across 39 of the 42 dependent variables. The dichotomy indicated either the presence or absence of a given variable in a recollection. A total score for each variable was calculated by adding together the subject's individual scores across the three early recollections. Scores for each individual could range from zero to three on 39 of the 42 variables. A zero would indicate the absence of the variable across the three ERs. A three would indicate the presence of the variable across the three ERs. The other three remaining variables were concerned with the number of variables found in each of three theme clusters, i.e., characters, themes, and settings. These scores could range from 0-21, 0-39, and 0-27, respectively. The three variables were assigned a number count and a final number was calculated by adding together the individual number from each of the three recollections for each of the three remaining dependent variables.

A chi-square test of independence, using the subject's total score, was completed for each of the 42 dependent variables. In chi-square tests of independence, two variables are involved, and observed and expected frequencies are compared. The expected frequencies were those frequencies that would be expected to occur if the two variables were independent. The level of significance was
set at $p < .05$. This level of significance was selected in order to reduce the probability of a Type I error (rejecting the null hypothesis when it should be retained). The .05 level of significance allowed for the probability of accepting the null hypothesis 95% of the time when there was no significant difference between the groups. The chances were five in 100, or less, that the difference between the groups resulted from mere chance alone.

**Limitations**

1. Validity studies on early recollections are encouraging but not conclusive. Concurrent validity and content validity have been demonstrated (Gushurst, 1971; Jones, 1987); however, criterion validity has not been empirically established.

2. The possibility exists that the operational definition of resiliency and nonresiliency may not accurately discriminate between the two groups. In general, the nonresilient group was from a lower socioeconomic status compared to the resilient group due to the criteria utilized for resiliency (completed high school, has a full time job). This may account for some differences between the groups.

3. The possibility exists that a Type I error could have occurred five percent of the time.

**Null Hypothesis**

The following general null hypothesis was tested in the study.
There are no significant differences in the manifest content of Early Recollections of adults who were considered at-risk as children who have been successful in their adult lives (resilient adults) and those who were at-risk as children and continue to display problems in adulthood (nonresilient adults).

The following 42 hypotheses were tested in the study:

1. There is no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs mentioning the mother variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual.

2. There is no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs mentioning the father variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual.

3. There is no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs mentioning the siblings variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual.

4. There is no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs mentioning the other family variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual.

5. There is no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs mentioning the non-family variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual.
6. There is no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs mentioning the group variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual.

7. There is no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs mentioning the animal variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual.

8. There is no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs mentioning the number of characters variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual.

9. There is no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs mentioning the sibling birth variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual.

10. There is no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs mentioning the death variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual.

11. There is no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs mentioning the illness/injury variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual.

12. There is no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs mentioning the punishment variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman
13. There is no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs mentioning the misdeeds variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual.

14. There is no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs mentioning the givingness variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual.

15. There is no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs mentioning the mastery variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual.

16. There is no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs mentioning the mutuality variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual.

17. There is no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs mentioning the getting attention variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual.

18. There is no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs mentioning the new situation variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual.

19. There is no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs mentioning the
threatening situation variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual.

20. There is no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs mentioning the hostility variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual.

21. There is no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs mentioning the other theme variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual.

22. There is no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs mentioning the number of themes variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual.

23. There is no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs mentioning the visual variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual.

24. There is no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs mentioning the auditory variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual.

25. There is no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs mentioning the motor variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual.

26. There is no significant difference between resilient and
nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs mentioning the school variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual.

27. There is no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs mentioning the hospital variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual.

28. There is no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs mentioning the inside the family or relative home variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual.

29. There is no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs mentioning the outside in the neighborhood variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual.

30. There is no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs mentioning the traveling variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual.

31. There is no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs mentioning the inside non-family home variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual.

32. There is no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs mentioning the
outside away from home variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual.

33. There is no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs mentioning the unclear setting variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual.

34. There is no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs mentioning the other setting variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual.

35. There is no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs mentioning the number of settings variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual.

36. There is no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs mentioning the active variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual.

37. There is no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs mentioning the passive variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual.

38. There is no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs mentioning the internal control variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual.

39. There is no significant difference between resilient and
nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs mentioning the external control variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual.  
40. There is no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs mentioning the positive affect variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual.  
41. There is no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs mentioning the negative affect variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual.  
42. There is no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs mentioning the neutral affect variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual.  

**Summary**

The subjects in this study were comprised of 40 individuals in both the resilient and nonresilient groups (N=80). The groups were approximately equal with regard to gender, age, and marital status. The resilient group had a higher number of individuals who were employed and a higher number of white collar workers. The groups were approximately equal with regard to situations as a child that included parental emotional illness, and parental alcohol and/or drug abuse. The nonresilient group had a higher number of participants who, as children, were on welfare,
were physically abused, and who were sexually abused. The resilient group had more participants who had attended college or a trade school.

As adults, the nonresilient group had a higher number of participants who currently used drugs and alcohol to an excess, had charges filed against them for physical or sexual abuse of another person, were receiving welfare benefits, and who did not graduate from high school.

This study employed two levels of the independent variable (resilient and nonresilient) and 42 dependent variables. The Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollection Scoring Manual was utilized to score three early recollections obtained from each subject. The subjects also completed a questionnaire pertaining to their situation as a child and their current situation as an adult. The data were analyzed using the chi-square test of independence. The level of significance was set at p < .05.
Chapter 4

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the findings of the study that examined the early recollections of resilient and nonresilient individuals. The major hypothesis tested was that there were no significant differences between resilient and nonresilient individuals with respect to the manifest content of their ERs as measured by the 42 variables of the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual. Differences across these 42 variables were examined using the chi-square test of independence statistic. The Early Recollections were scored using the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollection Scoring Manual (1974) by two independent raters. Both raters had previously been trained by the researcher in the proper method of scoring and were blind to the experimental condition to which subjects had been assigned. The interrater agreement was 94.5%.

The 42 total variables served as dependent variables in the current study. The responses on 39 of the 42 variables, for each of three recollections, were scored in a dichotomous fashion. This indicated either the presence or absence of a
given variable in any recollection. A score ranging from zero to three for each participant for each of the 39 dichotomous variables served as the dependent variables in the chi-square analyses. The remaining three variables of the 42 on the MPMCERSM, from the categories of characters, themes, and settings, required a number count. These three variables yielded scores ranging from three to 21 (number of characters), three to 39 (number of themes), and three to 27 (number of settings), respectively. These three scores served as the dependent variables in the chi-square analyses for each participant for these three variables.

The 42 variables researched were analyzed separately and then grouped into seven categories according to the Manaster-Perryman Early Recollection Scoring Manual. The seven categories include: A) Characters (mother, father, siblings, other family members, non-family members, a group of people, animal, and the number of characters); B) Themes (birth of a sibling, death, illness or injury, punishment, misdeeds, givingness, mastery, mutuality, attention-getting, new situation causing excitement, fear or threatening situation, open hostility, other themes, and number of themes); C) Concern with detail (visual, auditory, and motor); D) Setting (school, hospital/doctor's office, inside the home of family or relatives, outside, away from family home or neighborhood, unclear, other settings, and number of settings); E) Active-Passive (active or passive); F) Control (internal or external); and G) Affect (positive, negative, or neutral).
Results

The following was the general null hypothesis tested in this study: There were no significant differences in the manifest content of Early Recollections of adults who were considered at-risk as children who have been successful in their adult lives (resilient adults) when compared to those adults who were at-risk as children and continue to display problems in adulthood (nonresilient adults).

The 42 specific null hypotheses, clustered by category, are presented in this section. Tables displaying the statistics for each variable are provided.

Category A: Characters

Hypotheses one through eight are present in the following section. Table 6 contains the frequency counts, percentages, chi-square values and level of significance for the character category variables. These variables were concerned with the characters mentioned by the participant indicating their salience to that individual.

Null hypothesis one stated that there was no significant difference between the resilient and nonresilient individuals frequency of ERs mentioning the mother character variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual. The data in Table 6 indicate a significant difference between the groups with respect to the mother character variable at the .05 level of confidence. The resilient group had a significantly greater frequency of
ERs in which a mother was mentioned. Hypothesis one was, therefore, rejected.

Table 6

**Frequency Counts, Percentages, Chi-square Values, and Level of Significance for the Character Category Variables of Resilient and Nonresilient Participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Frequency &amp; Percentage</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Null #1</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>58 (26%) 41 (22%)</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt; .05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #2</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>65 (29%) 41 (22%)</td>
<td>9.73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt; .01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #3</td>
<td>Siblings</td>
<td>35 (16%) 25 (13%)</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #4</td>
<td>Other Fam.</td>
<td>18 (08%) 27 (14%)</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #5</td>
<td>Non-Family</td>
<td>33 (15%) 23 (12%)</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #6</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>09 (04%) 21 (11%)</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt; .02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #7</td>
<td>Animal</td>
<td>06 (03%) 10 (06%)</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #8</td>
<td># of Char.</td>
<td>221 188</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant

Null hypothesis two stated that there was no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals frequency of ERs mentioning the father character variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual. Data in Table 6 indicate a significant difference between the groups with respect to the father character variable at the .01 level of confidence. The resilient group had a significantly greater frequency of ERs in which a father was mentioned. Hypothesis two was,
therefore, rejected.

Null hypothesis three stated that there was no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs mentioning the siblings character variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual. The data in Table 6 do not indicate a significant difference between the groups with respect to the siblings character variable at the .05 level of confidence. The groups did not significantly differ with respect to the frequency of ERs mentioning brothers and/or sisters. Hypothesis three was, therefore, retained.

Null hypothesis four stated that there was no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals frequency of ERs mentioning the other family members variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual. The data in Table 6 do not indicate a significant difference between the groups with respect to the other family members character variable at the .05 level of confidence. The groups did not significantly differ with respect to the frequency of ERs mentioning other family members (i.e., aunts, uncles, grandparents etc.). Hypothesis four was, therefore, retained.

Null hypothesis five stated that there was no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals frequency of ERs with respect to the non-family
character variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual. The data in Table 6 do not indicate a significant difference between the groups with respect to the non-family character variable at the .05 level of confidence. The groups did not significantly differ with respect to the frequency of ERs mentioning non-family members (i.e. friends, teachers, etc.). Hypothesis five was, therefore, retained.

Hypothesis six stated that there was no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals frequency of ERs mentioning the group character variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual. The data in Table 6 indicate a significant difference between the groups with respect to the groups character variable at the .02 level of confidence. The nonresilient group had a significantly greater frequency of ERs in which groups were mentioned. Hypothesis six was, therefore, rejected.

Hypothesis seven stated that there was no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals frequency of ERs with respect to the animal character variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual. The data in Table 6 do not indicate a significant difference between the groups with respect to the group's character variable at the .05 level of confidence. The groups did not significantly differ with respect to the frequency of ERs mentioning
animals. Hypothesis seven was, therefore, retained.

Hypothesis eight stated that there was no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals frequency of ERs with respect to the number of characters variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual. The data in Table 6 do not indicate a significant difference between the groups with respect to the group's character variable at the .05 level of confidence. The groups did not significantly differ with respect to the number of characters in their ERs. Hypothesis eight was, therefore retained.

In summary, there were significant differences found on the character variables of mother, father, and groups. The resilient group had a higher frequency of ERs mentioning the mother and the father characters. The nonresilient group had a higher frequency of ERs mentioning groups of people. There were no significant differences found on the other character variables (siblings, other family members, non-family members, animals, and number of characters).

Category B: Themes

Hypotheses nine through 22 are presented in the following section. Table 7 contains the frequency counts, percentages, chi-square values and level of significance for the theme category variables. These variables were concerned with the theme or plot of the ER.
Table 7

Frequency Counts, Percentages, Chi-square Values, and Level of Significance for the Theme Category Variables of Resilient and Nonresilient Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Frequency &amp; Percentage</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resilient</td>
<td>Nonresilient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #09</td>
<td>Sibling birth</td>
<td>03 (02%)</td>
<td>03 (02%)</td>
<td>00.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #10</td>
<td>Death</td>
<td>04 (03%)</td>
<td>05 (02%)</td>
<td>00.11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #11</td>
<td>Illness/injury</td>
<td>23 (16%)</td>
<td>11 (05%)</td>
<td>01.50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #12</td>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>09 (06%)</td>
<td>14 (07%)</td>
<td>01.20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #13</td>
<td>Misdeeds</td>
<td>06 (04%)</td>
<td>11 (06%)</td>
<td>01.58</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #14</td>
<td>Givingness</td>
<td>06 (04%)</td>
<td>10 (04%)</td>
<td>01.07</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #15</td>
<td>Mastery</td>
<td>09 (06%)</td>
<td>33 (16%)</td>
<td>16.62</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #16</td>
<td>Mutuality</td>
<td>15 (10%)</td>
<td>29 (14%)</td>
<td>05.45</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #17</td>
<td>Getting att.</td>
<td>10 (07%)</td>
<td>17 (08%)</td>
<td>02.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #18</td>
<td>New situation</td>
<td>11 (08%)</td>
<td>20 (10%)</td>
<td>03.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #19</td>
<td>Threatening</td>
<td>25 (17%)</td>
<td>27 (13%)</td>
<td>00.09</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #20</td>
<td>Hostility</td>
<td>12 (08%)</td>
<td>14 (07%)</td>
<td>00.17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #21</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13 (09%)</td>
<td>11 (06%)</td>
<td>00.18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #22</td>
<td># of Themes</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>09.80</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant

Null Hypothesis nine stated that there was no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals frequency of ERs with respect to the birth of a sibling theme variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual. The
data in Table 7 do not indicate a significant difference between the groups with respect to the birth of a sibling theme variable at the .05 level of confidence. The groups did not significantly differ with respect to the frequency of ERs that mentioned the theme of a birth of a sibling. Hypothesis nine was, therefore, retained.

Hypothesis 10 stated that there was no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals frequency of ERs with respect to the death theme variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual. The data in Table 7 do not indicate a significant difference between the groups with respect to the death theme variable at the .05 level of confidence. The groups did not significantly differ with respect to the frequency of ERs mentioning a death experience. Hypothesis 10 was, therefore, retained.

Hypothesis 11 stated that there was no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals frequency of ERs with respect to the illness/injury theme variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual. The data in Table 7 do not indicate a significant difference between the groups with respect to the illness/injury theme variable at the .05 level of confidence. The groups did not significantly differ with respect to the frequency of ERs that mentioned the theme of an illness or injury. Hypothesis 11 was, therefore, retained.
Hypothesis 12 stated that there was no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals frequency of ERs with respect to the punishment theme variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual. The data in Table 7 do not indicate a significant difference between the groups with respect to the punishment theme variable at the .05 level of confidence. The groups did not significantly differ with respect to the frequency of ERs that mentioned the experience of being punished. Hypothesis 12 was, therefore, retained.

Hypothesis 13 stated that there was no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals frequency of ERs with respect to the misdeeds theme variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual. The data in Table 7 do not indicate a significant difference between the groups with respect to the misdeeds theme variable at the .05 level of confidence. The groups did not significantly differ with respect to the frequency of ERs that mentioned the theme of committing an act that was known to be wrong. Hypothesis 13 was, therefore, retained.

Hypothesis 14 stated that there was no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals frequency of ERs with respect to the givingness theme variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual. The data in
Table 7 do not indicate a significant difference between the
groups with respect to the givingness theme variable at the
.05 level of confidence. The groups did not significantly
differ with respect to the frequency of ERs mentioning the
experience of displaying generosity or kindness either
overtly or covertly. Hypothesis 14 was, therefore, retained.

Hypothesis 15 stated that there was no significant
difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals
frequency of ERs with respect to the mastery theme variable
as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early
Recollections Scoring Manual. The data in Table 7 indicate a
significant difference between the groups with respect to the
mastery theme variable at the .001 level of confidence. The
nonresilient group mentioned a significantly greater
frequency of ER themes of controlling the environment as
compared to the resilient group. Hypothesis 15 was,
therefore, rejected.

Hypothesis 16 stated that there was no significant
difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals
frequency of ERs with respect to the mutuality theme variable
as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early
Recollections Scoring Manual. The data in Table 7 indicate a
significant difference between the groups with respect to
mutuality theme variable at the .02 level of confidence. The
nonresilient group mentioned a significantly greater
frequency of friendly, cooperative experiences in their ERs
as compared to the resilient group. Hypothesis 16 was,
therefore, rejected.

Hypothesis 17 stated that there was no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs with respect to the getting attention theme variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual. The data in Table 7 do not indicate a significant difference between the groups with respect to the getting attention theme variable at the .05 level of confidence. The two groups did not significantly differ with respect to the frequency of ERs with the theme of getting attention. Hypothesis 17 was, therefore, retained.

Hypothesis 18 stated that there was no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs with respect to the new situation theme variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual. The data in Table 7 do not indicate a significant difference between the groups with respect to a new situation theme variable at the .05 level of confidence. The two groups did not significantly differ with respect to the frequency of ERs with the theme of a new or unfamiliar situation that caused excitement. Hypothesis 18 was, therefore, retained.

Hypothesis 19 stated that there was no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs with respect to the threatening situation theme variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest
Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual. The data in Table 7 do not indicate a significant difference between the groups with respect to the threatening situation theme variable at the .05 level of confidence. The two groups did not significantly differ with respect to the frequency of ERs with the theme of fear or anxiety surrounding a threatening situation. Hypothesis 19 was, therefore, retained.

Hypothesis 20 stated that there was no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals frequency of ERs with respect to the hostility theme variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual. The data in Table 7 do not indicate a significant difference between the groups with respect to the open hostility theme variable at the .05 level of confidence. The two groups did not significantly differ with respect to the frequency of ERs with the theme of open hostility. Hypothesis 20 was, therefore, retained.

Hypothesis 21 stated that there was no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals frequency of ERs with respect to the other theme variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual. The data in Table 7 do not indicate a significant difference between the groups with respect to the other theme variable at the .05 level of confidence. The two groups did not significantly differ with respect to the frequency of ERs with themes that were not listed on the MPMCERSM. Hypothesis 21 was, therefore,
Hypothesis 22 stated that there was no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs with respect to the number of themes variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual. The data in Table 7 do not indicate a significant difference between the groups with respect to the number of themes variable at the .05 level of confidence. The two groups did not significantly differ with respect to the number of themes in their ERs. Hypothesis 22 was, therefore, retained.

In summary, a significant difference between the two groups (resilient and nonresilient) was found on the theme variables of mastery, mutuality, and number of themes. The nonresilient group had significantly more themes that were considered to fall under the mastery variable. The mastery theme is characterized by attempts by the participant to control oneself, others, or the environment by psychological or physical acts. Furthermore, the nonresilient group also mentioned significantly more themes that were considered to fall under the mutuality variable throughout their early recollections. The mutuality theme is characterized by a friendly, socially reciprocal, or cooperative experience with others. The nonresilient group also mentioned a greater number of themes throughout their recollections. The other theme variables (birth of a sibling, death, illness/injury, punishment, misdeeds, givingness, attention-getting, new or
unfamiliar situation causing excitement, fear or anxiety of a threatening situation, open hostility, and other themes not listed on the MPMCEPSM were not significantly different with respect to the frequency of ERs mentioning those variables.

**Category C: Concern with Detail**

Hypotheses 23 through 25 are presented in this section. Table 8 displays the frequency counts, percentages, chi-square values, and level of significance for the concern with Detail category. These variables were concerned with attention the participant gave to something seen, heard, or to describing vigorous movement.

Table 8

**Frequency Counts, Percentages, Chi-Square Values, and Level of Significance for the Concern with Detail Variables of Resilient and Nonresilient Participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Detail</th>
<th>Frequency &amp; Percentage</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Null #23</td>
<td>Visual</td>
<td>46 (38%) 21 (18%)</td>
<td>12.91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #24</td>
<td>Auditory</td>
<td>17 (14%) 11 (9%)</td>
<td>01.44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #25</td>
<td>Motor</td>
<td>57 (48%) 88 (73%)</td>
<td>16.74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;.001*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant

Hypothesis 23 stated that there was no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals frequency of ERs with respect to the visual concern with detail variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest
Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual. The data in Table 8 indicate a significant difference between the groups with respect to the visual variable at the .001 level of confidence. The resilient group had a significantly higher frequency of ERs that attention was given to describing color, size, shape, etc. as compared to the nonresilient group. Hypothesis 23 was, therefore, rejected.

Hypothesis 24 stated that there was no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals frequency of ERs with respect to the visual concern with detail variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual. The data in Table 8 do not indicate a significant difference between the groups with respect to the auditory variable at the .05 level of confidence. The groups did not differ with respect to the frequency of ERs that attention was given to describing volume and quality of sound of something heard. Hypothesis 24 was, therefore, retained.

Hypothesis 25 stated that there was no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals frequency of ERs with respect to the motor concern with detail variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual. The data in Table 8 indicate a significant difference between the groups with respect to the motor variable at the .001 level of confidence. The nonresilient group had a significantly higher frequency of ERs with attention given to describing
some vigorous physical movement detail as compared to the nonresilient group. Hypothesis 25 was, therefore, rejected.

In summary, a significant difference was found between the resilient and nonresilient group with respect to the frequency of ERs with visual and motor concern with detail. The resilient group mentioned a significantly greater frequency of ERs in which attention was given to describing color, size, shape, etc. The nonresilient group had a significantly greater frequency of ERs in which attention was given to describing some vigorous physical movement. There was no significant difference between the groups with respect to the auditory concern with detail.

Category D: Setting

Hypotheses 26 through 35 are presented in the following section. Table 9 displays the frequency counts, percentages, chi-square, and significance for each of the setting variables. These variables regarded the place that the ER occurred.

Hypothesis 26 stated that there was no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals frequency of ERs with respect to the school setting variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual. The data in Table 9 does not indicate a significant difference between the groups with respect to the school variable at the .05 level of confidence. The groups did not differ with respect to the
frequency of ERs mentioning school. Hypothesis 26 was, therefore, retained.

Table 9

**Frequency Counts, Percentages, Chi-square Values, and Level of Significance for the Setting Category Variables of Resilient and Nonresilient Participants.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis #</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Frequency &amp; Percentage</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Null #26</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>08 (06%) 16 (12%)</td>
<td>02.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #27</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>05 (04%) 07 (05%)</td>
<td>00.35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #28</td>
<td>Inside family home</td>
<td>48 (38%) 50 (33%)</td>
<td>00.07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #29</td>
<td>Outside in neighbor</td>
<td>31 (24%) 16 (12%)</td>
<td>05.95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #30</td>
<td>Traveling</td>
<td>05 (04%) 02 (02%)</td>
<td>01.32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #31</td>
<td>Inside non-family home</td>
<td>01 (01%) 02 (02%)</td>
<td>00.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #32</td>
<td>Outside away from home</td>
<td>08 (06%) 16 (13%)</td>
<td>02.96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #33</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>18 (14%) 16 (13%)</td>
<td>00.14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #34</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>03 (02%) 02 (02%)</td>
<td>00.20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #35</td>
<td># of settings</td>
<td>127 127</td>
<td>00.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant

Hypothesis 27 stated that there was no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals frequency of ERs with respect to the hospital setting variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual. The data in Table 9 do not indicate a significant difference between the groups with respect to the school variable at the .05 level.
of confidence. The groups did not differ with respect to the frequency of ERs mentioning a hospital or doctor's office. Hypothesis 27 was, therefore, retained.

Hypothesis 28 stated that there was no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals frequency of ERs with respect to the inside family/relatives home setting variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual. The data in Table 9 do not indicate a significant difference between the groups with respect to the inside family/relatives home variable at the .05 level of confidence. The groups did not differ with respect to the frequency of ERs mentioning the inside area of a family or relative's home. Hypothesis 28 was, therefore, retained.

Hypothesis 29 stated that there was no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals frequency of ERs with respect to the outside in the neighborhood setting variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual. The data in Table 9 indicate a significant difference between the groups with respect to outside in the neighborhood variable at the .02 level of confidence. The groups did significantly differ with respect to the frequency of ERs mentioning outside settings in the participant's neighborhood. Hypothesis 29 was, therefore, rejected.

Hypothesis 30 stated that there was no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals
frequency of ERs with respect to the traveling setting variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual. The data in Table 9 do not indicate a significant difference between the groups with respect to the traveling variable at the .05 level of confidence. The groups did not differ with respect to the frequency of ERs mentioning traveling in a car, plane, boat or other vehicle. Hypothesis 30 was, therefore, retained.

Hypothesis 31 stated that there was no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals' frequency of ERs with respect to the inside non-family home setting variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual. The data in Table 9 do not indicate a significant difference between the groups with respect to the inside non-family home variable at the .05 level of confidence. The groups did not differ with respect to the frequency of ERs mentioning the inside house of a non-family member. Hypothesis 31 was, therefore, retained.

Hypothesis 32 stated that there was no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals frequency of ERs with respect to the outside, away from family home or neighborhood setting variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual. The data in Table 9 do not indicate a significant difference between the groups with respect to the
outside, away from family home or neighborhood variable at
the .05 level of confidence. The groups did not differ with
respect to the frequency of ERs mentioning settings of being
outside, away from the family home or neighborhood.
Hypothesis 32 was, therefore, rejected.

Hypothesis 33 stated that there was no significant
difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals'
frequency of ERs with respect to the unclear setting variable
as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early
Recollections Scoring Manual. The data in Table 9 do not
indicate a significant difference between the groups with
respect to the unclear variable at the .05 level of
confidence. The groups did not differ with respect to the
frequency of ERs that made no clear indication of the
setting. Hypothesis 33 was, therefore, retained.

Hypothesis 34 stated that there was no significant
difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals'
frequency of ERs with respect to the other settings variable
as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early
Recollections Scoring Manual. The data in Table 9 do not
indicate a significant difference between the groups with
respect to the other settings variable at the .05 level of
confidence. The groups did not differ with respect to the
frequency of ERs mentioning other settings not listed on the
MPMCERSM. Hypothesis 34 was, therefore, retained.

Hypothesis 35 stated that there was no significant
difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals
frequency of ERs with respect to the number of settings variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual. The data in Table 9 do not indicate a significant difference between the groups with respect to the number of settings variable at the .05 level of confidence. The groups did not significantly differ with respect to the number of settings in the ERs. Hypothesis 35 was, therefore, retained.

In summary, the resilient and nonresilient group had a significant difference with respect to the frequency of ERs mentioning the outside settings in the participant's neighborhood. They did not significantly differ in the frequency of ERs mentioning the other setting variables (school, hospital/doctor's office, inside the family/relative home, traveling, inside the home of a non-family member, outside, away from family home or neighborhood, unclear, other settings, number of settings).

Category E: Active-Passive

Hypotheses 36 and 37 are presented in this section. Table 10 displays the frequency counts, percentage, chi-square values, and level of confidence. These variables were concerned with the degree of initiation the participant had with regard to what happened in the memory.

Hypothesis 36 stated that there was no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals frequency of ERs with respect to the active variable as
measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual. The data in Table 10 do not indicate a significant difference between the groups with respect to the active variable at the .05 level of confidence. The groups did not differ with respect to the frequency of ERs that the participant initiated action. Hypothesis 36 was, therefore, rejected.

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Active-Passive</th>
<th>Frequency &amp; Percentage</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Null #36</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>51 (42%) 57 (47%)</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #37</td>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>69 (58%) 63 (53%)</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 37 stated that there was no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals frequency of ERs with respect to the passive variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual. The data in Table 10 do not indicate a significant difference between the groups with respect to the passive variable at the .05 level of confidence. The groups did not differ with respect to the frequency of ERs that the participant initiated little or no action. Hypothesis 37 was, therefore, rejected.
In summary, this category was concerned with the degree of initiation the participant had with regard to what occurred in the memory. No significant difference was found between the two groups on these two variables. Both groups mentioned active and passive action with approximately equal frequencies. These results suggest that the participants initiated action or the participants were acted upon in approximately equal numbers of ERs.

Category F: Control

Hypotheses 38 and 39 are presented in the following section. Table 11 displays the frequency counts, percentages, chi-square values and level of confidence for the control category. These variables were concerned with whether the participant assumed responsibility for what happened in the ER.

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Frequency &amp; Percentage</th>
<th>(X^2)</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resilient</td>
<td>Nonresilient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #38</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>41 (34%) 40 (33%)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #39</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>79 (66%) 80 (67%)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 38 stated that there was no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals...
frequency of ERs with respect to the internal variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual. The data in Table 11 do not indicate a significant difference between the groups with respect to the internal variable at the .05 level of confidence. The groups did not differ with respect to the frequency of ERs that the participant accepted responsibility for his/her actions. Hypothesis 38 was, therefore, retained.

Hypothesis 39 stated that there was no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals frequency of ERs with respect to the external variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual. The data in Table 11 do not indicate a significant difference between the groups with respect to the internal variable at the .05 level of confidence. The groups did not differ with respect to the frequency of ERs that the participant dissociated from any consequences to his/her actions. Hypothesis 39 was, therefore, rejected.

This category concerned itself with whether or not the participant takes responsibility for what occurs in the early recollection. The internal variable corresponds to the participant accepting the responsibility and the external variable corresponds with the participant dissociating from the consequences of the ER. No significant difference was found between the two groups with respect to the frequency of ERs mentioning these variables. Both groups had the highest
frequency of ERs on the external control variable.

Category G: Affect

Hypotheses 40, 41, and 42 are presented in the following section. Table 12 displays the frequency counts, percentages, chi-square values and level of confidence for the affect category. These variables are concerned with the pleasantness, unpleasantness, or lack of an affective state that the participant felt when the ER happened.

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Affect</th>
<th>Frequency &amp; Percentage</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resilient</td>
<td>Nonresilient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #40</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>38 (32%)</td>
<td>46 (38%)</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #41</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>65 (54%)</td>
<td>69 (58%)</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #42</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>17 (14%)</td>
<td>05 (04%)</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant

Hypothesis 40 stated that there was no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals frequency of ERs with respect to the positive affect variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual. The data in Table 11 do not indicate a significant difference between the groups with respect to the positive affect variable at the .05 level of
confidence. The groups did not differ with respect to the frequency of ERs with an pleasant overall feeling tone. Hypothesis 40 was, therefore, retained.

Hypothesis 41 stated that there was no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals frequency of ERs with respect to the negative affect variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual. The data in Table 12 do not indicate a significant difference between the groups with respect to the active variable at the .05 level of confidence. The groups did not differ with respect to the frequency of ERs with an overall unpleasant feeling tone. Hypothesis 41 was, therefore, retained.

Hypothesis 42 stated that there was no significant difference between resilient and nonresilient individuals frequency of ERs with respect to the neutral affect variable as measured by the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual. The data in Table 12 indicate a significant difference between the groups with respect to the neutral affect variable at the .05 level of confidence. The resilient group had a significantly greater frequency of ERs with no apparent indication of affect (neutral affect). Hypothesis 42 was, therefore, rejected.

This category was concerned with the pleasantness, unpleasantness, or lack of these affective states that the participant felt when the ER occurred. A significant difference was found on the neutral variable. The resilient
group had significantly more ERs with a neutral affective state as compared to the nonresilient group. The neutral variable suggests that affect was not apparent in the ERs of this group.

Table 13 displays a summary of the frequency counts, percentages, chi-square values, and level of confidence for each of the variables that were significantly different between the two groups.

Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis Variable</th>
<th>Frequency &amp; Percentage</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resilient</td>
<td>Nonresilient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #1 Mother</td>
<td>58 (26%)</td>
<td>41 (22%)</td>
<td>04.97</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #2 Father</td>
<td>65 (29%)</td>
<td>41 (22%)</td>
<td>09.73</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #6 Group</td>
<td>09 (04%)</td>
<td>21 (11%)</td>
<td>05.48</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #15 Mastery</td>
<td>03 (06%)</td>
<td>33 (16%)</td>
<td>16.62</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #16 Mutuality</td>
<td>15 (10%)</td>
<td>29 (14%)</td>
<td>05.45</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #22 # of themes</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>09.80</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #23 Visual</td>
<td>46 (38%)</td>
<td>21 (18%)</td>
<td>12.91</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #25 Motor</td>
<td>57 (48%)</td>
<td>88 (73%)</td>
<td>16.64</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #29 Outside in neighborhood</td>
<td>31 (24%)</td>
<td>16 (12%)</td>
<td>05.95</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null #42 Neutral</td>
<td>17 (14%)</td>
<td>05 (04%)</td>
<td>07.20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Post-Hoc Analyses

Thirty-two of the 42 null hypotheses tested were retained. Significant differences were obtained on ten of the variables found on the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual (1974). Analyses of the variables yielded a significant difference for: mother, father, group, mastery, mutuality, number of themes, concern with visual detail, concern with motor detail, the setting of outside in the participant's neighborhood, and the neutral affect.

Of these ten significant variables, six were subjected to a series of post-hoc descriptive analyses, involving frequency and percentages for the affective component (i.e., positive, negative, neutral). Prior research that utilized the Manaster and Perryman (1974) scoring manual typically interpreted the overall affect of each ER on the basis of the scored affective variable. This score was determined on the basis of the ER theme and the subjective report of affect as identified by the participant. This approach limited the researcher's ability to identify differences between the groups with respect to affect involving the remaining six significant variables. For example, it is possible for a participant to have received an overall negative affect score for an ER, yet a character in a memory may have played a positive role. In the current study, the resilient group mentioned the mother character variable significantly more than the nonresilient group. Given the prior method of
scoring, one is unable to ascertain whether this character was viewed more positively, negatively or neutrally. Thus, the following six significant variables were subjected to post-hoc analyses for the purpose of identifying the affective component associated with them by each group: mother, father, group, mastery, mutuality, and, outside in the participant's neighborhood.

The following four variables were not analyzed: number of themes, visual concern with detail, motor concern with detail, and, neutral affect. The three variables of number of themes, visual and motor concern with detail were not analyzed because they have no associated affective component. The variable of neutral affect was not investigated because of its inherent affective component. That is to say, any ER having the neutral affect variable present meant that the overall affect of the memory had already been interpreted as being neither pleasant nor unpleasant.

Tables 14, 15, and 16 present the frequency counts and percentages of the affective components associated with the mother, father and group characters, respectively.

The current study found that the resilient group mentioned the mother character significantly more frequently than the nonresilient group. The highest frequency count of affect was rated as negative (i.e., 59%) for the ERs of the resilient group mentioning the mother character variable. Additionally, there was a trend for both groups to report negative affect when mentioning the mother character.
Table 14

**Frequency Counts and Percentages for the Affective Components Associated with the Mother Character for the Resilient and Nonresilient Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother Character</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resilient</td>
<td>15 (26%)</td>
<td>09 (15%)</td>
<td>34 (59%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresilient</td>
<td>12 (30%)</td>
<td>03 (07%)</td>
<td>26 (63%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The current study found that the resilient group mentioned the father character significantly more frequently than the nonresilient group. The highest frequency of affect was rated as negative (i.e., 62%) for the ERs of the resilient group mentioning the father character variable. As with the mother character variable, there was a trend for both groups to report negative affect when mentioning the father character.

Table 15

**Frequency Counts and Percentages for the Affective Components Associated with the Father Character for the Resilient and Nonresilient Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father Character</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resilient</td>
<td>16 (25%)</td>
<td>09 (14%)</td>
<td>40 (62%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresilient</td>
<td>17 (41%)</td>
<td>00 (00%)</td>
<td>24 (59%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The current analysis found that the nonresilient group
mentioned the group variable significantly more than the resilient group. The highest frequency of affect was rated as negative (i.e., 57%) for the ERs of the nonresilient group mentioning the group variable. The resilient group did not have a high frequency of ERs mentioning the group variable; however, when the variable was mentioned, the resilient group had an equal frequency of positive and negative associated affect.

Table 16

**Frequency Counts and Percentages for the Affective Components Associated with the Group Character for the Resilient and Nonresilient Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Character</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resilient</td>
<td>04 (44%)</td>
<td>01 (11%)</td>
<td>04 (44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresilient</td>
<td>08 (38%)</td>
<td>01 (05%)</td>
<td>12 (57%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 17 and 18 display the frequency counts and percentages of the affective components associated with the two theme variables that were significantly different between the two groups.

The current analysis found that the nonresilient group mentioned the mastery theme (Table 17) significantly more than the resilient group. The highest frequency of affect was divided approximately equally between the negative and positive affect (i.e., 52% and 48%, respectively) for the ERs of the nonresilient group that mentioned the mastery theme.
The resilient group did not mention the mastery theme as frequent as the nonresilient group. When the resilient group mentioned this theme, the highest frequency of associated affect was positive (i.e., 78%).

Table 17

**Frequency Counts and Percentages for the Affective Components Associated with the Mastery Theme for the Resilient and Nonresilient Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mastery Theme</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resilient</td>
<td>07 (78%)</td>
<td>00 (00%)</td>
<td>02 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresilient</td>
<td>16 (48%)</td>
<td>00 (00%)</td>
<td>17 (52%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18

**Frequency Counts and Percentages for the Affective Components Associated with the Mutuality Theme for the Resilient and Nonresilient Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mutuality Theme</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resilient</td>
<td>11 (100%)</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresilient</td>
<td>29 (100%)</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The current analysis found that the nonresilient group mentioned the mutuality theme (Table 18) significantly more than the resilient group. The highest frequency of affect was rated as positive (i.e., 100%) for the ERs of the nonresilient group that mentioned the mutuality theme. The
resilient group also had a positive affect associated with
the frequency of ERs mentioning this theme (i.e., 100%).

Table 19 displays the affective components associated
with the setting that was significantly different between the
two groups.

Table 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outside in Neighborhood</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resilient</td>
<td>15 (48%)</td>
<td>01 (04%)</td>
<td>15 (48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresilient</td>
<td>07 (44%)</td>
<td>01 (06%)</td>
<td>08 (50%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The current analysis found that the resilient group
mentioned the setting of outside in the neighborhood
significantly more than the nonresilient group. The highest
frequency of affect was divided equally between the positive
and negative affect (i.e., 48% and 48%, respectively) for the
ERs of the resilient group that mentioned the setting of
outside in the neighborhood. The nonresilient did not
mention this setting as frequently. When the nonresilient
group mentioned this variable, there was a similar trend with
both positive and negative affect ratings divided equally
(i.e., 44% and 50%, respectively).
Discussion

The discussion will be drawn from the use of the manifest content of ERs, the theoretical implications of ERs, Adlerian theory, and resiliency research. The resilient and nonresilient groups had significant differences in five of the seven categories on the Manaster Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollection Scoring Manual (MPMCERSM). There were 10 specific variables encompassed in the five categories that differentiated the two groups. The significant differences in the categories included the following:

A. Character category: mother, father and group variables;

B. Theme category: mastery, mutuality, number of themes variables;

C. Concern with detail: visual and motor variables;

D. Setting: Outside in the neighborhood variable;

E. Affect: neutral variable.

Character Category

The character category simply refers to the characters that were mentioned in the participant's ER. The fact that the participant mentioned the character indicated the salience the character had on the participant. This category included seven separate character variables and a variable for the number of characters mentioned by the participant. Results of this study included the mentioning of the mother and father characters by the resilient group significantly more often than the nonresilient group. The nonresilient
group mentioned groups significantly more frequently than the resilient group. The ER characters of siblings, other family, non-family, animals, and number of characters did not significantly differentiate the two groups. Taken one at a time, the character variables will be discussed.

The mother variable was mentioned significantly more by the resilient group. This finding could suggest that the resilient group had an increased awareness of the mother figure in their lives. The more frequent mentioning of the mother character suggests the salience of the mother in the lives of resilient individuals.

Other researchers found that the mother character was mentioned significantly more by criminal justice majors as compared to non-criminal justice majors (Coram & Shields, 1987), nursing/medical students and graduate counseling students as compared to business, and teaching students (Manaster & Perryman, 1974), normals as compared to alcoholics (Hafner, Fakouri, & Labrentz, 1982). The interpretations of these findings reported by the researchers suggested that the mother-helper-supporter role was reinforced by the occupational choices of the nursing/medical students and counseling graduate students (Manaster & Perryman, 1974) and that the mother character could be viewed as a figure to dominate without the fear of retaliation by the criminal justice majors (Coram & Shields, 1987).

An interpretation using Adler's (1927) concept of the creative self suggests that the mother figure may have acted
as a motivator for the resilient group. The concept of the creative self asserts that humans construct their own personalities out of the raw material of heredity and experience. Theoretically, the mother character finding suggests that the personality and life goals of the resilient individual may be more highly influenced by the interactions with a mother figure, and the interpreted meanings of these interactions. In addition, post-hoc analysis found that the mother image as mentioned in the ERs of both groups, was most often associated with a negative affective component. This finding suggests that both groups had a negative affective tone regarding the mother figure in their lives.

The father character variable was also mentioned significantly more in the ERs of the resilient group. This finding suggests that the father image may also act as an influential role in the lives of resilient individuals. Previous research exploring ERs of other groups and utilizing the MPMCERSM had not reported the father character to be a statistically significant factor. In the current post-hoc analysis, the father character was most often associated with the negative affective component for both the resilient and nonresilient groups. This suggests that both groups had a somewhat negative outlook regarding the father figure in their lives.

The group character variable was mentioned significantly more frequently by the nonresilient group. This finding suggests that nonresilient individuals had an increased
awareness of interactions with groups of individuals. Prior research reported the variable of groups to be mentioned significantly more frequently by electrical engineering majors as compared to other types of engineering students (Hafner, Fakouri, & Etzler, 1986).

The post-hoc analyses found that the affective component most frequently associated with the variable of groups was negative for the ERs of the nonresilient group mentioning this variable. The resilient participants mentioned groups less frequently; however, when the resilient group mentioned groups in their ERs, they had an approximately equal frequency of ERs divided between the negative and positive affect.

The frequency of mentioning the non-family character variable was not significantly different between the resilient and nonresilient groups. Prior research reported this variable to be a statistically significant factor in the ERs of teaching and nursing/medical students as compared to business and counseling students (Manaster & Perryman, 1974) and medical technicians as compared to nurses (McFarland, 1988). The interpretations given by the researchers suggested that the careers of the groups were oriented to working with large numbers of non-family members (Manaster & Perryman, 1974). The results of the current study suggest that non-family members of the resilient and nonresilient individuals were not significantly different with respect to their salience to the participants.
The frequency of mentioning the siblings character variable, the other family character variable, and the animal character variable were not significantly different between the resilient and nonresilient groups. Prior research did not report these variable to be a statistically significant factor among other groups. The results of this study are consistent with prior research.

**Theme Category**

The theme category was comprised of 14 variables and concerned with the theme or plot of the ER. The category of themes significantly differentiated the resilient and nonresilient groups on the variables of mastery, mutuality and number of themes. The nonresilient group mentioned themes concerning attempts made to control one's environment (mastery), friendly, cooperative experiences (mutuality), and a greater number of themes mentioned significantly more than the resilient group. Research on ERs found that medical technologists (McFarland, 1988) and nursing students (Fakouri, Fakouri, & Hafner, 1986) had significantly more mastery themes as compared to the other groups in these studies. Additionally, research found that Vietnam war veterans with chronic psychological problems mentioned a higher number of mastery themes (Heyer, Woods, & Boudewyns, 1989). These researchers (Heyer, Woods, & Boudewyns, 1989) further noted that the veterans studied achieved the control of their environments in a socially devious manner. These
results may be related to the current post-hoc findings that 52% of the mastery themes mentioned by the nonresilient group had a negative affective component associated with the recollection.

The mastery theme variable may be related to Seyle's (1980) definition of a stressor. Seyle (1980) stated that a stressor had a "wear and tear" effect on one's body which required an extra effort of adaptation. The mastery variable is scored if the ER is focused on an attempt to control the environment. The nonresilient individuals may have had increased awareness of the extra effort put forth to overcome environmental stressors. Furthermore, Seyle (1974) noted that stressors could have either a positive or a negative behavioral reaction. The high percentage of mastery themes with an associated negative affect may be related to the nonresilient groups increased awareness of the negative reactions associated with attempting to control the environment.

In comparison, the resilient group had significantly fewer themes of mastery as compared to the nonresilient group. This finding may again be related to Seyle's (1980) remarks about stress. The resilient group may have had a decreased awareness, as compared to the nonresilient group, of their attempts to control their environments.

Another explanation for the high frequency of mastery themes, drawn from the resiliency research, focuses on Anthony's (1987) definition and explanation of "pseudo-
resilience." He describes pseudo-resilient individuals as characterized by overdeveloped counterphobic defenses and exhibitionism. These "pseudoheroes" (Anthony, 1987) need to demonstrate prowess and strength by carrying out difficult tasks which often require great risk and effort. Anthony states that the compulsiveness of their acts suggests they may, in reality, be brittle and timid.

Adler's (1930) notion of fictional finalism may also facilitate understanding this finding. Basically, Adler contended that humans lived by many purely fictional ideas that have no counterpart in reality. These fictional goals were, for Adler, the subjective causation of psychological events. Furthermore, normal individuals could free themselves from the influence of these goals and face reality when necessity demanded, something that troubled individuals were incapable of doing. The final goal of mastery for the nonresilient individuals may be an example of a fictional goal that has not been reached.

Adler's (1930) idea of striving for superiority may also facilitate in understanding the mastery theme finding. According to Adler's theory, the concept of striving for superiority is the innate drive for perfection and completion that counterbalances the innate feeling of inferiority. Adler (1930) stated that striving for superiority "lies at the root of all solutions of life's problems and is manifested in the way in which we meet these problems." He further believed that all of one's behaviors follow the
direction of this striving; however, superiority can be sought in either a right or wrong direction. Troubled individuals strive for egoistic and selfish goals whereas the normal person strives for goals that are primarily social in nature. A theoretical interpretation of the theme finding may suggest that the nonresilient individuals may feel inferior and strive for environmental control (mastery) in a selfish manner.

Another significant finding was in regard to the mutuality theme. The higher frequency of mutuality themes by the nonresilient group could suggest that they had an increased awareness of the friendly, cooperative experiences in their lives. Other researchers found normals to have a higher frequency of mutuality themes as compared to alcoholics (Hafner, Fakouri, & Labrentz, 1982).

A significant difference was found in the number of themes mentioned in the ERs. The nonresilient group mentioned significantly more themes throughout their ERs. Another group that had highly varied themes included a paranoid schizophrenic group (Hafner, Fakouri, Ollendick, and Corotto, 1979). The finding that nonresilient individuals and individuals with paranoid schizophrenia have more themes mentioned in their ERs suggests a possibility of a negative interpretation of this finding. One explanation to entertain is that a greater number of themes may be related to a lesser degree of focus and a sense of being scattered or pulled in many directions. Researchers using the Manaster-Perryman
scoring manual often do not utilize this variable (Hafner, Fakouri, & Labrentz, 1982). According to leading ER researchers, there is little utility and interpretive meaning of the number of themes variable (Hafner, Fakouri, & Labrentz, 1982). Thus, this variable requires further investigation in order to postulate a definable way to better understand this finding.

The two groups were not significantly different with regard to the frequency of ERs with the following themes: birth of a sibling, death, illness/injury, punishment, misdeeds, givingness, attention-getting, new or unfamiliar situations, anxiety provoking or threatening situations, hostility, and other themes.

The frequency of mentioning an ER with the plot being an illness or injury was not significantly different for the resilient and nonresilient groups. Prior research reported this variable to be mentioned significantly more by electrical engineering students when compared to other types of engineering majors (Hafner, Fakouri, & Etzler, 1985), normals as compared to alcoholics, Vietnam veterans diagnosed with PTSD (Kuykendall, Cowan, & Boudewyns, 1989) and criminal justice majors as compared to non-criminal justice majors (Coram & Shields, 1987). The results of the current study suggest that the participants did not significantly differ with respect to the salience of a plot of the ERs being an illness or injury.

The frequency of mentioning an ER with the plot being
the act of getting attention was not significantly different for the resilient and nonresilient groups. Prior research reported that non-alcoholics had a significantly greater frequency of this theme when compared to alcoholics (Hafner, Fakouri, Ollendick & Corotto, 1979). The results of the current study suggest that the participants did not significantly differ with respect to the salience of the plot of the ERs of getting attention.

The frequency of mentioning an ER with the plot being a new situation that caused excitement was not significantly different for the resilient and nonresilient groups. Prior research reported a significant higher frequency of this theme for paranoid schizophrenics as compared to other types of schizophrenia (Hafner, Corotto, & Fakouri, 1980) and criminal justice majors as compared to other students (Coram & Shields, 1987). The results of the current study suggest that the participants did not significantly differ with respect to the salience of a plot in a new situation.

The frequency of mentioning an ER with the plot being a threatening situation was not significantly different for the resilient and nonresilient groups. Prior research reported a significantly higher frequency of ERs with this theme for anxiety neurotics as compared to other mental disorders (Jackson & Sechrest, 1962) and Vietnam war veterans with PTSD (Hyper, Woods, & Boudewyns, 1989). The results of the current study suggest that the participants did not significantly differ with respect to the salience of a plot
that was considered threatening.

The frequency of mentioning an ER with the plot being marked by open hostility was not significantly different for the resilient and nonresilient groups. Prior research reported a significant higher frequency of this theme for mechanical engineering students as compared to other types of engineering majors (Hafner, Fakouri, & Etzler, 1986). The results of the current study suggest that the participants did not significantly differ with respect to the salience of a plot marked by open hostility.

The frequency of mentioning an ER with the plot being the birth of a sibling, the experience of death, the act of committing a misdeed, the act of being punished, the act of giving, and a plot that was not listed on the MPMCRSM were not significantly different for the resilient and nonresilient groups. Prior research did not report significant differences between others groups with respect to these variables. The results of this study are consistent with prior research.

**Concern with Detail Category**

This category was comprised of three variables and was concerned with attention the participant gave to something seen (visual), heard (auditory), or to describing vigorous movement (motor). A significant difference between the groups was found on the visual and motor detail variables. Resilient individuals had significantly more ERs that were
described and scored as visually detailed. The nonresilient group had significantly more motor details in their ERs. The two groups did not significantly differ with respect to the frequency of ERs attending to something heard (auditory variable).

Research results indicated that criminal justice majors as compared to non-criminal justice majors (Coram & Shields, 1987), medical technologists as compared to nurses (McFarland, 1988), and normals as compared to alcoholics (Hafner, Fakouri & Labrentz, 1982) reported significantly more visual detail in their ERs suggesting that the ability to utilize visual information is critical in their lives.

The visual concern with detail variable is characterized by attention given to describing color, size, shape, etc., of persons or objects in the Early Recollection. The visual detail variable may be conceptualized as a symbol of the resilient group's ability to see their environment more clearly, thus, enabling them to plan and react in a constructive manner.

The nonresilient group had a significantly higher mentioning of motor details in their ERs. Research findings suggested that alcoholics who were willing to continue substance abuse treatment had significantly more motor details in their ERs as compared to nonalcoholics and alcoholics who did not want to continue treatment (Chesney, Fakouri, & Hafner, 1986) and nursing students (Fakouri, Fakouri & Hafner, 1986). These researchers suggested that
alcoholics who were unwilling to continue treatment were actually more well adjusted than alcoholics who were willing to continue treatment. This finding, in turn, would imply that those individuals who mentioned more motor details may have been less well adjusted. This suggests that the nonresilient group may have been less well adjusted than the resilient group.

The concern with motor detail variable was defined as attention given to describing some vigorous physical movement. This definition relates to research findings that noted nonresilient children were restless and demonstrated wild and aggressive behavior (Neiman, 1988). An Adlerian perspective of this finding may be interpreted as the nonresilient group being less goal directed and having less social interest.

The frequency of mentioning an ER with the concern for detail being auditory was not significantly different for the resilient and nonresilient groups. Prior research did not report significant differences between other groups with respect to this variable. The results of the current study suggest that the participants did not significantly differ with respect to the attention given to something that was heard in the ER.

**Setting Category**

This category was comprised of 10 variables and was concerned with where the ER took place. The resilient group
mentioned the setting of being outside in the neighborhood significantly more than the nonresilient group. The two groups did not significantly differ with respect to the other setting variables: school, hospital/doctor's office, inside the family home, traveling, inside non-family members' home, outside away from the home, settings that were unclear, other settings, and the number of settings.

A significant difference was found on the variable of outside in the neighborhood. The resilient group had a significantly higher frequency of ERs with this theme. The significant finding of outside in the participant's neighborhood may be related to Honig's (1986) findings that stress was linked to overcrowded household living conditions. Research on resiliency suggested that overcrowding in the home of children is a risk factor that can lead to pathology (Rutter, 1979). Thus, resilient individuals may have had to cope with overcrowding in their homes by removing themselves to another place.

Another possible explanation for this finding may be related to the sociability of resilient children. Block (1981) noted that sociability is a common characteristic of resilient children. The notion of being outside of the home and in the individual's neighborhood may suggest a high social nature for this group because they were engaging in activities away from their home environments and possibly increasing their interactions with other people during these activities. Furthermore, the ability and desire of the
resilient group to leave their home environment may represent their ability to go outside their sphere of experience and find alternative possibilities for their lives.

The frequency of mentioning an ER with the setting being at a hospital or doctor's office was not significantly different for the resilient and nonresilient groups. Prior research reported a significantly higher frequency of this setting for nurses as compared to medical technicians (McFarland, 1988). The results of the current study suggest that the participants did not significantly differ with respect to the salience of the setting of being in a hospital or doctor's office.

The frequency of mentioning an ER with a traveling setting was not significantly different for the resilient and nonresilient groups. Prior research reported a significantly higher frequency of this setting for criminal justice majors as compared to non-criminal justice majors (Coram & Shields, 1987). The results of the current study suggest that the participants did not significantly differ with respect to the salience of the setting of traveling.

The frequency of mentioning an ER with the setting being inside a non-family member's home was not significantly different for the resilient and nonresilient groups. Prior research reported a significantly higher frequency of this setting for criminal justice majors as compared to non-criminal justice majors (Coram & Shields, 1987) and medical technicians as compared to nurses (McFarland, 1988). The
results of the current study suggest that the participants did not significantly differ with respect to the salience of the setting of being inside a non-family member's home.

The frequency of mentioning an ER with the setting being at school, inside the home of a family member, outside away from home, an unclear setting, a setting not listed on the MPMCERSM, and the total number of different settings were not significantly different for the resilient and nonresilient groups. Prior research did not report significant differences among other groups with respect to these variables. The results of the current study are consistent with prior research.

**Active-Passive Category**

This category was comprised of two variables and was concerned with the degree of initiation the participant had with regard to what happened in the memory. The participant could have initiated action (active) or the participant could have initiated little or no action (passive). There was no significant difference found between the resilient and nonresilient groups with respect to the active-passive category. Prior research found that Vietnam veterans suffering from Post-traumatic Stress Disorder (Hyer, Woods & Boudewyns, 1989) and nursing students compared to non-nursing majors (Fakouri, Fakouri & Hafner, 1986) had significantly more active ERs. This finding may simply be a function of the three different comparison groups.
Internal-External Control Category

This category was comprised of two variables and was concerned with whether the participant assumed responsibility for what happened in the ER. The internal variable was scored if the participant accepted responsibility for what happened and the external variable was scored if the participant dissociated from any consequences or outcomes of the ER. There was no significant differences found among the resilient and nonresilient groups with respect to the internal-external locus of control category.

Researchers previously found that medical technicians as compared to nurses (McFarland, 1988), and nursing students as compared to non-nursing students (Fakouri, Fakouri & Hafner, 1986) had significantly higher internal control in their ERs. External control was significant in the ERs of nurses as compared to medical technicians (McFarland, 1988), electrical engineers as compared to other types of engineering majors (Hafner, Fakouri, & Etzler, 1986), and alcoholics as compared to normals (Hafner, Fakouri & Labrentz, 1982). Again, the absence of any significant differences in the current study may simply indicate that the comparison groups were not similar.

Affect category

This category was composed of three variables and was concerned with the pleasantness (positive), unpleasantness (negative), or lack of these affective states (neutral). The
resilient group had significantly more ERs with neutral affect as compared to the nonresilient group. The groups did not significantly differ with respect to the frequency of ERs with pleasant or unpleasant affective tones. Prior research reported a significantly higher frequency of negative affect in the ERs of Vietnam war veterans (Hyper, Woods, & Boudewyns, 1989).

Adcock's (1975) study on early memories and gender differences hypothesized a higher frequency of positive affect within female ERs. Adcock found that females had significantly more neutral affect in their ERs. As noted earlier, the sample of resilient individuals was composed of more females than males (females = 24, males = 16) and thus a gender difference may account for this finding.

Another possible explanation for the difference between the resilient and nonresilient groups involved the issue of temperament. According to Rutter (1983) temperamentally easy children manage to avoid negative interactions and are less likely than temperamentally difficult children to be the subject of parental criticism. Additionally, Bleuler (1978) noted that resilient children tended to use withdrawal and distancing as coping mechanisms. He further stated that these children became less cautious when a trusting relationship was established.

A third possible explanation for this finding relates to the resilient research conducted by O'Connell-Higgins (1983). She suggested that resilient individuals may have an active
evocative approach toward solving life's problems. This approach would enable them to successfully negotiate emotionally hazardous experiences. Resilient individuals may use a cognitive coping mechanism that facilitates the ability to remain emotionally controlled and calm.

Lazarus and Folkman (1984) hypothesized a transactional perspective to explaining the concept of stress. This approach describes the process of coping as comprised of active efforts that manage environmental and internal demands, as well as the conflicts that arise between them. Furthermore, they conceptualized two types of coping processes: problem-focused coping and emotion-focused coping. The former process involves attempts to alter the sources of stress (i.e., changing one's problem-maintaining behavior or changing existing environmental conditions). The latter process involves attempts to regulate one's emotional responses to the problem (i.e., controlling stressful emotions or physiological arousal in order to maintain a satisfactory internal state for information processing and action). This concept of emotion-focused coping may explain the resilient group's high number of ERs with neutral affect.

**Similarities of the Two Groups**

Similarities among the resilient and nonresilient groups were interesting and noteworthy. Both groups mentioned the following six variables most frequently in their ERs:

1. negative recollections of parental figures;
2. motor concern with detail (attention given to describing some vigorous physical movement);
3. inside family/relative home setting;
4. passivity (initiates little or no action; acted upon rather than take action);
5. external control (disassociates from any consequences or outcomes of the ER); and,
6. negative affect (overall feeling tone is unpleasant).

These findings may simply suggest that these groups are similar in nature with respect to the above six variables and that these similarities may be indicative of their early "at-risk" environments.

**Summary of the Findings**

In summary, the resilient group's ERs revealed the significance of the mother and father figures, the setting of outside in the neighborhood, the visual detail, and the neutral affect. The nonresilient group's ERs revealed significance on the experiences of being in a group, themes of mastery and mutuality, a greater number of themes, and motor detail.
Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter contains the summary, conclusions, implications, and recommendations based on the research investigating the early recollections of resilient and nonresilient individuals.

Summary

The present study was designed to investigate the manifest content of the early recollections of resilient and nonresilient adults. A review of the literature revealed a considerable amount of information regarding the many aspects of early recollections. To date, this information includes a fairly standard definition of ERs (Dreikurs, 1952; Gushurst, 1971; Mosak, 1958), high interrater reliability has been reported (Gushurst, 1971), and concurrent validity has been demonstrated (Gushurst, 1971; Jones, 1987). Early recollections have also been investigated for the purposes of educational/vocational exploration, as a projective instrument, and as a differential diagnostic tool. It was speculated that research in this field could be enhanced by studying adults who were at-risk as children.
The purpose of the current study was to determine if adults, defined as resilient, have significantly different ERs than adults who have not overcome many of the obstacles they encountered as children (nonresilient adults). The study was conducted in an effort to contribute to the existing literature of resilient characteristics and early recollections of particular groups.

**Null Hypothesis**

The following was the general null hypothesis of this study:

There are no significant differences in the manifest content of Early Recollections of adults who were considered at-risk as children who have been successful in their adult lives (resilient adults) and those who were at-risk as children and continue to display problems in adulthood (nonresilient adults).

**Findings**

Analyses of the variables yielded a significant difference for the characters of mother, father, group, the theme of mastery and mutuality, visual and motor detail, the setting of outside in the participant's neighborhood, and the neutral affect. Specifically, the resilient group compared to the nonresilient group had an increased awareness of their mother and father figures, a heightened sense of visual detail, a desire to be outside in their neighborhood, and a predominant neutral emotional affect in their early
recollections. In comparison to the resilient group, the nonresilient group had an increased awareness of non-family groups, themes of mastery and mutuality, and a heightened sense of motor detail in their early recollections.

Conclusions

Within the limitations previously noted, the following conclusions are warranted:

1. The Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Scoring Manual is a useful tool in differentiating between resilient and nonresilient individuals manifest content of their early recollections.

2. Unpleasant feelings associated with the characters of mother and father may be more salient and involved in the guiding theme or life plan of resilient individuals as compared to nonresilient individuals.

3. Unpleasant feelings associated with groups of individuals may be more salient and involved in the guiding theme or life plan of nonresilient individuals as compared to resilient individuals.

4. Control over the environment (mastery theme) may be particularly salient and involved in the guiding theme or plan of nonresilient individuals as compared to resilient individuals. Control, however, may be attempted in a socially deviant manner as was noted in the high frequency of negative affect associated with the mastery theme for the nonresilient group.
5. Resilient individuals may attend more to describing color, size, or description of a person, object, or scene as compared to nonresilient individuals. This greater attention to visual detail might suggest a greater awareness, vividness, or perceptiveness in their outlook on life. This conclusion is supported by prior research that found "normals" mentioned visual detail more often than non-normal groups (Hafner, Fakouri, & Labrentz, 1982; Chesney, Fakouri, & Hafner, 1986).

6. Nonresilient individuals may attend more to vigorous movement as compared to resilient individuals. Early recollections involving motor detail (i.e., attention given to describing some vigorous physical movement) have previously been found to be more prevalent in the ERs of non-normal populations (Hafner, Fakouri, and Labrentz, 1982). A conclusion is thus drawn that the motor detail variable may have a strong association with individuals who have significant problems in their lives.

7. Resilient individuals may tend to view themselves, others, and the world with less emotionality as compared to nonresilient individuals, as evidenced in the greater frequency of feelings that were neither pleasant nor unpleasant in their ERs.

**Implications**

Based on the results of the present study, the following implications are warranted:
The findings of this study support the Adlerian assumption that childhood memories can be useful in better understanding the lifestyles of individuals. The fact that resilient and nonresilient individuals were differentiated on ten of the 42 variables on the Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content Early Recollections Manual strongly suggests that this instrument can be an effective tool in differentiating between groups. This study supports the Adlerian view that early recollections reveal a person's consistent guiding line for adapting to life and its demands.

The findings also suggest that mental health professionals may augment their assessment and therapeutic work with at-risk populations by attending to the personality variables found in this study. Finally, the definition of resilience utilized in this study separated the resilient and nonresilient groups in a manner that may be useful to others investigating this area of research.

**Recommendations**

The results of this study suggest that there are differences in the Early Recollections of resilient and nonresilient individuals. The ten variables that were significantly different leave one with many hypotheses about these group differences. This study attempted to identify these differences; however, several suggestions for future research endeavors are warranted.

One recommendation for future researchers is to further
understand these findings by completing in-depth interpretation interviews with participants who fit the operational definition of resiliency and nonresiliency. These interviews could be constructed in a manner that would shed additional light on the specific characteristics of the resilient individual’s mother, father, affective state, and ways of coping. These results could then be added to the list generated by O’Connell-Higgins (1983) as common characteristics of resilient individuals.

Another recommendation focuses on the interconnection of the 42 variables listed on the Manaster-Perryman Early Recollection Scoring Manual (1974). It is recommended that future researchers find a way to view these variables in a manner that would provide intercorrelations among them. An example would be to correlate the specific character(s) mentioned with the affective state variable and/or the control variable. These results could then facilitate the broadening of the list of common characteristics of resilient individuals.

Finally, it is recommended that future research be conducted on the interpretation and utility of the variable of "number of themes" to determine whether this variable is highly associated with troubled populations.
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APPENDIX A

The Manaster-Perryman Manifest Content

Early Recollections Scoring Manual

The scoring variables for the ERs developed and utilized in connection with the study are listed below. Explanations and examples will appear after each item and/or category where necessary to clarify the meaning and method for scoring the variable.

A. Characters (Persons mentioned in the ER)

1. Mother
2. Father
3. Siblings
4. Other family members (includes aunts, uncles, grandparents, etc...)
5. Non-family members
6. Group (References to a group or groups of people: (e.g. "My class went on a field trip").)
7. Animal
8. Number of character types mentioned in the ER (may range from 0-7)

Category A concerns the characters mentioned in the memory, whether they played an active role in the memory or not. The fact that they are mentioned by the participant indicates their salience to that individual. Score
"character" variables on a presence or absence basis, except for #8 which receives a numerical score.

B. Themes (What the memory is about)

9. Birth of a sibling
10. Death
11. Illness or injury
12. Punishment
13. Misdeeds (acts committed by subject that were known to be wrong
14. Givingness (generosity or kindness whether overt or covert: e.g. "The old lady looked ill and I wanted to help her").
15. Mastery (attempts by the participant to gain control of himself, others, or the environment by psychological or physical acts: ("I knew he was going to hit me so I played dumb". "I tried to reach the cookie jar, but couldn't quite make it").
16. Mutuality (a friendly, socially reciprocal, or cooperative experience with others: e.g. "My family went to the beach and everyone had a great time.")
17. Attention-getting (the participant receives or wants special attention)
18. New or unfamiliar situation causing excitement (e.g. "I remember the first day of school." "We got caught in a storm and it was very exciting.")
19. Fear or anxiety provoking or threatening situation (e.g. "The old man chased me and I was really scared.")

20. Open hostility

21. Other (list other themes separately)

22. Number of themes in the ER (may range from 1-13)

Category B concerns the themes or plot of the ER. Score "theme" variables on a presence or absence basis, except for #22 which receives a numerical score.

C. Concern with Detail

23. Visual (attention given to describing color, size, shape, etc... of a person or object: e.g. "I remember my pink and yellow swimsuit").


25. Motor (attention given to describing some vigorous physical movement: e.g. "We ran and jumped around the yard").

Category C concerns the attention the participant gives to describing something seen, or heard, or to describing vigorous physical movement. Score "detail" variables on a presence or absence basis.

D. Setting (where the situation remembered took place)

26. School (inside or outside)

27. Hospital/doctor's office
28. Inside the home of family or relatives
29. Outside in the participant's neighborhood
30. Traveling (in a car, plane, boat, etc...)
31. Inside the house of a non-family member
32. Outside, away from family home or neighborhood
33. Unclear (no clear indication is made in content of ER)
34. Others (list separately)
35. Number of settings in the ER (may range from 1-9)

Category D concerns the place the situation remembered happened. Score "setting" variables on a presence or absence basis, except for #35 which receives a numerical score.

E. Active-Passive

36. Active (participant initiates action: he acts rather than is acted upon: e.g. "I remember when I tried to drive dad's car to see what it was like").

37. Passive (participant initiates little or no action; he is acted upon rather than takes action: e.g. "I watched the workmen building the house next door").

Category E is concerned with the degree of initiation the participant has with regard to what happens in the memory. Score "active-passive" variables on a presence or absence basis.
F. Control

38. Internal (participant accepts responsibility for what happens in the ER.)
39. External (participant dissociates himself from any consequences or outcomes of the ER.)

Category F is concerned with whether the participant assumes responsibility for what happens in the ER. Score "control" variables on a presence or absence basis.

G. Affect

40. Positive (overall feeling tone of the ER is pleasant.)
41. Negative (overall feeling tone of the ER is unpleasant.)
42. Neutral (no indication of affect is apparent in the ER).

Category G is concerned with the pleasantness or unpleasantness or lack of these affective states that the participant felt when the ER happened. Score "affect" variables on a presence or absence basis.
APPENDIX B

Demographic Questionnaire

Please fill out the information listed below

Age: ________

Male   Female   (circle one)

3. Marital status (single, divorced, married, committed/long term relationship)? (circle one)

4. How many times have you been married? ________

5. How many children do you have? ________ How many boys ________ and how many girls ________?

6. What is your job title? ____________________________.

7. How many years of education have you completed?
   ___ less than 7 yrs. of school   ___ some college
   ___ junior high school   ___ 4 year college degree
   ___ some high school   ___ masters degree
   ___ high school diploma   ___ doctoral degree

9. How many children are in the family you grew up in? ___

10. What number child were you in the family you grew up in (1-oldest, 2-middle, 3-youngest)?
APPENDIX C

Life Situation Questionnaire

Please read the following situations and put an X on the line beside the number of any item that pertained to you when you were a child:

____ 1. My parent's received welfare benefits.

____ 2. One or both of my parents had emotional problems that, most of the time, made it difficult or impossible to fulfill the role of a parent (e.g. unable to feed, clothe, and nurture the children).

____ 3. I experienced physical beatings that required medical attention.

____ 4. One or both of my parents abused drugs and/or alcohol (e.g. did not go to work because hung over, goes to school or work "high", intoxicated while taking care of his or her children).

____ 5. I was sexually abused.

Read the following items and put an X on the line next to the number of any items that pertain to you as an adult:

____ 1. I do not receive welfare benefits.

____ 2. I have graduated from high school.

____ 3. I have attended college or some type of trade or vocational school for two or more semesters.

____ 4. Complaints or charges against me of physical or sexual abuse of others have not been filed with law enforcement authorities or the child welfare
5. I presently hold a full time job in or out of the home.

6. I do **not** use alcohol or drugs to an excess (e.g., did not go to work because you were hung over, was intoxicated at work or school, could not care for yourself or family due to intoxication.)
APPENDIX D

Early Recollection Questionnaire

1. Please write the earliest incident you can recall from your childhood that occurred before the age of eight years old. Write the experience in as much detail as you can remember.

(a.) How old were you when you had this experience?
(b.) How did you feel at the time?
(c.) What part of the memory stands out in your mind?

2. Please write another early memory that occurred before the age of eight years old.

(a.) How old were you when you had this experience?
(b.) How did you feel at the time?

(c.) What part of the incident stands out in your mind?

3. Please write one more early memory that occurred before the age of eight years old.

(a.) How old were you when you had this experience?

(b.) How did you feel at the time?

(c.) What part of the memory stands out in your mind?
APPENDIX E

Human Subjects Form

The Department of Counseling Psychology supports the practice of protection for human participants in research. The following information is provided so that you can decide whether you wish to participate in the present study. You may agree to participate, however, you are free to withdraw at any time.

This study is interested in early memories of individuals who have undergone specific situations in their lives. You will be asked to fill out two short questionnaires that will provide the researcher with some background information about you. You will then be asked to write three memories that occurred in your childhood.

Your participation is strictly voluntary. Your name will not be used at any time throughout this study. Please do not hesitate to ask questions about the study. I appreciate your cooperation very much.

Sincerely,

Jacque Pfeifer, M.S.
Principal Investigator
237-2870

Signature of participant __________________________ Date ___________