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**Absence**  Carlos Drummond de Andrade - (translated by Ivone Falcirolli)

For a long time I thought that absence is lack.
And complained, ignorant, the lack
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The absence is a being in me.
And I feel it, white, stuck and cuddled in my arms
that I laugh and dance and dream up happy expressions
Because the absence, this grasped absence
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THE TRUTH - Carlos Drummond de Andrade (translated by Ivone Falcírolli)

The door of the truth was opened,
but it let pass through
half person each time

Therefore there was no way to reach the whole truth.
Because the half person who entered
would only bring the profile of the half truth.
and its other half
would go back equally with half profile.
And the halves would not meet.

The door was destroyed. The door was put down
It was reached a light place
Where the truth spreaded its fire
The truth was divided into halves
Different from one another

It was discussed which half was more beautiful
None of them were completely beautiful
It was necessary to choose. Each one chose according to
its desire, its illusion, its near sight.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION
1.1. Preliminary Considerations

In a world where concepts like emotional independence, individuality, equality, and economic independence are highly valued, and also where changes are sudden and gratifications can be instantaneous, and losses can be quickly substituted, a new socio-cultural context has emerged. This seems to be the case mainly in those societies, which have their environment threatened by the increase of social violence and as a result of that, interpersonal relationships have adapted under the influence and demand of these new contexts. In fact, new family configurations have been created and roles have been changed.

Mitscherlich (1963) links socio-economic changes and influences, such as fragmentation of labour and mass production, with changes in the role of fathers. According to him:

“the progressive fragmentation of labour, combined with mass production and complicated administration, the separation of home from place work, the transition from the independent producer to the paid employee who uses consumer goods, had led to a progressive loss of substance of the father’s authority and a diminution of his power in the family and over the family.”[Mitscherlich (1963) 1993, p 147]

Like Mitscherlich, Obholzer (2002) is concerned about the increasing loss of confidence in the value of fatherhood nowadays:

“... in the second half of twentieth century, there was an increasing loss of confidence in the value of the received sense of manhood and of fatherhood. Increase
divorced rates and the inexorable rise in single-parent families have contributed to a social climate in which fathers, as consistent and stable role models, are increasingly unavailable to the next generation. Even unstable fathering role models are in short supply." (Obholzer, 2002, p XV)

Concerning these new configurations, it would be important to look at the ways in which those changes intervene or have implications for the development of children’s identity. The concept of identity is based on an interchange between psychological structure and social environment. Thus it allows us to gain access into the cultural developmental process, taking in account its identifications with the parents’ cultural unconscious and conscious patterns, the inner processes of mental representations, as well as the further elaboration on ego formation, superego formation, and ego ideal. Erikson (1956) asserts in summary that:

“Identity, in outbalancing at the conclusion of childhood the potentially malignant dominance of the infantile superego, permits the individual to forgo excessive self-repudiation and the diffused repudiation of otherness. Such freedom provides a necessary condition for the ego’s power to integrate matured sexuality, ripened capacities and adults commitments.” (Erikson, 1956, p.119)

According to Erikson identity crises may result from special genetic causes and from specific dynamic conditions. Günter (2004) discusses the repercussions of the identity crises for the discrimination and integration of the matured sexuality. Günter contrasts ways in which the intimate sexual relationship in adolescence can help or hinder identity formation. On the one hand it can be used for a healthy development of the identity, not only in helping in the integration of regressive sexual
impulses and aggressive ones, but also in the integration of the new body and sexuality identity. On the other hand, identity formation may be hindered when this intimate sexual relationship is under the domain of pathological fixated defences. In this case, a sexual acting out is used not only as an expression of the fixation in the infantile objects; but also as a way to achieve the lost identity formation, in other words, as a desperate attempt to solve the identity crises. Laufer (1964), referring also to processes in adolescence, and more particularly to the dynamic relation between ego, superego and ideal ego in this phase, states that:

“*The part played by ego ideal in adolescence is determined by the quality and the uses made of the pre-oedipal and oedipal identifications and the fate of the ambivalence toward the original objects during these developmental periods. The identifications in adolescence can be used to change the interrelation of the superego functions, and can also be a means of changing the relationship between the ego and the superego. However, the content of the superego does not change in adolescence*.” Laufer [2001 (1964), p.287]

Bohleber (1999) asserts that identity is not a qualitative fact, for example it can not be clearly defined through some characteristics. Instead, identity is a dynamic-dialectic psychological construction that is under the influence of reality (social-values, social-expectation, and social-behaviours) and also at the same time of the child’s inner world (mental representation, inner objects, and unconscious fantasies). Berberich (2004), referring to the latency process, argues that latency is more than a phase when there is a transitional reorganization of defences under the influence of superego development. According to Berberich, societies make use of the latency
phase to transmit cultural values and moral standards. The skills, which are absorbed from each particular culture, arise at this time. The child absorbs these skills not only through the acquisition of reading and writing knowledge, but also through making use of abilities like: dreaming up, sublimating, which in the adolescence and adult phase will be more developed. With our research, we can have a close look into the beginning of these identity formation processes in latency, which has not been discussed very much in psychoanalysis up to now. The parents have the role of filtering the cultural values and the characteristics in different societies. The development of father’s and mother’s functions is the basis and the structure for the evolution of children’s identity. Although identity is dynamic and progressive, it gains a first stability when the Oedipus Complex is elaborated. More or less at this point, at the end of the elaboration of the Oedipus complex, children start in elementary school. Anna Freud (1935, 1973) asserts that in latency the child does not suffer the superior forces of the infantile instinctual, motions, due to his/her original egoism’s restriction, which was emotionally experienced through the Oedipus Complex. Consequently, the child does not become exhausted looking for constant satisfaction, but instead develops his/her abilities in the social situation:

“In the classroom, the child is prepared to the situation of being one more child among others, and he/she can not expect from the teacher a preferential attitude toward him/her” [Freud, A. (1935), 1973; translated by Franieck].

In the school, separated from the parents and the holding environment of the family, the child needs to trust in his/her own capacities in order to deal with the new quality of experiences that he/she will meet through the learning process. The child
will live in a different world from the one, which he/she has already known and had together with hi/her parents. Bettelheim [(1981), 1984] and Aberastury & Salas [(1978), 1984] argued that there are learning implications for the child in two ways. On the one hand, there is the challenge of starting learning, in which the child has to establish a different relation to internalized feelings, and to the demand of the new environment that aims to adapt the child in the knowledge world, which is expressed through the relation between writing and reading. On the other hand, there is the necessity for the child to leave home, and consequently the family environment, to engage in a new social group that is almost always comprised of other unknown children and which is lead by an unknown adult. In other words there is the necessity to change the child’s attitudes towards what has been his/her most important inner objects - the parents, and to adapt to the new learning institution. For a successful adaptation of the child in this new learning environment, he/she must have his/her own sense of identity and that means in this context recognize and discriminate father-masculine function and mother-feminine function. According to Mitscherlich ([1963] 1993), the teacher replaces the father-masculine function in the learning process.

“As a civilization develops and grows more complicated, the more situations arise in which the father’s teaching role is taken over by others-until teaching finally emerges as an independent profession. Teachers then assume very definite aspects of the absent father.” Mitscherlich ([1963] 1993, p.140)

As has been pointed out, there is interdependence between cognitive and emotional development. Piaget (1972) asserted at a psychoanalytic conference that
the affectivity or its privation can be a reason of the acceleration or of the backwardness in the child’s cognitive development; however it does not mean that the affectivity produces or also changes the cognitive structure, because these are thought to be intrinsic. Instead the affectivity has an energetic impulse as background, whereas the cognition is structural. However, Piaget recognizes a correlation between the cognitive stage (in his cognitive theory) and affective stages/periods (in Freud’s theory). In this case, the latency is correlated with new reciprocity relations, in connection with the formation of reversible operations. At the first grade of school, the learning process will demand from the child, a capacity to work with symbolizations and representations. Words, numbers, phrases, mathematic counts will symbolically express in writing the child’s thoughts in a socio-historical way. Vygotskian theory links social and cognitive process. Cognition is not seen as internal and individualistic, but instead it is formed and built up in interaction with the interpersonal and wider social environment.

1.2. Theoretical Frameworks

Human psychological development has basically two levels of comprehension, the cognitive and the emotional. Up to now, many studies have brought up important questions and concepts in both levels and all of them have been contributed for the best understanding of the human psychological development. To this study some theoretical frameworks from the two levels were adopted.

One of the fundamental theories of human psychological development, which has profoundly affected our understanding of the development of cognitive capacity
throughout the childhood, is the “**Genetic Epistemology**”, developed by Jean Piaget. Piaget called his general theoretical framework "**genetic epistemology**" because he was primarily interested in how knowledge develops in human organisms. Although this conception of intelligence has been revised and elaborated, it nevertheless is of value in understanding intelligence and competence in information societies. The concept of cognitive stages is central to Piagetian theory, describing the different and specific logic of thought that characterizes each age. According to Piaget, depending on the child’s age, he/she will interact with the environment making use of different schemas that form the basis of the reasoning. These stages follow a specific sequence, in which each stage set it up as pre requirement to the next, so the child needs to grasp the strategies of one stage to reach a new one. The environment is thought to have an important influence on the child’s performance through these stages. Progress is helped by a stimulating and challenging environment while a less challenging environment may lead to backwardness in development.

According to Piaget there are four primary cognitive stages: **sensori-motor**, **pre-operational**, **concrete operations**, and **formal operations**. The basic characteristics of each stage are described below. The aim is to provide a an overview of this theoretical framework, without considering in detail the research and theoretical development of the “**Genetic Epistemology**”

The cognitive stage begins with **sensori-motor period** (0 – 24 months), which is characterized by a movement from reflex behaviors to voluntary behaviors. At the beginning (between one and four months) the child works on **primary circular reactions**, interacting with the environment mainly through obvious, sensorial and
physical acts, without mental representation (symbolic or semiotics function). Between four and 12 months, the infant turns to secondary circular reactions, which involve acts that extend out to the environment. The child is learning “procedures that make interesting things last.” At this point, other things begin to emerge as well. For example he/she begins to develop object permanence. This is the ability to recognize that, just because he/she can’t see something doesn’t mean it’s gone! Younger infants seem to function by an “out of sight, out of mind” schema. Older infants remember, and may even try to find things they can no longer see. Between 12 months and 24 months, the child works on tertiary circular reactions. They consist of the same “making interesting things last” cycle, but with the introduction of constant variation. This kind of active experimentation is best seen during feeding time, when discovering new and interesting ways of throwing his/her spoon, dish, and food.

Around one year and a half, the child is clearly developing mental representation, that is, the ability to hold an image in his/her mind for a period beyond the immediate experience. So the child can engage in deferred imitation, and also use mental combinations to solve simple problems. Infant research has made many contributions to that which can not be explicated here.

The essence of the following period, the pre-operational stage (2-6 years old), is that the child is able to represent an action or an object making use of mental representation, or words. A symbol is a thing that represents something else. A drawing, a written, or a spoken word comes to be understood as representing a real object. The use of language is, of course, the prime example, but another good example of symbol use is creative play, wherein checkers may be cookies, papers may be dishes, a box a table, and so on. By manipulating symbols, the child is now
thinking, in a way the infant could not, in the absence of the actual objects involved!
Along with symbolization, there is a clear understanding of past and future. At this point the child has a tendency to become more egocentric and think that the world turns round him/her. The child is self centered and he/she interprets reality according to his/her perspectives. Reasoning is under the control of the child’s wishes, and its working goes from specific to specific. Piaget named this working as transductive reasoning. The child does not yet understand reversibility reasoning and can’t deal with transformations. The child attends to the most characteristic of the object to the detriment of the others. As a result of this, the child in this period even though can do reverse operation; he/she is not able to connect the direct relation of the elements from this operation, in other words, to grasp the complement and cancellation of this kind of operation. At this stage the child does not understand conservation reasoning principle. That is to say, even though he/she witnesses a sequence, such as the pouring of water from a tall thin jar to a wide low jar, he/she is influenced by the appearance of a change, rather than an awareness that the amount of water has stayed the same.

The **concrete operations stage** lasts from approximately 6 to 12 years. Now the child is able not only to do complex classifications, but also to execute logical operations (mental actions and reversible) with a set of objects or experiences, because reasoning is understood to be reversible. However at this point, the child must still perform these operations within the context of concrete situations. Thus the child is not able to realize operations about possibilities nor potentialities. This capacity will appear only over the next and last stage (12-18 years old) – **“formal operations stage”** - when then thinking involves abstractions.
The **concrete operations** stage begins with progressive decentering. By six or seven years old, most children develop the ability to conserve number, length, and liquid volume. Conservation refers to the idea that a quantity remains the same despite changes in appearance. By seven or eight years old, children develop conservation of substance - a feature known as reversibility. By nine or ten years old, the last of the conservation tests is mastered: conservation of area. In addition, a child learns classification and categorization during this stage. Classification refers to questions such as ‘are there more white marbles or more black marbles?’ Categorization is putting things in order. Since arithmetic is essentially nothing more than classification and categorization, the child is now more ready for formal education. The understanding of the cognitive structure during the **concrete operations** stage is of fundamental importance to this study, because of focus on the emotional and cognitive development of the children at the moment, when they are in the first grade in school.

Summarizing, in the **sensor-motor** stage (0-2 years), intelligence takes the form of motor actions. Intelligence in the **pre-operational** stage (3-5 years) is intuitive in nature. The cognitive structure during the **concrete operational** stage (6-11 years) is logical but depends upon concrete referents. In the final stage of **formal operations** (12-15 years), thinking involves abstractions.

As it has been pointed out the concept of cognitive structure is central to Piaget’s theory. Cognitive structures change through the processes of adaptation: assimilation and accommodation. Assimilation involves the interpretation of events in terms of existing cognitive structure whereas accommodation refers to changing the cognitive structure to suit the environment. Cognitive development is thought to
Consist of a constant interplay between assimilation and accommodation in an effort to adapt to the environment. In this sense, Piaget's theory is similar in nature to other constructivist perspectives of learning such as Vygotsky's, also referred to as the "Cultural-Historic School" (Oerter & Montada, 2002).

The "Cultural-Historic School" emphasizes cultural contributions, social interactions, and the historic dimension of mental development as important elements in the cognitive developmental process. This understanding of the cultural influences on the cognitive development is briefly described below, because of the cross-cultural characteristics of this study.

According to Vygotsky, the culture supplies the child with the symbolic system of the reality representation, in other words, the universe of representations, which enable the child to build the interpretation from the real world. In this way, a cultural environment is given, where the child can build his/her interactions and through them recreates as well as reinterprets information, concepts and significations.

The major theme of Vygotsky's theoretical framework is that social interaction plays a fundamental role in the development of cognition. Vygotsky (1978) states:

"Every function in the child's cultural development appears twice: first, on the social level, and later, on the individual level; first, between people (inter-psychological) and then inside the child (intra-psychological). This applies equally to voluntary attention, to logical memory, and to the formation of concepts. All the higher functions originate as actual relationships between individuals." (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 57)

A second aspect of Vygotsky's theory is the idea that the potential for cognitive development depends upon the "zone of proximal development" (ZPD): a level of
development attained when children engage in social behavior. Full development of the ZPD depends upon full social interaction.

Vygotsky’s theory was an attempt to explain consciousness as the end product of socialization. For example: in the learning of language, our first utterances with peers or adults are for the purpose of communication but once mastered they become internalized and allow "inner speech".

Principles:

1. Cognitive development is limited to a certain range at any given age.
2. Full cognitive development requires social interaction.

In conclusion, the main focus of “Cultural-Historic School” is on the acquisition of knowledge through the interaction between the child and the environment. However this interaction process presupposes also the existence of an emotional involvement, in other words an emotional development.

One of the theoretical frameworks addressing child emotional development with relevance to “Genetic Epistemology” as well as with the “Cultural-Historic School” is Psychoanalysis. Some of the early psychoanalytic founding principles, such as the Freudian model of developmental stages, as well as some key ideas regarding psychosocial stages described by Erikson can be correlated with the cognitive developmental stages, because of their shared emphasis on developmental sequences resulting from the interaction between the child and the environment.

The basic characteristic of each psychoanalytic principle is described below, without aiming to describe in detail the theoretical development of the Psychoanalysis. Although this is a classical model, which has restrictions that have been widely discussed, both early and current psychoanalytic understandings of the
child's emotional development have in common an emphasis on the relationship with objects (person) and on the concept of **emotional development** stages or levels. The reference to this Freudian model of developmental stages, which follows a fixed sequence, introduces not only a better understanding of the way new strategies develop in the course of the interaction between the child and the environment, but also the possibility to consider how the psychoanalytic and cognitive developmental stages may be related. This integrated view – cognitive and emotional – offers a better comprehension of the mechanisms that promote the child’s development, and underpin each development stage. Understanding the child’s interaction with the environment at the beginning of the learning process is one of the most important aims of this study.

One of the most significant parts of the early Psychoanalytic Theory is concerned with the concept of the instinct development, approached by Freud. The origin of the instinct is linked with states of corporal tension, as arising in specific erogenous zones and is correlated with a certain biological development that changes throughout the first years of a child’s development. According to Freud, the first erogenous zone is the mouth, the second is the anus and the third is the genital organ. The mental and emotional growth depends on experiences, such as social interactions, anxieties and gratifications, which happen in relation to these zones. The concept of phases of instinctive development is not understood as isolated segments, but as periods without strict borders, and with movement from one to another.

According to Freud, the emotional stages begin with the “**oral phase**” (0 – 12 months). The first contact between the baby and the environment is made by the mouth, as a result of the biological characteristics of feeding. However the suction
pleasure, which is felt through the mouth, the lips and the tongue; becomes independent from the feeding necessities and a pleasure center is set up. This kind of pleasure is named by Freud as primary narcissism, which is based on the original self-eroticism, since the child does not have the a very elaborate idea about the external world, on an emotional level, so he/she can not discriminate the self from the external object – the caregiver. In fact, the baby has many ideas and perceptions and in this way very elaborate functional concepts of the outer world closely associated to perception. Some authors of the current Psychoanalysis, such as Winnicott interpret this early perception of the self through other perspective. According to Winnicott, the baby and the maternal care together form a unit, and in this concept of early self, the maternal care has the role to be the environment’s facilitator to the development of the baby. However to Freud, the baby identifies his/her self with the pleasure and slowly he/she starts to associate this feeling with an external object (the caregiver), who provides this pleasure. Then the first affectionate relationship is built with the object (the caregiver), who provides such pleasure - the first model of relationship with the first object of love, in which the baby will the identification. Over this phase the child builds slowly the border of his/her body, which is the first step of the “self” building.

According to Abraham, the oral phase can be divided into two moments: one is the passive moment – early oral phase - which is characterized by the assimilation of sounds, words, images and sense; and the other is the active moment – sadistic oral phase - which begins about at the same time of the biological development of teething. And in spite of the real pain (displeasure) of the teething process, this new biological development provides the child with new elements (the teeth) and
mechanism (using the teeth to bite), which put him/her in an active position toward the environment, including also the primary object.

The interest in the dynamic of object relationship induced some authors, such as Melanie Klein, to describe in a more complex way the expressed meaning of this oral phase. The most important contribution of Melanie Klein to psychoanalytic theory was not only the introduction of the concepts of the paranoid anxiety position and depressive anxiety position, but also the description of the early pre-genital phases of the Oedipus complex as well as of superego formation.

The second phase of the libidinal evolution is named “anal phase” (1 – 3 years old). It is characterized by the maturation of the sphincter region as well as by the movement of the libido’s organization from the oral zone to the domain of the erogenous anal zone. According to Freud, only from this moment the child experiences (for the first time) feelings of ambivalence and as consequence the object relation is impregnated by this kind of feeling, which is characterized by the meaning of the defecating function (expulsion-retention / passive-active / love–aggression / praise-punishment). As a result of the muscular nature of the sphincter, the pleasure experiences are self erotic, based on sadic-masochist pattern and the child’s thought is basically characterized by two types of mechanism, identification and projection. The conflict between the instinctive wish for evacuation and the demand from the external world for the postponement of it is the basis of the structural conflict between id and ego; in other words, it represents the first crucial conflict between the individual and the society. In this case the environment requires from the child the violation of pleasure principle or the punishment. The external displeasure (the threat of the punishment) makes use of the internal displeasure
(given up on the pleasure to control the sphincter at anytime, in agreement with the child’s wish)

According to Freud, the **phallic phase** lasts from 3 to 5 years old approximately. It is characterized by the unification of the partial instincts under the primacy of the genital organ, which at this time is recognized only by the presence of male genital organ, so that sexual differences are explained by the presence of the penis for the male and the phallic/castration for the female. And, the most important event of this phase is the named Oedipus complex, which also peaks and declines over this period. The Oedipus complex can be defined as the organized set of loving and hostile desires, which the child feels in his relationship with the parents [Laplanche & Pontalis, (1967), 1986] and it is in close relation with castration complex and especially with its prohibitive and normative function, which will contribute to superego formation. For the boy, the castration threat terminates the oedipal conflict and the boy is forced out of fear to abandon the wish for the possession of his mother in rivalry with his father. For the girl, the awareness of castration (the lack of penis) confirms the threat of castration and initiates the Oedipus complex. She is forced to give up the wish for a penis in relation to the first love object and turns to the father as her love object, wishing for babies instead of the penis. According to Freud the resolution of Oedipus complex consists in giving up the claim to posses the parent of the opposite sex (undergo repression) and in identifying with the parent of the same sex. In the Freudian framework the concept of Oedipus complex is the central element and has a basic role on the building of the personality structure as well as on the orientation of human desires. Although this concept has been revised and elaborated in current Psychoanalysis, it is still relevant especially in relation to the ideas about the role of triangulation in mental health and social adaptation.
The role of triangulation, involving the addition of a father representation (the third) to the dyadic relation between infant and mother as well as to their representation (infant-mother) is a landmark in the child’s psychological development. The presence of the third (the father) not only breaks up with the primary relationship of the child to the mother - the “oceanic feeling” (oceánico sentimiento) of primary narcissism referred to in “El Malestar en la Cultura” (Freud, 1930), but it is also bound up with the concept of reality. Through this process, the child is removed from his/her narcissist world and introduced to the real one, where he/she needs to deal with new relationships, and not only with his/her primary object. In other words this is the introduction of the child into society. The rupture of the dyadic- narcissistic relationship is replaced by the child identification with the fatherly function, which supplies the child with the absorption of social rules. This identification process thought to provide the basis of moral development, social adaptation, sexual roles and affective relationships. On the other hand, the castration complex, through the threat of loss, brings up also the death concept to the child’s mind and as consequence, it gives an amplitude to the child’s thought, introducing for example the temporal concept (present/past/future), which will help the child on working with his/her impulses, postponing their satisfaction. At this moment begins the latency phase (5 to 12 years old) with its origins in the decline of the Oedipus complex. This study pinpoints exactly this moment of the development - when the child is at the first grade of elementary school. The most significant characteristic of the latency phase is the development of some mechanisms of defense, such as negation, repression, sublimation. Through them reactive formation of morality, shame and revulsion are structured. In this case the repression of the sexual libido, which is under the domain of the superego, will provide the child with means to develop his/her conscious and
pre-conscious activities toward the domain of the external world. The sublimation will be the basis of the socialization process, since the sexual instincts are drawn from the sexual target and projected towards social objects that have increased social value. It is not by chance, that children usually begin literacy around the ages of 6-7 years. The **latency phase** has a correspondence with the **concrete operations** stage in Piagetian theory of cognitive development, during which there is a huge development of cognitive abilities. According to Piaget, at early latency, the child begins with a progressive decentering. The reasoning changes from the specific (in psychoanalytic terminology – dyadic narcissist relationship) to the broad (in psychoanalytic terminology – role of triangulation).

According to Freud, not only interpersonal and social developments are of fundamental importance over this phase but also the cognitive activities. However to him cognitive development is a sub by-product of personality and social development, and not the contrary.

The **genital phase** (12 to 18 years old) begins with the new arousal of sexual impulses as a result of biological hormone changes (normal growth). From this point there are expectations of increasingly, mature sexual relationships.

According to Erikson the **latency phase** and the **genital phase** are periods in which the person develops a sense of success and diligence (contrasted with inferiority) and, very importantly, a sense of identity (contrasted with diffusion). At the **latency phase** there occurs a series of changes in the child’s abilities, as well as in his/her experiences, which will have an impact on the building of identity. In this case the beginning of the elementary school is an important force, since the learning process demands from the child the necessity to be productive in developing specific abilities such as: reading, writing and calculating. This process of being productive is
referred to by Erikson as *industry*. He argues that failure in these specific abilities could provoke a sense of inferiority. Thus a new interpretation of the *latency phase* is added by Erikson, who named this period as *“industry versus inferiority”*. According to Erikson during the *genital phase* there is a need for the integration of the Ego through the sexual identity, as well as occupational identity. Failure of the integration of the Ego it is referred to by Erikson as identity crisis.

The focus of this study is on first grade elementary school children ranging from 6-8 years old. Over this age period children are in the early *latency phase* (Freud) when the energy of the sexual impulses is focused on social and intellectual aims. According to the cognitive theory of Piaget, they are in the *concrete operations stage*, when the reasoning is characterized by more complex mental operations, such as they are also in the period of *“industry versus inferiority”*, when according to Erikson many changes are experienced, such as the beginning of the school, that will have an impact on the child’s identity development. Although Freud, Piaget and Erikson give different names and three different points of view regarding the same period of childhood, they nevertheless all suggested that new strategies are built through the child’s interaction with the environment, and that these are developed following a fixed sequence. Although Piaget agrees that there are links between cognitive stages and affective ones (e.g. latency and concrete operations), he defines both structures, cognitive and affective, as distinct in their origin and essence; so they can develop in correlation with one another, however the development of one does not determinate the existence of the other. In other words they can be complementary, and one does not have priority over the other.

For this study, the term *latency* has been adopted, to refer to this period of childhood.
1.3. LATENCY

The primary developmental task in this period is the integration of the oedipal identifications and the consolidation of sexual identity and the **gender roles**. The relative tranquility and control of the instinctual impulses allow the ego’s **structural** development and the discovery and domain of new abilities. Elements of further identification can be added to the oedipal components, based on contacts with other important figures outside the family such as teachers, trainers and other adults.

Latency can be understood and characterized in terms of the following features:

1.3.1 **Sexual Development:**

Sexuality in this time period is described psychoanalytically as a “**psychosexual moratorium**” in the child’s development (Erikson, 1956), or as a period of sexual instinct numbness in which the child’s interest focuses mainly on the learning process and acquisition of knowledge and an immersion in the social environment. According to Klein the progress of the libidinal organization and the successful adjustments of the Ego are closely linked to the modification of persecutory and depressive anxieties concerning the internalized parents, that brings more security to the child’s inner world. At the beginning of the latency phase, anxiety vicissitudes are lessened as the relationship between the child and his/her parents becomes calmer. This is thought to result from an the integration, of the child’s mental representation of the parents with the his/her experience of the real parents , so the child grasps the patterns of reprimands and prohibitions of their
parents, which help not only the repression of oedipal impulses but also the child’s social adaptation. The most important characteristic of this phase is the integration of the super-Ego into social development.

**1.3.2. Cognitive Development**

According to Piaget, the child’s reasoning expands in terms of the comprehension and explanation of natural phenomena, but there is no increase regarding the egocentric world, as it was in the previous phase - phallic phase. The child has less of an interest in his/herself and also in his/her private interpretation of the world, and is more concerned with a global comprehension of it. Reasoning is based on abstract operations. Now there is a capacity for reversible reasoning. The child’s ability to link what was in the past to what is in the present provides an important basis for reversibility, and as well gives a new quality to memory. Furthermore the child develops the capacity to co-ordinate the operation taking account its total structure (for example in classification). However these abilities are still linked with the external and real object.

Sarnoff [(1987), 1995] asserts that the capacity to build special symbols is one of the most important acquisitions in this phase. According to him the ordinary metaphoric symbolization is replaced by dissimulated symbols, also referred to as psychoanalytic symbols. Psychoanalytic Symbols are characterized by a dissimulation of the meaning, where the correspondence between the significant (symbol) and the meaning (latent content) is under the domain of the repression. In other words, the message that will be transmitted, is usually linked with anxiety or with a feeling of discomfort, so in order to permit its expression, without anxiety or discomfort, (and maintaining the pleasure of the child), the connexion between the
symbol and original information (latent content) is repressed. In this way, it can be possible to create fantasies that can express and relieve some implicit wishes of the original information, keeping the original content in safety to the child. In other words, the Psychoanalytic symbols are an expression of meanings, for example a concern of the child, in which the associated anxieties are repressed. Thus what is conveyed by the child includes information about the original concern, and the child's efforts to reduce the associated anxieties. The child's ability to generate Psychoanalytic Symbols is promoted by his/her capacity for abstract reasoning, the capacity to postpone pleasure, capacity of pleasure postponement and repression. Thus psychoanalytic symbols are genuinely creative, but also have a repressive function in relation to the original anxieties. Furthermore the expression of these fantasies aims to provide a resolution of the latent child conflicts, even though it is expressed at verbal level that is culturally dominated, so the creativity can be shown through the using of a wide range of verbal symbols, which is originated from the cultural pattern. In this way, the psychoanalytic symbol can be understood as a product of creativity and repression. The repression is a universal process designed to deal with anxiety but creativity is influenced by individual and cultural differences.

An association between cognitive and affective processes can be seen at this phase in the development of the new reciprocity relations, which are, in the cognitive level, connected to the formation of reversible operations. This reciprocity relation is expressed in the domain of moral functioning as a weakening of the effects of the Superego (more flexibility and less severity) and increasing reciprocal feelings of justice (and other moral aspects).
1.3.3. The Development of Conscience

Sarnoff [(1987), 1995] asserts that the latency begins when the child is able to discriminate by his/herself right from the wrong, and then he/she can drive his/her behavior according to that. As a consequence the child is also able to show appropriate behavior for the appropriate situation, achieving in this way, a behavioral pattern that will permit him/her to be integrated into other groups, outside his/her family (e.g. school). According to Piaget (Sarnoff, 1995) during the latency phase, there is a change in the child’s morality character - from “restrictive morality”) to “cooperative morality”. Under the domain of the “restrictive morality” the child obeys the parents’ instructions, but does not have enough behavioral constancy to respond by his/herself, so the child needs to know exactly (in words) the expectations of his/her parents, before he/she is able to respond appropriately. Under the domain of “cooperative morality”, by contrast, the child is driven, through guilt and the ability to discriminate (between wrong and right), not only to take his/her own decisions, but also to solve problem cooperatively with his/her parents. In the course of the latency phase, the child will slowly absorb the demands of other groups (e.g. the school), and these together with the parents’ upbringing will build the child’s identity.

1.3.4. Social Development/ Relationship with Parents

Over the latency phase, specific maturational cognitive events help the child to change cultural demands into an organized set of internalized memory elements, which are available for the child to use in the regulation of his/her impulses and the organization of his/her social behaviors. This enables the child to achieve the moral rules and the triangular object relationship stability, consequently the child
is able to grasp the rules of a social interaction and he/she is able to assimilate complex ethical concepts and adapt them to be applied in other different situations, making use of his/her sense of discrimination. So the moral behavior and the triangular object relationship stability support the social development.

During latency wider cultural patterns are transmitted to the child through the family, and through his/her widening social and educational contacts. Concerning family interactions, during latency cultural patterns are strongly transmitted because the parents’ up-bringing of the is not only based on home cultural elements (the main point of the pre-latency), but also on the transmission and approval of elements from other external cultural patterns, e.g. school, sports group. Over time the influence of the home environment and the parents’ relationship are accompanied by influences from out of home social experiences. In this way the absorption of cultural patterns is more extensive than in the pre-latency phase, as a result of the social contact enlargement that the child experiences at the school, and with their peers, at this moment. This does not however mean that the holding environment of the family becomes less important. It may provide a crucial support to the cultural adaptation of the child to the new learning environment that he/she needs to deal with - the school. According to Sarnoff [(1987), 1995], the latency child is not only under the parents’ influence.

“The culture, the speech and the social acts start on building nuclei, consisting of elements, that are beyond parental interests or preferences” (Sarnoff, 1995 – quote translated by Franieck).
However the parents’ rules and their expectations remain at the roots of the child’s concerns. In some areas such as self esteem, superego contents and sexual identity, the parental influence can be still seen.

“The parents exert a special influence on certain development areas, over the latency years. The cognitive styles of perception and comprehension, as well as the organization of memory, have their roots in parental preferences, which are transmitted to their children, over the latency years, through their ruling and examples.” (Sarnoff, 1995 – translated by Franieck).

The choice to work with latency children is based on the fact that the latency is a point that has a previous reference – from early childhood, and a later reference – to adolescence. It is therefore exactly the transition point, or “bridge” between early childhood and adolescence (or the beginning of the early adulthood). The core point of this study is to increase the understanding of the way the relationship between the child and his/her parents is characterized, during this phase, and what kind of parental representation and family structure, the child has identified and assimilated. This mental representation will support the building of child’s identity, giving him/her the social background information as an instrument to deal with external social demands (outside the family relationship). So the latency structure is a driver that takes the child to an objective world, socially dominated by rules, ethical and cultural patterns. One of the most important social demands arises from the beginning of literacy.

“From the cultural point of view latency is necessary to the formation of civilization.” (Sarnoff, 1995 - translated by Franieck).
1.4. IDENTITY

The common conceptualization of the term identity is:

“Identity is the quality that makes someone or something that they are and different from other people” (Macmillan, 2002).

This conceptualization is correct; however it does not express the complex processes involved in the acquisition of identity as described above. More widely in psychology some authors have tried to define better this process according to their point of view. Terminologies such as: “self”; “identifications” and “identification process” are introduced by these authors as important elements in describing identity processes. In this way the identity can be explained through:

1. 4.1. Cultural / Social Psychology

The self has been defined as:

“an active agent that promotes differential sampling, processing and evaluation of information from the environment, and thus leads to differences in social behavior ... Some aspects of the self may be universal. “I am hungry” will be an element with much the same meaning worldwide, and across the time. Other elements are extremely culture-specific. For instance, they depend on the particular mythology-religion- world view and language of a culture.” (Triandis, 1989, p. 506).
Triandis thus defines the self as one element of subjective culture that can be distinguished as private, public and collective, in which the self’s complexity depends on cultural variables, such as language, technology, economics, politics and educational systems, religions, aesthetic patterns, and social structures. So identity is defined on the basis of different elements in the cultures. According to Triandis the qualities that are most important in forming an identity can be quite different. When they tend to emphasize elements of identity that reflect possessions, being logical, rational, balanced, then the identity will be characterized by individualistic qualities. On the other hand when they tend to emphasize elements that reflect relationships, personal style, sincere self-expression, emotional expression; then the identity will be characterized by collectivist qualities.


“It emerges from in-group and out-group comparisons, and shows a sharing of group attitudes, goals norms and values. Social identity implies an emphasis on interdependent attributes of self-image, through which the individual defines him/herself as belonging to groups…” (Gouveia, et al. 2002, p 335)

So, social identity implies the subordination of individual needs and interest to the group.

Sinha (1988) making use of some Psychoanalytic concepts, takes the position that the family is not only the first group but also the main group that has influence in child identity process.
“Family is still a very important in-group for the identification process of a child. If the family relationships suffer from serious deficiency or the politics of family (Laing 1971) are played at the cost of the child or the family maintains its integrity by preventing the growth of identity in a child, the child later on shows basic disturbance of the central unconscious core of personality manifesting in aggression, anxiety and destructive and deficient narcissism. The family must provide sufficient amount of social energy through warmth, understanding openness, and trust so that the child may develop strong identity with constructive impulses, holistic and humanitarian perspective of life” (Sinha, 1988, p. 114)

1.4.2. Psychoanalysis

The Freudian psychosexual stages theory is focused on the development of instincts and the concepts of mental and emotional growth depend on not only the quality of the child’s experiences with the first model of relationship or also named as the first object of love, but also the evolution and resolution of the Oedipus complex. In this way, Freud works with the child’s identification process that is emerges from the development of instincts and he does pay much attention to the identity’s concept itself. The identification concept took a central position in Freud’s work, with a greater importance than an ordinary psychological mechanism once this importance is a crucial operation in which a person settles him/herself. So the identification can be understood as a:

“Psychological process, through which a person assimilates an aspect, a (property) attribute from the other and develops totally or partially, according to the model of the other. The personality sets up and differentiates through a succession of identifications.” [Laplanche; Pontalis; (1967) 1986 - translated by Franieck].
Erikson (1950), described the child’s affective development through the psychosexual stages of Freud, and added a psychosocial interpretation to these stages, focusing attention on the ego, or on the conscious being. According to him the identity meaning is dynamic and it is developed under a series of psychosocial stages, which are characterized by cultural demands and expectations. In fact, identity formation is a reconstruction of the whole previous identifications, in each previous stage. Erickson asserts that identity needs to connect past and future [Evans (1976) 1979] and because of this the latency stage and genital one represent crucial moments in identity development. Both stages “build” the bridge that makes the connection between childhood and adulthood in the life cycle. According to Erickson [(1982) 1985] during latency, a period that he named “industry x inferiority”, there is a certain numbing of the infantile sexuality and a postponement of the mature sexuality. This enables the future adult (now still a child) to submit him/herself to the beginning of the school method, offered by his/her society, and to learn the technical and social rudiments of a labor situation. In other words, sexual impulses are replaced by the knowledge interest. He concludes that the child is under the domain of a “psychosexual moratorium”, or period of the libido repression, which is a a transition phase on the road to the achievement of future sexual maturity. During this phase the child's cognitive development is focused on the learning of the technical and social rudiments of a labor situation, and on interaction with and adaptation to, cultural institutions, beyond the family organization. This learning creates for the child a new identification model with his/her parents as workers and supporters of learning. These developments are shared with similar aged peers in school, geographically separated from home, with its infantile memories of mother and father. The goals of learning support the suppression of
infantile instinctual aims, offering a constructive activity with actual tools and materials in a communal reality. So at this stage, the ego’s activity is linked with the inner need for activity, practice and work completion, preparing the child to meet the corresponding demands and opportunities in wider society.

With the beginning of literacy the child seeks approval through his/her capacity, competence and industry. According to Erikson (1983) industry can be understood as a basic feeling of competent activity adapted to social and cultural demands and rules. These demands and rules are of two kinds. Firstly there are those that are made explicit, for example in moral statements, and are acquired passively. Secondly there are those that are acquired actively through interactions with others. The effective development of these abilities is thought to be important to identity development as it enters the next psychosocial phase of “identity versus identity diffusion” or in Freudian terminology “the genital phase”. However limitations in the development of these abilities, at this moment, are likely to contribute to a basic sense of inferiority, with implications for identity development in adolescence.

“Adolescence is the last and concluding stage of childhood. The adolescent process, however, is conclusively complete only when the individual has subordinated his childhood identifications to a new kind of identification, achieved in absorbing sociability and in competitive apprenticeship with and among his age-mates. …

… Societies offer, as individuals require, more or less sanctioned intermediary periods between the childhood and adulthood, and institutionalized psychosocial moratoria, during which a lasting pattern of “inner identity” is scheduled for relative completion.” (Erikson, 1956, p. 66)
Summing up, there are two kinds of identity to be achieved over the “identity versus identity diffusion” phase. The first is “sexual identity”, which has its roots in the integration of the oedipal complex identifications that were in a “psychosocial moratorium” during the previous latency phase. The second is “social identity”. According to Erikson this entails not only defining oneself as part of a group (Gouveia 2002) but also requires reconciliation between the young person’s concept of him/herself and the community’s recognition him/her. At this point the Erikson theoretical framework has a different perspective from the cultural one, regarding the Gouveia (2002) assertion that social identity has to do with defining oneself as a part of a group.

Concluding the idea of the reintegrated ego in adolescence refers both to the sexual role and the social role. When there is confusion resulting from a profusion of roles, the adolescent experiences identity diffusion.

1.4.3. Cognitive

The Piagetian conceptualization is focused on cognitive development, and does not encompass themes such as adult functioning, emotional development, personality and personal identity. However cognitive development cannot be separated from these wider themes. Cognitive development is a result of exploration of, and interaction with, the social and cultural environment. Furthermore if identity is influenced by the demands of social and biological changes in adolescence, cognitive abilities are likely to be important to the young person’s ability to cope with them.
1.5. PLAY AND ITS ROLE IN THE CHILD’S DEVELOPMENT

There are different psychological interpretations regarding the meaning of the play in the child’s development. They are based on different theoretical frameworks and are briefly described below:

*Catharses and Wish-fulfillment*

From a psychoanalytic perspective one of the most important functions of play is to provide a setting to explore the fulfillment of wishes. The reality principle of the play gives support to the hidden expression of the pleasure principle. Through activities of play the child can also express ego defenses, such as: catharsis and repetition (as a way to control the situation)

Freud asserts that in spontaneous play children are able to communicate unconscious processes, in the same way as adults are able to do this through free association (in terms of precision as well as according to eloquence). Thus observations of children’s play create the possibility to establish a direct psychoanalytic contact with their mental representations. The interpretation of play provided the basis for Klein’s psychoanalytic technique for analyzing young children, which has been widely adopted in child psychoanalysis and psychotherapy.

According to Klein, when the child plays, he/she overcomes painful realities and expresses instinctual fears, which are projected into the toys. The capacity for symbolization is the core of this mechanism. In this way, the use of the toy by the child can be viewed as “a bridge between the fantasy and the reality”. The adaptation to this reality is achieved progressively through the evolution of cognitive and emotional stages.
Winnicott sees play as central to psychoanalysis but is a rather different way. He suggests that play represents a “transitional space” which has features both of fantasy and reality but is different from both. Playing for Winnicott is a creative and serious arena, and it essential that a playful interaction is established in psychoanalysis. Thus where the patient is unable to play the first task of psychoanalysis is to provide an inner situation that enables him/her to play, before going on to dealing with conflicts.

Realization of unfulfilled Wish

According to Vygotsky play creates for the child the possibility for experiencing the realization of unfulfilled wishes.

If asked why the child plays, there is only an answer to be given. In play it is possible to imagine a reality and to realize wishes that will not come true at this moment, e.g. the child wants to be his/her parents, or have their power; so he/she makes use of dolls to “play” the role of being his/her father or mother.

The characteristics of playing go along with the development of the cognitive stages, so they change over time. According to Vygotsky in the concrete operation stage play can be characterized as:

“At school age play does not die away, but permeates the attitude toward reality. It has its own inner continuation in school instruction and work (compulsory activity based on rules). All examinations of the essence of play have shown that in play a new relationship is created between the semantic and the visible – that is, between situations in thought and real situations.” [Vygotsky, 1933] 2002, p 25]
Practising Reasoning

According to cognitive theory, play provides opportunities for practising assimilation and accommodation, and so it exerts an important influence on the child’s cognitive development. Through the activities of play the child is able to make use of new cognitive abilities, and also acquire new capabilities in response to the challenges that emerge, from his/her interaction with the environment – most of the time, especially in play with other children.

Summing up, each theoretical framework focuses on one development characteristic of the meaning and purpose of play (emotional, social adaptation, cognitive adaptation). Each has the potential to complement the other.

PLAY AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE MACARTHUR STORY STEM BATTERY

Considerable attention has been paid to this link between cognitive theories and theories of affective stages and to trying to assess the child’s inner world making use of affective-cognitive processes, through play narrative techniques. Narrative has been used for a long time as way to express humanity’s history and culture, and as a way of conveying personal emotional interpretations and feelings. Play as it was previously quoted, is the main activity developed in the childhood.

One of the semi projective narrative techniques, that has been employed to understand better the child’s inner world and to assess it reliably in a scientific research context, is the MacArthur Story Stem Battery – **MSSB** - (Bretherton,

“The development of the MSSB was influenced by psychoanalytic play therapy (e.g. Erikson, 1950; Freud, 1946) as well as by research on early emotional (e.g. Wolf, Rygh, & Altshuler, 1984) and cognitive development (e.g. Nelson & Gruendel, 1981). The MSSB was designed to gain insight into children’s inner worlds, including their representations of interpersonal relationships with family and peers and their moral understanding” (Oppenheim, 2004, p. 83)

The MacArthur Story Stem Battery (MSSB) is a play technique that involves story completion tasks in which the child is asked to construct narratives about attachment and conflict themes. The goal is to encourage, through the play technique, insights into the creative process of child’s meaning, made through the stories, in addition to the communication patterns in actual relationships, using the narrative.

“The Narratives communicate mental representations of experience, as well as the role of self and others in that experience. Narratives also have organized plots or points; typically a plot involves a problem or a tension followed by some kind of resolution (Labov & Waletsky, 1967; Bruner, 1986). Finally Narratives are spoken discourses, located in a specific conversation with another person. The preschooler usually tells the narrative to one or two others – for example, a mother, a father, or other children – who are involved in “co-constructing” meaning with the child as they collaborate in play or storytelling.” (Emde, R; Wolf, D; Oppenheim, D, 2003; p.06).
Initially, Buchsbaum & Emde (1990) and Bretherton & Ridgeway (1989), had developed the MSSB, aiming to assess children’s representation of moral rules, prohibitions and family conflicts; later Oppenheim, who joined the MacArthur Network, developed a set of separation and distress stories to assess the attachment-exploration balance in preschoolers (published in Oppenheim, 1997). Findings using this technique indicate that there are rich individual variations in the areas of empathy, pro-social behaviour, and adherence to roles, reciprocity and aspects of family relationship. Over the last 15 years other researchers joined to this group (Robinson; Kelsay and others ;) and developed together new stories and coding schemes for the MacArthur Story Stem Battery (MSSB), and these are used now as an important tool in a scientific research context.

The MSSB is a structured story completion task, in which children are presented story beginnings and are asked to complete the story. The whole play is recorded with video-tape and then rated by independent raters with a rating manual rating that includes content themes, relationship themes and performance themes. Thus the information on the child’s mental representations in a conflict situation can be evaluated reliably. The main goal is to assess, at the level of representation, the child’s relationship representations and inner conflicts, which may increase their propensity for behavioural problems or emotional distress. Today, as a result of the reliability of the MSSB in the assessment of child mental representation, the use of this tool has spread to many areas of child mental health, such as antisocial children (Warren et al 1996, Von Klitzing et al 2000, Hill et al., 2004), adaptation of children undergoing stem cell transplantation (Günter et al, 2004), and the relationship between attachment in infancy and representations during latency (Oppenheim, 2004).
CHAPTER 2

GOALS – QUESTIONS - HYPOTHESES
The Memphis New Mother Study conducted by Robinson; Herat; Haynes and Simmons (2000) explored ways in which the MacArthur Story Stems Battery allows us investigate the inner life of children, and its potential usefulness in evaluating the effectiveness of interventions geared to prevent dysfunctional parenting. The authors concluded that the story stem technique could play an important role in evaluating children’s emotion regulation, social skills and early experience in the family.

Of particular relevance to this study, the MSSB was used with low income African, American children - who in spite of being American, are likely to be exposed to social and cultural practices that differ from those of white and middle class Americans.

Robinson et al reported that some cultural–specific interactive behaviours, different from the White American middle-class norms, were evident in the narratives of children assessed using the MSSB.

“This culturally-specific interactive behaviours among African-American peers and siblings warranted several changes in our scoring system that enabled us to capture the underlying normative rules that motivate some of the distinctive behaviours observable within this ethnic population.” (Robinson, et al; 2000, p.107)

One of these cultural-specific interactive behaviours concerns parental care. In the stories of African-American children well-regulated physical punishment appeared to be an expression of caring and concern for their well-being, rather than uncaring or punitive. This is consistent with the findings of Deater-Deckard et al (1996), that physical punishment was associated with behaviour problems in white US children, but there were few if any effects in African-American samples. The authors argued that the meaning of the physical punishment is crucial. If it is experienced as, or
associated with, behaviors implying rejection, its effect is likely to be detrimental, contrasted with a setting in which it may be regarded as a marker of involvement and concern. The MSSB offers a way of examining directly how children in different cultural settings represent physical punishment. Children’s representations of interparental conflict and violence were studied by Grych et al (2002) using story stems based on the MSSB. They created new story stems depicting family conflict, and developed codings to assess the children’s responses. The results suggested that witnessing violence in the family affects the children’s developing beliefs about close relationship. This could provide a way of understanding the well established associations between children’s behaviour problems and interparental conflict (Moffitt et al 1998, Hill 2002).

The aim of this study was to examine cultural variations in children’s representations of their family relationships using the MacArthur Story Stem Battery, keeping in mind the many other developmental processes reviewed in previous sections. These include changes in family relationships over time (due to the demand of the environment), and stages in the development of identity and emotional maturity. The MSSB appeared to be well suited for this task because it can be rated reliably, and there was preliminary evidence that it was sufficiently sensitive to detect cross-cultural variations (Robinson et al, 2000)

The study reported here was designed to investigate the similarities and differences in the mental representations of parents and of family structure in first grade elementary school children from two countries - Brazil and Germany:

This was the first study in which the MSSB was used to compare children from two different countries.


2.1. AIMS

The aims of this study reported here are:

1. To identify cultural patterns and related mental representations of children
2. To assess the expectations of parents toward their child as well as the parents’ cultural filter role
3. To assess possible cultural differences in defensive processes in the latency period. These may be important to stabilizing the child internally and in promoting her/his integration into the social environment
4. To better understand important aspects of the child’s identity development in latency.

2.2. QUESTIONS

In order to better understand the processes involved in building the child’s mental representations, and taking into account the cognitive structure used to achieve this (adaptation process toward the environment - assimilation and accommodation), it is also important to assess parents’ roles and participation with their child and their expectations regarding the child. This will help to characterize the environment to which the child needs to adapt him/herself. In other words, it is necessary to have a close look at the features of the relationship between the parents and their child, in order to understand the interactions between the way the child builds mental representations and the parents act as cultural filters. The questions in the study are:
• Do Brazilian and German parents report different levels of participation in their children’s daily activities?

• How do Brazilian and German parents organize themselves in the daily care of their child’s school life?

• Do Brazilian and German parents have different expectations regarding the qualities in their children that are important for healthy development?

• Do Brazilian and German parents differ in recognition of their child’s actual emotional maturity?

• Do Brazilian and German children differ in the family processes that they portray in their play, implying different representations of family relationships?

• Do the differences between the participation and expectations of Brazilian and German parents; explain differences in their children’s representations of family relationships?

2.3. HYPOTHESES

The underlying theoretical framework of this study is mainly a Psychoanalytic one, although many other perspectives have been included.

As it has been pointed previously even though the identity feeling is dynamic and progressive, its stabilization is achieved in the elaboration of Oedipus complex, phase in which the child needs to deal with triadic conflict, due to the introduction of the father function. In Lacan’s view the introduction of the father’ symbolic function at this phase represents the break up the collusion between child and mother, and the
introduction of the child in a wide world (society), characterized by rules and the necessity of other relationships. Or in other words:

“The resolution of the Oedipal conflict is essential to free intrapsychic energy to embark on an engagement with life, creativity, relationships, learning.” (Trowell & Etchegoyen, 2002, p.17)

According to Grinberg “the effects of the Oedipus Complex in the structuring of the subject are described in terms of identification. The father and the mother are at the same time the objects of love and of rivalry. It is probable that this ambivalence is essential to the construction of any identification” (Grinberg, 1990 p.22) the identity feeling is a product from the continuous interrelation between the spatial, time and social child links, in the relationship with the parents, who have the culture filter role. This Psychoanalytic developmental concept is rather similar to other concept based on different theoretical backgrounds. This will compatible for example with more sociologically oriented role concepts or with learning theoretical concepts

Costa (2001) emphasizes the importance of the couple relationship role in the structure of male and female identity. According to him, the child needs to understand clearly the differences of mother and father roles, as well as knows the complementary character of both, in order to achieve his/her sexual identity and consequently his/ her social role in the society. That means, the child can accept his/her own exclusion from the parental couple thus resolving the Oedipus complex will be able to achieve a more social identity (Hypo. 4)

Recently some authors (i.e. Mitscherlich, 1963; Costa, 2001; Obholzer, 2002) bring up the question about the role and the place of actual fathers in families and in Western society, which is currently changing, due to the increase in marital
breakdown, single-parents families, socio-economic changes and influences, such as fragmentation of labor and mass production and the dramatic change in women’s position in society. According to them all of these changes reduce the significance of fathers not only in the society but also in the child’s mental representation. Concerning these new configurations, it would be important to look at the ways in which those changes intervene or have implications for the significance of father in the child’s mental representations (Hypo 1 and 3) as well as – and that was the core of this study – to look at the different associations between the significance of mother and father roles across cultures (Hypo. 2 and 5). Thus the hypotheses of this study were made taking in account these previous questions and also the differences in the social environment between these two countries (Hypo. 6 and 7)

The main Hypotheses derived from these considerations shortly above are:

1. Expansive behaviour will be associated with representations of fathers as weak, and this will be equally true in the Brazilian and German groups
2. Fathers in the German sample will be represented as more punitive than fathers in the Brazilian sample
3. There will be an association between the portrayal of fathers as weak and mothers as strong and harsh in the narratives of the children. This will be equally the case in the Brazilian and German groups
4. High Social Competence will be connected to a good perception of the child’s place in his/her family as an element that stands aside from the parental couple. It means that the child can admit his/her exclusion from the couple. This will be equally true in the Brazilian and German group.
5. When the parents’ figures are strong and harsh it will be expected that the child will display more mistrust against the environment. This will be equally the case in the Brazilian and German groups.

6. There will be more representations of violence in the society resulting in mistrust against the environment, which is perceived more dangerous/aggressive in the Brazilian sample than in the German one.

7. If the child is engaged with these themes, then it is expected that he/she will have a lower Narrative Coherence.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY
3.1 Research sample

The study was developed in Brazil and in Germany, using two sample of non-clinical children population, who were in the first grade of the elementary school (at the end of the first semester). Each group is made of 41 children (23 boys and 18 girls; ranging from 6-8 years) and 41 respective parents. The study consisted of an independent assessment of parents and their children.

The standardization criteria to form the two groups were the standard of living, i.e. middle class children in Brazil, which were comparable to the majority of families in Germany regarding their socio-economic status in society. Both groups were from the same category of city, i.e. Stuttgart (in Germany) and Campinas (in Brazil), industrial cities, about the same size.

3.2. Ethical safeguards

The study was evaluated by the ethical commission of the Medical Faculty of the Eberhard University Tübingen. The participation in this study was of one’s own free will and included written informed consent by the parents and the child respectively. They were informed that they could withdraw their consent at any time without any reason.

3.3. Tools

To understand better how parents filter and transmit the (different) cultural values of their societies, and consequently how the child identifies him/herself with these socio-cultural patterns as well as to investigate how the child’s mental

1The written informed consent is in attachment n°1
representation of his/her parents and of his/her family structure is expressed, this study was developed through two work perspective: a) a work with parents and b) a work with their child.

3.3.1. PARENTS ASSESSMENTS.

Two different tools were used and each one had a specific assessment aim.

3.3.1.1. CBCL - CHILDREN BEHAVIOUR CHECK LIST - version 4-18 years old (Achenbach – 1991)

It is the most used instrument for the assessment of psychopathological features in children in psychological and psychiatric studies. The aim to use this tool was to assess the psychopathology and to state that the children, who formed the two samples, came from non-clinical population.

The Child Behaviour Checklist (CBCL) is a standardized parent-report questionnaire designed to assess’ social competencies and behaviour problems in children 4-18 years old. It includes 113 items describing a range of child behavioural and emotional problems, which are rated by parents as: not true (0); somewhat or sometimes true (1); and very true or often true (2).

Externalizing and internalizing behaviour problem scores were generated according to the guidelines provided by Achenbach – 1991².

---

² There is a German CBCL Standard and due to not having a Brazilian standard one, the German Standard was adopted for both groups.
3.3.1.2 QUESTIONNAIRE - FAMILY ORGANIZATION / PARENTS EXPECTATIONS

INVENTORY – FOPEI (Franieck & Günter, 2002)

This Questionnaire was developed specially for this study. This tool was created with the aim to assess the participation of family members in the child’s daily school activities in the first part, and in the second one to assess the parents expectations and recognitions regarding their child’s attitudes and emotional maturity. Each part is named: Child’s Daily Activities and Attitudes and Feelings.

FIRST PART - Child’s Daily Activities

- It included 11 questions describing a range of activities in the daily care of the child’s school life (i.e. “Who wakes up the child?”; “Who takes the child to school?”; “Who has lunch with the child?”; “Who helps the child to do her/his homework?”; “Who puts the child in bed?”
- Measuring the participation of each member of the family (mother, father, child by him/herself and others) in these activities
- The daily participation is rated by parents as: never (0); sometimes (1); often (2) and always (3).
- The percentage of participation of each element in the family was calculated and analysed statistically to compare differences between the Brazilian and the German sample.

SECOND PART – Attitudes and Feelings

- It included 02 questions about the features/capacities of the child development. The first question aims to assess the expectation from the parents toward their child to a successful development (the ideal

---

3 The FOPEI (English version) is in Attachment n° 2
The second one aims to assess their recognition of their actual child’s behaviour (real parameter). The respective question are:

1. “How deep is each of these attitudes/feelings for a good child’s growth and development?”

2. “How deep is each of these attitudes/feelings in your child?”

A list of 25 attitudes/feelings was presented:

1. Aggressiveness
2. Autonomy
3. Companionship
4. Competitiveness
5. Trust
6. Courage
7. Creativity
8. Dependence
9. Distrust
10. Fear
11. Flexibility
12. Insolence
13. Impulsiveness
14. Individuality
15. Leadership
16. Rationality
17. Self-respect
18. Self-assertion
19. Self-assurance
20. Self-control
21. Self-discipline
22. Self-help
23. Self-interest
24. Self-sacrifice
25. Sociable

Rated by parents regarding the presence of attitudes/feelings as:

No (0); little (1), enough (2) and a lot (3).

The expected attitudes/feelings (question 01), recognized attitudes/feelings (question 02) and the ratio (expected/recognized) were calculated and analysed statistically through factor analyses and other statistical analyses to compare differences between the Brazilian and the German samples.
3.3.2. CHILDREN ASSESSMENTS.

Two different instruments were used in the work with the children.

3.3.2.1. MSSB – MACARTHUR STORY STEM BATTERY’S NARRATIVE CODING MANUAL - Tübingen-Basel Version (Günter et al., 2001)- Revision and Attachment Parental Representations (Franieck et al., 2003)

The original MSSB was developed through a basic framework made from three studies: Emde & Buchsbaum and collaborators (1990), Bretherton & Ridgeway and collaborators (1990) and Oppenheim (1997). For this cross-cultural study a German version of the MacArthur Story Stem adapted to school children, version Tübingen-Basel-Wien (Günter et al. 1999b), Tübingen-Basel Manual (Günter et al. 2001a)\(^7\), Revision and Attachment Parental Representations (Franieck et al., 2003) was used. This was the core instrument to assess the children’s mental representations in different countries. Due to the complexity of this tool, its description is divided into topics.

3.3.2.1.1 Definition and aim of MSSB

“The MSSB is structured, moreover, to yield information that can be evaluated psychometrically. The narrative completion responses it elicits are scored with multiple dimensions in coding schemes that allow for a high degree of interrater reliability and, as indicated by chapters in this volume, convergent and discriminative validity can be assessed.” (Emde et al. 2003, p. 04)

\(^7\) This Version is based on the Memphis Narrative Coding Manual (JoAnn Robinson, Linda Mantz Simmons, Jenny MacFie and MacArthur Narrative Working Group, 2000) and the Kempe Aurora Preschool Coding Manual 1999 (Kelsay)
The MSSB is a video-based semi-projective doll-play technique, where stories with moral and/or interpersonal conflicts are presented to the child. Each story stem was created with a particular theme or dilemma in mind, aiming to provide to the child a coherent address of the stems in more than one way. The stories are presented by an examiner, who must demonstrate a degree of playfulness and ability to actively engage with the child as well as ability to set enforce boundaries when needed. The examiner engages the child with an interesting story beginning, making use of small family dolls as character (Mom, Dad and two children), until the narrative reaches a “high point”. At this moment the child is requested from the examiner to show him/her and tell him/her what happens next. The child has to provide a “resolution” in play and in words, using his/her feelings aroused, as well as his/her imagination and creativity to inform what happens next. In this way the story-stems provoke the child to reveal the subjective attitudes, feelings and emotions, as well as her ability to organize his/her feelings into coherent thoughts through the stories and draw from the scripted inner representations of his/her world, his/her individual experiences, as well as his/her cultural background. The goal of MSSB is: to encourage many insights into the creative process of a child’s mind doing through the stories, in addition with communication patterns in actual relationship. In this study there was a special very close look at the parental representations. The aim was to identify cultural difference patterns of the inner conceptualization of parental representations, how children and their parents cope with the impact of insecurity and anxiety at the moment when the children have to make a separation step and engage themselves in social relationships, i.e. the elementary school, in an environment different from his/her family’s. Furthermore to assess the adaptation processes or to stabilize defensive
processes in psychoanalytic terminology, which were used in both cultures to successfully, in order to overcome this developing barrier.

3.3.2.1.2. **Content of the MacArthur Story Stem Battery**

The story stems were developed to elicit children’s narratives about specific themes, although the children are free to add new themes according to their response and creativity. The original Battery was constructed by Bretherton, Oppenheim, Buchsbaum, Emde and the MacArthur Narrative Group, 1990, that reflects a wide variety of interests: several types of family relations (parent-child, marital and peer conflict, parent-child attachment, the oedipal and other triads), moral rules (do’s or and not does); moral emotions (guilt, shame, empathy); and competence (pride). Others investigators, who made use of the MSSB in their study, have added some special purpose stems as well as created new stems, due to their scientific interest. Günter, Di Gallo, and Stohrer (2000) created a parallel set of 10 story stems, which had slight changes concerning the contents but they were designed as closely as possible to the original stories. (Bretherton, Oppenheim, Buchsbaum, Emde, 1990) The goal of the MacArthur Story Stem Battery Version Tübingen-Basel-Wien is not only to open the possibility to develop a longitudinal process of investigation using this tool twice within a relatively short period of time, but also to provide an alternative to the MSSB, when administered to the children ranging 8-12 years old (Aurnhammer & Koch, 2001)

In this study were applied one warm up story and more 8 stories, which were grouped according to their content: one involved transgression theme, three

---

8 The Story Stem Battery used in this study was composed of some stories from the Original MSSB Battery (Bretherton, Oppenheim, Buchsbaum, Emde and the MacArthur Narrative Group, 1990) and some others from MacArthur Story Stem Battery Version Tübingen-Basel-Wien (Günter, Di Gallo & Stohrer, 1999)
described emotional conflicts and four involved attachment themes. The applied story stems are described in summary on the next table 01 in their respective presentation’s order.

Table 01: Applied Stories MSSB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Story Stem</th>
<th>Brief description</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbecue</td>
<td>After the mother’s advise not to be close to the fire, the child tries to get a sausage for him/her to eat and burn him/herself.</td>
<td>Two siblings, mother, father,</td>
<td>attachment/parental sympathy versus authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost Keys</td>
<td>The mother accuses the father of having the lost keys, and argument ensues</td>
<td>Mother, father and one child</td>
<td>Child response to parental conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gift for Mom or Dad</td>
<td>The child, who has made a beautiful drawing at his or her school, shows it to the parents on coming home. The interviewer asks who the child gives the picture to: mom or dad</td>
<td>Child, mother, father,</td>
<td>Does the child favour the same sex or opposite sex parent? How does child deal with triadic conflict?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injured Child</td>
<td>The child wears a plaster foot. It is Sunday and the parents suggest doing an outing and ask to the children what they would like to do. The brother/sister answers that he/she wants to ride a bike (in summer) or to ski (in winter)</td>
<td>Two siblings, mother and father</td>
<td>community, exclusion, physical injury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost Dog</td>
<td>Part I – when going outside to play, a child discovers the family dog was gone. Part II – The dog returns</td>
<td>Child, mother and dog (in part II)</td>
<td>Concern for sadness about a lost animal, joyful, angry, or avoidant reunion response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Departure

**Attachment story stems**
- The parents go on an overnight trip while the grandmother baby-sits
- Mother, father, two siblings and grandmother

**Separation anxiety**

### Reunion

**Attachment story stems**
- The parents return from their trip
- Mother, father, two siblings and grandmother

**Reunion quality**

---

#### 3.3.2.1.3 Directions for Administering the MacArthur Story Stem Battery

**Rapport:** It is very important that the examiner establishes a good rapport with the child through the playful interaction, before starting the application of this tool. Proper training of the examiner is crucial.

**Material:** Doll families are used. The precise appearance of the family figure is not important; however it is absolutely necessary that the characters be able to stand up and where each characters identity in the family must be well described: mother, father, grandmother, siblings (two children), additional children (to serve as friends) and the family dog. It is also important to follow the layout of the props and positioning/orientation of the characters recommended in the manual. In this study “Playmobile” characters was used.

Other important material is the cam-recorder. A special attention needs to be paid to its position in relation to the child and the examiner. The recorder should have a clear sound and good scene due to the following coding scheme that will be applied. The examiner has to introduce and explain the child the purpose of the camera.

**Warm-up story:** The task is administrated at a table with the child and examiner sitting at angles. To begin the application the examiner introduces and

---

9 The full texts of the applied Story Stem Battery with the layout of the props are in attachment n°3
names the family members one by one. Although this story is closer to the other stories of the Stem Battery, it is not considered part of it. The warm up story content does not have any moral or interpersonal conflict, so it can be characterized as a descriptive story that besides of introducing the family characters to the child, it also introduces the narrative setting, on providing an opportunity to convey to the child what is expected from him/her through out the following stories.

3.3.2.1.4 Coding System

The original MSSB Coding System was developed by Robinson and colleagues (1992). Robinson created a list of common themes related to the issues probed by various stems, this system was intended to serve as a mapping or survey functions for scoring each of the child's story stem response. The rating manual includes, content themes, relationship themes, performance features themes (specific affects and narrative coherence). Some of these themes are expressed in an ordinal conception but most of the themes are rated in dichotomised way. Each Story Stem response is rated in terms of the presence or the absence of the content themes, relationship themes and performance features. Each item is rated no more than once per story. Item codes are then added over the story set of eight stories (in this study) and then lumped together to scales. A German version of narrative-coding manual - “Narrative-Coding Manual of the MacArthur Story Stem Battery” - Tübingen-Basel-Wien Version was developed by Günter (1999 a) and co-workers adapting the instrument for the assessment of school children and using it in several research projects. For this cross-cultural study, an adapted version of the MacArthur Story Stem MSSB, version Tübingen-Basel-Wien (Günter et al. 1999b), Tübingen-Basel
Manual (Günter et al. 2001a) - Revision and Attachment Parental Representations (Franieck et al., 2003) was used. Franieck (2003) developed new ratings about parents’ representation as well as some adaptation on the item - object relationship, which were included in the MacArthur Story Stem Battery’s Narrative Coding Manual – Tübingen - Basel Version as an attachment.

The Original Narrative Coding Manual Tübingen-Basel- Version (Günter et al. 2001a) contains 58 reliable items divided into content items, narrative emotional codes, and specific affects/behaviour codes. And after the revision and with the Parental Representations Attachment (Franieck 2003) more 65 items such as: the parents’ representation (mother-child interaction, father-child interaction, marital interaction, parents/child characteristics) as well as items for specific story stems (content codes for parents’ conflict story stem and content codes for separation/reunion story stems) were included in the Narrative Coding Manual Tübingen Basel Version\(^{10}\). Totalling up there were 123 coding items in the Narrative Coding Manual. Aiming a broad understanding of the coding items’ features, a brief description of some items will present below as an example from each theme that comprise the Narrative Coding Manual\(^{11}\):

**A) Content Themes:**

**Item 04 - Exclusion (EX)**

1 = exclusion of others:
One character prevents another from joining in an activity or a character gets sent away.

2 = self-exclusion:
A character excludes her/himself from an activity or others.

3 = both, 1 and 2:

\(^{10}\) A table with the 135 items of the Coding Manual is presented in Attachment n°4

\(^{11}\) Some detailed examples of the items that comprised the Narrative Coding Manual is presented in Attachment n°5
Item 05 - Aggression (AG)
Interpersonal acts of aggression. Aggression against a dog is not coded. Also the dog being aggressive to people is not coded under aggression.
1 = verbal aggression:
2 = physical aggression:
3 = unprovoked or deregulated aggression:
4 = the child assaults an adult.

Item 10 - Empathy/Helping (E/H)
A character or the subject either identifies with or demonstrates an understanding of the thoughts or feelings of another through action.

Item 13 - Compliance (CP)
This refers to situations, in which a character yields to the rules or requests of an adult, and does what is asked.

Item 19 - Affection (AFC)
Any display of hugs, kisses, compliments, warm or caring touch or praise. The direct verbal or physical interaction is important here.

B) Narrative Emotional Codes:

Item 38 - Danger Theme (DAN)
This theme refers to the presence of a theme, which involves danger in the narrative.
0 = missing/no danger theme present
1 = continuation of the danger theme:
2 = new danger or clear worsening of the danger:

Item 41 - Child Power (POW)
1 = Inappropriate Parental role Child Power
2 = Inappropriate Grandiose Child Power

C) Performance:

Item 50 - Narrative Coherence (NC)
Addresses the degree to which the child responses to the stories stem with a logical sequence of events as well as the degree of elaboration, which is brought to response.
Conflict Not Handled (ranging from 0-3)
Conflict Handled by Changing Constraints (ranging from 4-8)
Understanding the Story, Embellished + (ranging from 9-10)
D) Coding the parental and child representations in the Narratives

D.1. Positive Parent-child Interaction

Item 61. Nurturance/Protection:
Item 64 - Authoritative discipline/guidance

D.2. Negative Parent-child Interaction

A negative representation will be characterized by inappropriate, insensitivity and harsh and rejecting interactions.

Item 65 - Verbal Aggression
Item 67 - Punishment

D.3. Marital Interaction

These codes refer to how the child interprets and describes his/her perception of his/her parents' relationship (between them).

Item 71 - Neutral

D.3.1. Positive

ITEM 72 = HELPFUL / FRIENDLY / WARM RELATIONSHIP
Item 73 = Reparation
Item 74 = sensitively, tenderly, caring, supporting
Item 75 = special relationship

D.3.2. Negative

Parents express conflict, anger, tension, etc., toward each other, either verbally or physically.

Item 76 = unfriendly / aggressively
Item 77 = Rivalry
Item 78 = Exclusion

E) Content codes specific to the parents’ conflict Story Stems (Lost Key)

E.1. Conflict Expression/Resolution

Item 88 - Conflict Resolution
1: Resolved
2: Unresolved
3: Escalated

Item 90 – Child's Involvement in the Conflict.
F) CONTENT CODES SPECIFIC TO THE SEPARATION/REUNION STORIES
(Barney / Departure / Reunion)

F. 1. Child Response to Separation
Item 111 - Acceptance/neutral or positive affect:
Item 114 - Indifference/disregard
Item 117 - Denial/Control
Item 118 - Aggressive/Sadism

F.2. Child Response to Reunion
Item 122 - Indifference
Item 123 - Exclusion
Item 124 - Aggressive / Destructive:

3.3.2.1.5 Reliability of Coders

The coder’s training must be done before the researcher codes his/her material. This training comprises a reading and studying of the Coding Manual, which is related to the coding answer sheet. Observing the children’s narrative examples, which were video-taped, as well as the several different narratives style, the researcher (coder) was able to learn how to use correctly the Coding Manual. Following this, each coder must independently code 15-20 children’s narratives in order to attain reliability. In this study 19 children’s narratives of German sample were coded independently by Franieck and Delatrée in order to assess inter-rater reliability. In this study the inter-rater reliability proved to be good - ICC Mean = 0.80 SD = 0.137 and Variance = 0.019. Due to the cross-cultural features of this study, such as the necessity to work with respective samples in Brazil and in Germany; the necessity to speak and understand both languages (Portuguese and German), and aiming to keep the same procedure standard as well as the same analyses of data standard (i.e. evaluation by Coding Manual). The 82 children’s narratives in this study were applied and coded by Franieck.
3.3.2.1.6. The Scales

Robinson and co-workers (1992) created some MSSB Scales, aiming to organize the contents themes into domains. Some of these scales were revised by Robinson (2000). Over the last years other investigators have developed new scales, i.e. Günter (et al. 1997, 1999) developed three new scales to assess the mental representation of children, who underwent bone marrow transplant, although here is presented only one of his scales. In this study 08 scales were used which were partly drawn from the literature and partly newly constructed (Franieck, 2004). The eight scales are following presented, including their content themes:

The Scales “Social Competence” and “Poor Internal Control” were preliminary introduced by Robinson due to Memphis study (Robinson et al. 2000), where she found more the expression of emotion competence and behaviour regulation than the parenting dysfunction. The scales mentioned above shall differentiate among children with a good psychosocial adaptation and children with externalising behaviour problem. They are comprised by the following items:

I. Scale: Social Competence (SC) - created by J. Robinson

1. Empathy/Helping
2. Shame
3. Affection
4. Affiliation
5. Interpersonal Conflict Resolution
6. Sharing
7. Compliance
8. Reparation/guilt
9. Verbal punishment / verbal reprimand/
10. Positive final content
II. Scale: Poor internal control (PIC) - created by J. Robinson

1. Aggression
2. Destruction of objects
3. Death by aggression
4. Non-compliance
5. Teasing/Taunting
6. Dishonesty
7. Physical punishment
8. New danger or worsening of the danger

III. Scale: Emotional Coherence and Adaptation Capacity (EA) - created by Günter

This scale aims to assess the child’s competence in dealing with emotional distress. In designing this scale the main interest was to be able to detect differences among severely ill children, who were under distress, due to their potential or actual life threatening from illnesses and healthy controls. Somehow this scale is close to the narrative coherence scale but it includes more content themes and stress more the emotional regulation and relationship capacity than the NC scale. In the author’s view, this scale has also a link with the capacity for psychosocial adaptation. It is comprised by the following items:

1. Sharing (A2)
2. Empathy / Helping (A10)
3. Interpersonal Conflict Resolution (A12)
4. Affiliation (A17)
5. Emotional Incoherence to Positive (B5, reverse)
6. Emotional Incoherence to Negative (B6, reverse)
7. Parent-child Representation (Positive – mother and father) (D 01) –
8. Denial (D2, reverse)
9. Creativity / Imagination (D3)

IV. Scale: Narrative Coherence (NC) - created by J. Robinson

Core scale of the whole instrument, reflects the child’s capacity to develop coherent stories and to handle the conflict. Age dependent this Scale was composed by just one item. Here the evaluation is about how the child’s response addresses the conflict inherent in the story stem; his/her capacity to organize jointly his/her emotions and experiences into words coherently. The lowest ratings (ranging from 0 to 5) are applied to the stories that are not adapted to the particular story stem, that was presented, or they avoid the central conflict in the story. The upper ratings on the scale (ranging from 6 to 10) are given to the responses that do address/resolve the
central conflict, but vary according to the degree of elaboration and presence of incoherence.

V. Scale: Moral Themes (MT) - created by Robinson
1. Interpersonal Conflict Resolution
2. Compliance
3. Non-compliance
4. Shame
5. Blame
6. Teasing/Taunting
7. Dishonesty
8. Punishment/Discipline
9. Reparation/Guilt

The following three Scales are based on the coding scheme of the adapted version of the MacArthur Story Stem Manual, Tübingen-Basel Manual (Günter et al. 2001a) - Revision and Attachment Parental Representations (Franieck et al. 2003), which was newly developed due to this cross-cultural study.

The scales VIII and IX were constructed to assess the child’s inner representations of the parents and the family structure in a period of development in early latency.

VI Scale: Positive Representation of Parents (PRP) – created by Franieck
1. Parent-child interaction representation (Positive – mother and father) (D 01)
2. Marital Interaction (Positive) (D 02)
3. Parent Characteristic (Item B – mother and father) (D03)
4. Child Characteristics (Items B,E,F) (D04)
5. Content codes specific to separation and reunion (Item a) (F01 and F02)

VII. Scale: Negative Representation of Parents (NRP) – created by Franieck

Due to the strong defensive mechanisms, which characterize the latency period, the compilation of this scale was not as clear as the positive parents representation scale. The latency children use their defensive mechanism, as a protection and therefore may have difficulties to show openly the negative parents representation. For the building of this scale, it was necessary not only coding the

* The codes of quoted items are based on the electronic coding paper by Franieck/2003
expressed negative parents’ representations, but also including the clinical experiences concerning the expression of the child’s defenses during play-therapy.

This scale is comprised by the following items:
1. Parent-child representation (Negative – mother and father) (D 01)
2. Marital Interaction (Negative) (D 02)
3. Parent Characteristics (Item A – mother and father) (D03)
4. Child Characteristics (Items A,D) (D04)
5. Other Nurturance/support (Item A e B) (D05)
6. Content codes specific to separation and reunion (Item C+G, D+F, E)(F01) and (Items C+F, E) (F02)
7. Non-compliance (A14)
8. Dishonesty (A21)
9. Regression (B3)
10. Child Power (B4)

VIII. Scale: Expression of mistrust against the environment* – created by Franieck

Taking into account the same theoretical principle of the latency period described above for the Negative Parents Representation Scale, this scale was also built making use of the clinical experiences. The aim of this scale is to show the existence of mental representation of social violence that was not directly represented in a level of anxiety but as an expression of mistrust against the environment – that is the representation of the violence is expressed not frankly but through somewhat defensive or organizing mechanisms aiming to adapt the mental organization to this social situation. The scale is comprised by:
1. Exclusion (A04)
2. Refuse of Empathy/Help (A11)
3. Interpersonal Conflict Resolution (A12)
4. Non-compliance (A14)
5. Dishonesty (A21)
6. Punishment/Discipline (A22)
7. Repetition (A37)
8. Go to bed by oneself (A25)
9. Control of the examiner (C01)
10. Anxiety (C09)
11. Endless story (C11)

* The codes of quoted items are based on the electronic coding paper by Franieck/2003
3.3.2.2. **RORSCHACH - BOARDS IV AND VII**

The Rorschach is a projective test that includes ten boards with symmetric ink blots. The 10 boards are introduced to the Subject following an order and the Subject then conveys and explains his/her perception of each board. Although it is unusual, only two of ten boards are used for this study:

**Board IV**, concerns the parental representations of masculinity: anxiety shock, threatening father figure power, strength, potency)

**Board VII**, concerns the parental representation of femininity

In this study the presentation of the two boards was done after the MSSB application. The goal of using Rorschach is not as an empirical material, but as a speculative material concerning the child’s perception of parents’ representation. The child’s responses were transcribed and after that rated independently by Franieck and Günter.

**3.4. WORK ENVIRONMENT**

The whole work was developed by only one examiner – Franieck
3.4.1 Contact with the Schools to build the groups

At first the contact with the schools\textsuperscript{12} in each country was done. The school’s participation in this study was also of one’s free will. More than ten schools about the same size and characteristics were invited to participate in this study, in each country. The contact with the schools was done directly between the researcher and the schools’ principal. For this study, the Brazilian sample was made by children from three different schools and the German sample was made by children from four different schools.

3.4.2. Procedure with the parents

The first contact with parents was done through an introduction letter\textsuperscript{13} and immediately afterwards a face to face contact, where the parents’ doubts were cleared out and where the Questionnaires and the written consent were given and explained in order to be filled out. The Questionnaires were filled out by the parents at home and they returned it at their child’s play-session.

It was given some advice to the parents, regarding how to inform their child about the play-session as well as the contact with the examiner.

3.4.3. Procedure with the children - setting

The work with the children was developed at the schools, during the school time with the consent of the schools’ principal and of their parents. The play-session was done only with the examiner and the child\textsuperscript{14} in an empty classroom. The MSSB was applied and after its end the two Boards of Rorschach were presented in the

\textsuperscript{12} Due to the standardization criteria – standard of living, i.e. middle class children in Brazil, the work in Brazil had to be done with private schools.

\textsuperscript{13} The introduction letter is in attachment n° 6

\textsuperscript{14} The examiner’s introduction to the child is described in attachment n°7
following sequence: Board IV, Board VII\textsuperscript{15}. Each play-session was video-taped and ranged from 30 to 60 minutes, depending on the child’s play as well as his/her narrative. There was no difficulty working with the children from the two groups. The children enjoyed the play-session and engaged in playing. There was no refusal to play.

\textsuperscript{15} The Rorschach application was also video-recorded.
CHAPTER 4
DATA ANALYSES
Data Analysis

Frequency tables are presented to show the rates of categorical variables, such as of males and females, and descriptive statistics are provided for continuous variables, such as scores on MSSB scales. To describe the sample profile according to the several variables in the study, it was built frequency’s tables for the categorical variables (gender, age group, social group...) and descriptive statistics (with position and dispersion measures – mean, standard deviation, minimum value, maximum value and median value for the continuous variables (scale scores...).

Differences between the countries on proportions of children with characteristics of interest were examined using the Chi-Square Test or if necessary (if the presence of expected values was smaller than 5), the Fisher’s Exact Test.

Examination of the distributions of the scores for the continuous variables suggested that the majority were skewed, and so the non-parametric Mann-Witney U Test was used to compare the Brazilian and German groups.

Inter-rater agreement for ratings of the MSSB and Rorschach Test was assessed using Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC) for continuous variables and Cohen’s Kappa Agreement Coefficient for dichotomous variables.

The internal consistency of the scores obtained from the instruments was analysed using Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient (\(\alpha\)), which is more appropriate when the scales are comparable, because the variance and covariance are taken into account for calculation.

\[16\] Statistical Adviser: Machado, Helymar C. – Statistician– CONRE – SP 7696 – A
Factor analysis was used to reduce the number of measures from the MSSB and the Feelings Scales. For MSSB four Factorial Analyses were done according to each part of the Manual: a) Tübingen – Basel Manual; b) Parent’s Representation; c) Parent’s Conflict and d) Separation/Reunion. And for Attitudes/Feelings three Factorial Analyses were done, according to the aim of each part: a) Expected Feelings; b) Recognized Feelings and c) Ratio (Expected/Recognized).

KMO and Bartlett’s Test were done first to establish whether the variables would be suitable for Factor Analysis. The extraction of the Factors followed three successive criteria: 1) Eigenvalue 2) screeplot: to select the number of Factors that have the higher Eigenvalues (the best values of Eigenvalue); and 3) Varimax Orthogonal Rotation: based on the results of Screeplot the number of the extracted Factors was fixed before the rotation. The criteria for the selection of a Factor were either that there were more than four items with a factor loading of ≥ 0.60 or there were more than ten items with a factor loading ≥ 0.40. The items that were selected for the final factors were the ones with the highest loadings. The factor structural stability (FS) was proved following the equation of Guadagnoli & Velicer (1988)\(^{17}\). According to the authors these equations give a value, which estimate the structural stability of the Factors. Stability is considered to be adequate if FS ≥ 0.80, excellent if FS > 0.90. Aiming to avoid the multicollinearity effect in the extracted Factors for those MSSB variables, which are expressed in an ordinal concept (loading ranged from 0 = absence of response to N=number of items, which compiled the ordinal variable) it was made use of the Adjusted Weighed Mean, due to the necessity to

\(^{17}\) FS= 1-\{(1.10 x X1 - 0.12 x 2 + 0.066) \times X1 = \frac{1}{n} \times X2\}

X1= minimal load value of the rotated factor
FS= Factor structural stability (FS ≥ 0.80 or FS > 0.90 good agreement with the reality)
standardize these variables to forward work (extracted factor; scales) as well as the necessity to reduce these ordinal variables to the same size of the variables; which are expressed in dichotomised concept. The dichotomised variables were expressed in presence or absence of the response and the item scores from each dichotomised variable were summed up over the 8 stories. The entire scores to each variable are expressed through a scale ranging from 0 to 8.

In both the Rorschach and the MSSB some of the dichotomous variables assess rare characteristics. In order to ensure that the validity of the analyses was not undermined by sporadic variables, variables were excluded if the characteristic that they assessed had not been rated as ‘present’ in at least 10% of the subjects (N=82).

In order to establish whether there were independent effects of two predictor variables (country and gender) in the responses for Rorschach (Boards IV and VII), they were examined jointly in two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA, taking in account that the variables were changed into ranks). Post-hoc Tukey’s Test was also used in order to compare countries and genders in case of a significant interaction effect.

To analyse the correlation between the instruments scores, it was made use of Spearman’s Rho correlation coefficient, which is more appropriate when the variables do not have Normal or Gaussian distribution or have skewed values.

Aiming to study which variable better jointly discriminates the obtained scores of the instruments (CBCL Scales; MSSB Factors, items; Feelings Factors; items of Questionnaire; socio-demographic variables and the groups Br and De) and to confirm or not the hypotheses of this study, it was made use of Multiple Linear Regression Analysis. Through this analysis it was taken into account one response variable, which comes from the instruments in relation to the other variables that
enter as explanatory variables. It was done univariate analysis and multivariate analysis with Stepwise criterion for variables selection as well as the variables, which did not have a normal distribution, were changed into ranks.

The significance level was set at 5% (p<0.05) for all statistical analyses.
CHAPTER 5

RESULTS
5.1. BASIC RESULTS OF EACH INSTRUMENT AND FURTHER COMPARISON BETWEEN THE TWO COUNTRIES

5.1.1. SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

5.1.1.1. SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC DATA – BRAZILIAN SAMPLE

The table 02 shows the descriptive statistics of the socio-demographic variables, such as gender, age, marital status and sibling status, in the Brazilian sample.

Table 02: Socio-demographic characteristics of the Brazilian sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGE YEARS (M=7.32, SD=0.40)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0 - 6.9</td>
<td>(17.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0 - 7.9</td>
<td>(80.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0 - 8.9</td>
<td>(02.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>(43.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>(56.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIBLINGS’ AGE PLACEMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldest</td>
<td>(31.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>(07.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngest</td>
<td>(26.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twins</td>
<td>(04.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only child</td>
<td>(29.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIBLINGS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No siblings</td>
<td>(29.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One sibling</td>
<td>(56.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more siblings</td>
<td>(14.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARENTS’ MARITAL STATUS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>(75.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>(07.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never lived together</td>
<td>(04.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live together (not married)</td>
<td>(04.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step father</td>
<td>(02.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single mother</td>
<td>(04.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>(0.00%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.1.1.2. SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC DATA – GERMAN SAMPLE

The table 03 shows the descriptive statistics of the socio-demographic variables, such as gender, age, marital status and sibling status, in the German sample.

Table 03: Socio-demographic characteristics of the German sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGE YEARS (M=7.53, SD=0.56)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0 – 6.9</td>
<td>(14.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0 – 7.9</td>
<td>(68.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0 – 8.9</td>
<td>(17.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>(43.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>(56.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIBLINGS’ AGE PLACEMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldest</td>
<td>(31.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>(04.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngest</td>
<td>(46.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twins</td>
<td>(00.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only child</td>
<td>(17.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIBLINGS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No siblings</td>
<td>(17.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One sibling</td>
<td>(70.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more siblings</td>
<td>(12.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARENTS’ MARITAL STATUS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>(75.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>(19.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never live together</td>
<td>(00.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live together</td>
<td>(02.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(not married)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step father</td>
<td>(00.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single mother</td>
<td>(00.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>(02.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.1.3. SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC DATA – COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

The table 04 shows the P Values for the analyses comparing the Brazilian and German groups.
Table 04: P Values for the comparison of the Brazilian and German samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>P- Value*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIBLINGS’ AGE PLACEMENT</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIBLINGS</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARENTS’ MARITAL STATUS</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean ages of the two groups were compared using two sided independent groups t-test.
All other analyses were either the Chi-Square Test or Fisher’s Exact Test.

The groups did not differ in age, gender, birth order or number of siblings.
However there was a trend for there to be more divorced parental couples in the German group.

5.1.2. CHILD BEHAVIOUR CHECK LIST (CBCL)

5.1.2.1. CHILD BEHAVIOUR CHECK LIST (CBCL) – BRAZILIAN SAMPLE

Table 05 shows distributions of children in the normal, borderline and clinical ranges on the CBCL Scales of Competence, Internalizing Symptoms and Externalizing Symptoms in the Brazilian sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBCL SCALES</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMPETENCE SCALE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>(88.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borderline</td>
<td>(05.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical</td>
<td>(05.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTERNALIZING SCALE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>(56.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borderline</td>
<td>(24.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical</td>
<td>(19.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERNALIZING SCALE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>(51.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borderline</td>
<td>(12.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical</td>
<td>(36.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.2.2. CHILD BEHAVIOUR CHECK LIST (CBCL) – GERMAN SAMPLE
Table 06 shows distributions of children in the normal, borderline and clinical ranges on the CBCL Scales of Competence, Internalizing Symptoms and Externalizing Symptoms in the German sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBCL SCALES</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMPETENCE SCALE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>(97.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borderline</td>
<td>(00.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical</td>
<td>(02.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXTERNALIZING SCALE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>(78.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borderline</td>
<td>(07.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical</td>
<td>(14.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERNALIZING SCALE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>(80.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borderline</td>
<td>(09.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical</td>
<td>(09.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.2.3. CHILD BEHAVIOUR CHECK LIST (CBCL) - COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

Table 07 shows the P values for the comparisons of the Brazilian and German groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBCL SCALES</th>
<th>P-Value*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMPETENCE SCALE</strong></td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXTERNALIZING SCALE</strong></td>
<td>0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERNALIZING SCALE</strong></td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p-value for the Chi-Square Test or Fisher's Exact Test comparing the frequency of variables between the countries

The numbers of children in the Brazilian group with internalising scores in the clinical range were much higher than in the German group, and the difference was statistically significant. There was also a tendency to higher values on the Externalizing Scale in the Brazilian sample. It is important to point out here that there is no CBCL Standardization for
the Brazilian population. In addition, Bordin et al (2004) made use of the CBCL with Brazilian children and found a high rate of children in the clinical range - 45.9% of the whole sample (N= 482) was compiled by clinical and borderline to Internalizing Problems, according to American Standardization. The possible reasons for the elevated rates of internalising problems in the Brazilian group are discussed in Section 5.1.6. Summary of Results, page 106.

5.1.3. QUESTIONNAIRE

5.1.3.1- Part I - Child’s Daily Activities Scale (% of participation) - Comparative Analysis

The following Table 08, shows the descriptive statistics for the percentages of each parent and child in the participation of the family members (Mother, Father, Child and Other) in the 9 child daily activities, which was measured through the 9 questions of the Daily Scale as well as the comparison between the groups: Brazilian children (Br) and German children (De).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Participation</th>
<th>Brazilian Group (N = 41)</th>
<th>German Group (N = 41)</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range; Mean (s.d)</td>
<td>Range; Mean (s.d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>24.26 – 69.44; 47.63 (12.15)</td>
<td>11.64 – 78.70; 50.86 (15.23)</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>0.00 – 46.11; 19.46 (11.54)</td>
<td>0.00 – 25.29; 13.55 (6.68)</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>0.00 – 32.41; 13.18 (8.49)</td>
<td>2.78 – 54.07; 25.03 (11.95)</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (grandparents, maid, old siblings)</td>
<td>0.00 – 64.26; 19.74 (14.18)</td>
<td>0.00 – 49.21; 10.57 (9.76)</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ESCORES ITENS 1 A 9 DA DAY-TO-DAY ****/  
PERCMO=((WAMO)/(WAMO+WAFA+WACH+WAOT)+(BRMO)/(BRMO+BRFA+BRCH+BROT)+(SNMO)/(SNMO+SNFA+SNCH+SNOT) +(GMT0)/(GMT0+GMFA+GMCH+GROT)+(HM0)/(HM0+HFA+HCH+HOT) +(ORM0)/(ORM0+ORFA+ORCH+OROT)+(BOM0)/(BOM0+BF+BECH+BOT))/9*100 ;  
PERCFA=((WAFA)/(WAMO+WAFA+WACH+WAOT) + (BRFA)/(BRMO+BRFA+BRCH+BROT) + (SNFA)/(SNMO+SNFA+SNCH+SNOT) + (GMFA)/(GMT0+GMFA+GMCH+GROT) + (HMFA)/(HM0+HFA+HCH+HOT) + (ORFA)/(ORM0+ORFA+ORCH+OROT) + (BF)/(BOM0+BF+BECH+BOT))/9*100 ;  
PERCCH=((WACH)/(WAMO+WAFA+WACH+WAOT) + (BRCH)/(BRMO+BRFA+BRCH+BROT) + (SNCH)/(SNMO+SNFA+SNCH+SNOT) + (GMCH)/(GMT0+GMFA+GMCH+GROT) + (HMCH)/(HM0+HFA+HCH+HOT) + (ORCH)/(ORM0+ORFA+ORCH+OROT) + (CH)/(BOM0+BF+BECH+BOT))/9*100 ;  
PERCOT=((WAOT)/(WAMO+WAFA+WACH+WAOT) + (BROT)/(BRMO+BRFA+BRCH+BROT) + (SNOT)/(SNMO+SNFA+SNCH+SNOT) + (GNOT)/(GMT0+GMFA+GMCH+GROT) + (HNOT)/(HM0+HFA+HCH+HOT) + (OROT)/(ORM0+ORFA+ORCH+OROT) + (OT)/(BOM0+BF+BECH+BOT))/9*100 ;

* P-value for the Mann-Whitney test comparing the scores between the countries.  
Variables are the average percentage of participation of each person (mother, father, child and other) in children’s life for items.
The mother's participation in the daily activities of the child is higher than that of the other members of family, and this does not differ significantly between the groups. The results show a significant difference in the participation of other family members in the child's daily activities. Brazilian fathers report significantly greater participation in their children's activities than German fathers. The groups also differ significantly in the child's participation by his or her self, and with others, which suggests a difference in the family organization, concerning the child's role in the daily activities. German children have higher scores for activities by themselves, and Brazilian children for participation with others.

5.1.3.2 - Part II - Attitudes and Feelings - Descriptive and comparative analyses of the extracted Factors' scores for: a) Expected Feelings; b) Recognized Feelings and c) Ratio (Expected/Recognized).

Five Factors from the Attitudes and Feelings were extracted.

The Factors were named according to the interpretation (meaning) of the items (attitudes/feelings), which comprised the higher factorial loading in each extracted Factor. The structural stability (FS) as well as the internal consistency (Standardized Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient - $\alpha$) of all the Factors proved to be fairly good. In this case, the values are: $0.92 < FS < 0.82$ and $0.89 < \alpha < 0.72$.

5.1.3.2. A) EXPECTED ATTITUDES/ FEELINGS – The factors express the parents' expectation of the qualities in a child that contribute toward emotional maturity, and growth and development.

The following tables 09 and 10 show the descriptive and comparative analyses of the items that comprised each of the two extracted factors from Expected Attitudes/Feelings: “COMPETENT–SELF” ($FS=0.92/\alpha=0.89$) and “SELF-ASSERTION AND INDIVIDUALITY - NARCISSISTIC-SELF”
The items are presented in decreasing order, according to their respective factorial loading.

**Table 09: Descriptive and comparative analyses of “COMPETENT-SELF”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GROUP BR</th>
<th>GROUP DE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-ASSURANCE</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-RESPECT</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPANIONSHIP</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF HELP</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREATIVITY</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-CONTROL</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIABLE</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURAGE</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLEXIBILITY</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-DISCIPLINE</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATIONALITY</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUST</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEADERSHIP</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTONOMY</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scores computation:**

COMPETENT SELF = SASSU + SRESP + COMPA + SHELP + CREAT + SCONT + SOCIAR + FLEXI + SDISC + RATIO + TRUST + LEAD + AUTON / 14

*p-value for the Mann-Whitney test comparing the scores between the countries

The **Competent-Self** is comprised of items that refer mainly to the child’s emotional competence and behavioural regulation in with other people and directed towards social adaptation. However, the items that comprised **Self-Assertion and Individuality** are characterized more by personal competence and power. Due to these characteristics it can be also named as **“Narcissistic-Self”**.

**Table 10: Descriptive and comparative analyses of: “SELF-ASSERTION AND INDIVIDUALITY – (“NARCISSISTIC-SELF”)”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feelings</th>
<th>GROUP BR</th>
<th>GROUP DE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-ASSERTION</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPULSENESNESS</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSOLENCE</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-INTEREST</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIVIDUALITY</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-SACRIFICE</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scores computation:**

SELF-ASSERTION AND INDIVIDUALITY = (SASSE + IMPUL + INSOL + SINTE + REVSACR) / 6. REVERSE S.SACRIFICE = 3 - S.SACRIFICE

*p-value for the Mann-Whitney test comparing the scores between the countries
The results show highly significant differences in the **Competent-Self** Scale (higher values in Brazilian sample) and the **Self-Assertion/Individuality** Scales (higher values in German sample). Brazilian parents have higher expectations than German parents of their children concerning their children’s attitudes and behaviours with other people. They value qualities such as self-assurance, self-respect, and companionship. By contrast, German parents have higher expectations regarding the child as an individual. They see qualities such as assertion, impulsiveness and insolence from their children, as important to their growth and development.

**5.1.3.2. B) RECOGNIZED ATTITUDES/FEELINGS – The factors express the parents’ recognition of their children’s actual behaviours**

The following tables 11 and 12 show the descriptive and comparative analyses of the items that comprised each of the two extracted Factors from Recognized Feelings: **“DARING-SELF”** \( (FS=0.82/ \alpha=0.75) \) and **“SOCIAL LEADER SELF”** \( (FS=0.83/ \alpha=0.72) \). The items that comprised each Factor are presented in decreasing order, according to their respective factorial loading.

**Table 11: Descriptive and comparative analyses of: “DARING-SELF”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GROUP = “BR”</th>
<th></th>
<th>GROUP = “DE”</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSOLENCE</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPULSIVENESS</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-ASSERTION</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-INTEREST</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGGRESSIVENESS</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIVIDUALITY</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-CONTROL (REVERSE)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCORES COMPUTATION**

**DARING-SELF** = \( \frac{(RINSOL + RIMPUL + RSASSE + RSINTE + RAGRES + RINDIV + REVRSCON)}{7} \)

**REVERSE SELF-CONTROL** = 3 - S-CONTROL

* p-value for the Mann-Whitney test comparing the scores between the countries
The **Daring-Self** is comprised of items supported by individual characteristics, which express an active approach towards the environment. The items of **Social Leader Self** express also an active approach towards the environment, however not against the environment but aiming at social adaptation.

### Table 12: Descriptive and comparative analyses of: “SOCIAL LEADER SELF”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GROUP = “BR”</th>
<th></th>
<th>GROUP = “DE”</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Creativity</strong></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Help</strong></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competitiveness</strong></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Sacrifice</strong></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Companionship</strong></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socialable</strong></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.243</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCORES COMPUTATION**

SOCIAL LEADER SELF = (RLEAD + RCREAT + RSHELP + RCOMPE + RSSACR + RCOMPA + RSOCIA)/7

* P-value for the Mann-Whitney test comparing the scores between the countries

The results show a highly significant difference concerning **“DARING-SELF”** (higher value in German sample) and **“SOCIAL LEADER SELF”** (higher values in the Brazilian sample). German parents see their children much more as being insolent, impulsive, and self-assertive than the Brazilian parents. By contrast Brazilian parents see their children much more as having creativity, self-help, self-sacrifice, and companionship.

### 5.1.3.2. C) RATIO (EXPECTED/RECOGNIZED)

The ratio between Expected Attitudes/Feelings and Recognized Attitudes/Feelings was calculated. Since the Expected Attitudes/Feelings scale and the Recognized Attitudes/Feelings scale had ranges of 0 to 3, the ratio was calculated with plus “1” for each feeling, i.e. Ratio = (Expected+1)/ (Recognized+1).
The following table 13 shows the descriptive and comparative analysis of each Expected/Recognised ratio item that comprised the extracted Factor which was called the “STRUCTURAL-SELF” \((FS=0.86/\alpha=0.76)\). The Structural-Self scale is characterized by items that refer to attitudes and feelings in the make up of his/her social-self, for example self-assurance, self-help, and trust. The items, which comprised this Factor, are presented in decreasing order, according to their respective factorial loading.

**Table 13: Descriptive and comparative analyses of: “STRUCTURAL-SELF”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP = “BR”</th>
<th>GROUP = “DE”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D SELF-ASSURANCE</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D SELF-HELP</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D TRUST</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D COURAGE</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D COMPETITION</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D LEADERSHIP</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D SELF-DISCIPLINE</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D SELF-ASSERTION</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D CREATIVITY</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{SCORE COMPUTATION} \]
\[ \text{STRUCTURAL-SELF} = \left( \text{DSASSU + DSHELP + DTRUST + DCOURA + DCOMPET + DLEAD + DDSDIC + DSASSE + DCREAT} \right) / 9 \]

\* \(p\)-value for the Mann-Whitney test comparing the scores between the countries

The interpretation of this table is more complex than the others. The mean values shown in the table are the average of the expected/recognised scores from each parent, referred to as the ratio mean. A \(RM < 0.90\) means the parents can recognize more their actual child’s behaviours regarding attitudes/feelings, than they expect for emotional maturity. If \(RM \sim 1.0\) (ranging from \(0.90 < RM < 1.10\)), it means there is good agreement between expectation and recognition. \(RM >1.10\), means that the parents expect from their children more of the attitudes they regard more important to emotional maturity than they can recognize in their child’s actual
behaviours. The ratio mean for Structural Self of the Brazilian parents is significantly
higher than that of the German parents indicating that Brazilian parents expect much
more from their children than the German ones. There is however some variability
across the items. Brazilian parents have a greater ratio of expectations to
recognised attitudes and behaviours than German parents for self-assurance, self
help, and trust. On the other hand the German parents expect that their child can
have more self-assertion than the Brazilian parents.

5.1.4. MACARTHUR STORY STEM BATTERY – MSSB

The MSSB inter-rater-reliability for this study was proved to be very good taken
into account that it is a very complex video-supported instrument with highly
complex ratings for contents of the child’s play, child’s performance, and
representations of parental figures. In this study the ICC mean = 0.80, variance= 0.02, SD= 0.12

Aiming to get a broad understanding from the child’s mental representation, the
MSSB results were interpreted through two methodologically different approaches:
Scales and Extracted Factors.. In this study some of the scales that were used
came from the existing MSSB literature, and others were newly constructed as
described in Section 3.3.2.1.6 of the Methods chapter on page 71. The Scales are
developed by researchers on the basis of theory and clinical intuition, and therefore
to some degree have a subjective characteristic. On the other hand the Factors are
derived empirically. The results of both methods are presented below.
5.1.4.1. Scales

5.1.4.1.1. Internal Consistency

The Table 14 shows the Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient (\( \alpha \)) that measures the internal consistency of the items of the MSSB Scales in this sample.

Table 14: Internal consistency coefficients to MSSB Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-Scale</th>
<th>N° of Items</th>
<th>CRONBACH’S ALPHA</th>
<th>ITEMS WITH LESS CONSISTENCY</th>
<th>CORRELATION N WITH TOTAL*</th>
<th>ALPHA (after item deleted)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL COMPETENCE (N=82)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.687</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>0.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POOR INTERNAL CONTROL (N=82)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.698</td>
<td>A20, A22.3</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMOTIONAL COHERENCE AND ADAPTATION CAPACITY</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.632</td>
<td>B5, A2</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORAL THEMES (N=82)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECTIVE EXPRESSION OF MISTRUST AGAINST THE</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.715</td>
<td>KTR</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>0.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENT (N=82)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSITIVE REPRESENTATION OF PARENTS (N=82)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.786</td>
<td>F01/F02</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td>0.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGATIVE REPRESENTATION OF PARENTS (N=82)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td>D05</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>0.746</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation of last item deleted with the total of that part of the scale.
Note: Narrative Coherence not considered due to the reduced structure (compiled by just 1 item).

5.1.4.1.2. Descriptive and Comparative Analyses of the Scales

The Tables 15 to 22 show the descriptive statistics and analyses comparing the Brazilian (Br) and German (De) children on the MSSB Scales and the items that were included in each scale.
Table 15: Descriptive and Comparative Analyses of Poor Internal Control (PIC).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP= “BR”</th>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>MIN.</th>
<th>MAX.</th>
<th>P-VALUE*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AGGRESSION</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DESTRUCTION OF OBJECTS</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEATH BY AGGRESSION</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NON-COMPLIANCE</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TEASING/TAUNTING</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DISHONESTY</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PHYSICAL PUNISHMENT</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEW DANGER OR WORSENING OF THE DANGER</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>0.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POOR INTERNAL CONTROL</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.493</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP= “DE”</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>MIN.</th>
<th>MAX.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p-value for the Mann-Whitney test comparing the scores between the countries.

Table 16: Descriptive and Comparative Analyses of Narrative Coherence (NC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP= “BR”</th>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>MIN.</th>
<th>MAX.</th>
<th>P-VALUE*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOGIC/STRINGENCY</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EMBELLISHMENT</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0.619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONFLICT</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>0.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NARRATIVE COHERENCE</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>0.549</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP= “DE”</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>MIN.</th>
<th>MAX.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p-value for the Mann-Whitney test comparing the scores between the countries.

Table 17: Descriptive and Comparative Analyses of Negative Representation of Parents (NRP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP= “BR”</th>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>MIN.</th>
<th>MAX.</th>
<th>P-VALUE*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PARENT-CHILD NEGATIV REPRESENTATION</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MARITAL INTERACTION NEGATIV</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PARENT CHARACTERISTIC NEGATIV</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHILD CHARACTERISTIC NEGATIV</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OTHER NURTURANCE/SUPPORT</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEPARATION/REUNION</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REMAINING ITEMS</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DISHONESTY</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REGRESSION</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>0.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHILD POWER</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEGATIV PARENTS REPRESENTATION</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP= “DE”</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>MIN.</th>
<th>MAX.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p-value for the Mann-Whitney test comparing the scores between the countries.
The results of the tables 15 to 17 show no difference between Brazilian and German samples regarding the scales: “Poor Internal Control”, “Narrative Coherence” and “Negative Representation of Parents”.

### Table 18: Descriptive and Comparative Analyses of Sub-Scales Emotional Coherence and Adaptation Capacity (EA).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP= “BR”</th>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>MIN.</th>
<th>MAX.</th>
<th>P-VALUE*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHARING</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>P=0.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EMPATHY / HELPING</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>P=0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INTERPERSONAL CONFLICT</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>P=0.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RESOLUTION</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>P=0.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EMOTIONAL INCOHERENCE TO POSITIVE</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>P=0.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EMOTIONAL INCOHERENCE TO NEGATIVE</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>P=0.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POSITIVE PARENT REPRESENTATION</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>P=0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DENTAL</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>P=0.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CREATIVITY</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>P=0.547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EMOTIONAL COHERENCE ADAPTATION CAPACITY</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>p=0.008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP= “DE”</th>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>MIN.</th>
<th>MAX.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHARING</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EMPATHY / HELPING</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INTERPERSONAL CONFLICT</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RESOLUTION</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EMOTIONAL INCOHERENCE TO POSITIVE</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EMOTIONAL INCOHERENCE TO NEGATIVE</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POSITIVE PARENT REPRESENTATION</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DENTAL</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CREATIVITY</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EMOTIONAL COHERENCE ADAPTATION CAPACITY</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>5.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p-value for the Mann-Whitney test comparing the scores between the countries.

### Table 19: Descriptive and Comparative Analyses: Social Competence (SC).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP= “BR”</th>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>MIN.</th>
<th>MAX.</th>
<th>P-VALUE*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EMPATHY/HELPING</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHAME</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>P = 0.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AFFECTION</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>P = 0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AFFILIATION</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>P = 0.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INTERPERSONAL CONFLICT</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>P = 0.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RESOLUTION</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>P = 0.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COMPLIANCE</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>P = 0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REPARATION/GUILT</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>P = 0.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VERBAL PUNISHMENT / VERBAL REPRIMAND</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>P = 0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POSITIVE FINAL CONTENT</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>P = 0.885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOCIAL COMPETENCE</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>p= 0.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP= “DE”</th>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>MIN.</th>
<th>MAX.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EMPATHY/HELPING</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHAME</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AFFECTION</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AFFILIATION</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INTERPERSONAL CONFLICT</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RESOLUTION</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COMPLIANCE</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REPARATION/GUILT</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VERBAL PUNISHMENT / VERBAL REPRIMAND</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POSITIVE FINAL CONTENT</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOCIAL COMPETENCE</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p-value for the Mann-Whitney test comparing the scores between the countries.
### Table 20: Descriptive and Comparative Analyses of Sub-Scales Moral Themes (MT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>MIN.</th>
<th>MAX.</th>
<th>P-VALUE*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTERPERSONAL CONFLICT</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>P = 0.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESOLUTION</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>P = 0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-COMPLIANCE</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>P = 0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHAME</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>P = 0.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLAME</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>P = 0.768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEASING/TAUNTING</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>P = 0.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISHONESTY</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>P = 0.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUNISHMENT/DISCIPLINE</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>P = 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPARATION/GUILT</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>p = 0.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORAL THEMES</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>p=0.008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p-value for the Mann-Whitney test comparing the scores between the countries.

### Table 21: Descriptive and Comparative Analyses of Positive Representation of Parents (PRP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>MIN.</th>
<th>MAX.</th>
<th>P-VALUE*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARENT-CHILD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSITIV REPRESENTATION</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>p=0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARITAL INTERACTION</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>p=0.661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARENT CHARACTERISTIC POSITIV</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>p=0.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILD CHARACTERISTIC POSITIV</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>p=0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPARATION/REUNION ITEM A (F01/F02)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>p=0.540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSITIV PARENTS REPRESENTATION</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>p=0.020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p-value for the Mann-Whitney test comparing the scores between the countries.

The results of the tables 18 to 21 show a significant difference between the Brazilian and German children on the scales: “Social Competence”, “Emotional Coherence and Adaptation Capacity”, “Moral Themes” and “Positive Representation of Parents”. In each case Brazilian children had higher scores than German children. These differences appear to indicate that Brazilian children have a greater understanding of the demands of social interactions, and in particular show more...
evidence of empathy, that they represent more moral themes in their play, and are more likely to portray positive parental behaviours.

Table 22: **Descriptive and Comparative Analyses of “Expression of mistrust against the environment”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>GROUP “BR”</th>
<th>GROUP “DE”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCLUSION</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFUSED EMPATHY/HELP</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERPERSONAL CONFLICT RESOLUTION</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-COMPLIANCE</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISHONESTY</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUNISHMENT</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO TO BED BY SELF</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPETITION</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTROL</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANXIETY BEHAVIOUR</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENDLESS STORY</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p-value for the Mann-Whitney test comparing the scores between the countries.

The results shown in Table 22 show a highly significant difference between the two groups on the Scale “Expression of mistrust against the environment”, with higher values in the Brazilian children.

5.1.4.2. **FACTORS**

Five Factors were extracted from the MSSB and they were named according to the interpretation and meaning of the items with the highest factorial loadings in each extracted Factor. Four Factors have a high structural stability (FS) as well as high internal consistency - Standardized Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient (\(\alpha\)). The fifth Factor has a good internal consistency, but the structural stability is lower than 0.80.
Because of this, this Factor was considered as speculative and will not be included here.

The four extracted Factors are: “Representation of Threat and Anxiety” (FS=0.92/α=0.89); “Narrative Competence and Social Empathy” (FS=0.91/α=0.87); “Kind Parents” (FS=0.92/α=0.91); “Weak Parents” (FS=0.80/α=0.76). The following tables 23 and 24 show the descriptive statistics of the extracted Factors: “Representation of Threat and Anxiety” and “Weak Parents” and also of their respective items, which are presented in decreasing order, according to their respective factorial loading. The tables show also the comparisons of the scores of the Brazilian children (Br) and German children (De), and the P Values for the statistical tests of differences between the groups.

Table 23: Descriptive and Comparative Analyses of “Representation of Threat and Anxiety”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>P Value*</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DANGER</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.341</td>
<td>1.886</td>
<td>p = 0.458</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2.488</td>
<td>1.519</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELATIONSHIP WITH OBJECTS</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1,0</td>
<td>2.233</td>
<td>1.141</td>
<td>p = 0.034</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.512</td>
<td>0.940</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>END OF DANGER</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.325</td>
<td>1.079</td>
<td>p = 0.223</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.512</td>
<td>0.940</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANXIETY BEHAVIOR</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.325</td>
<td>1.079</td>
<td>p = 0.772</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.817</td>
<td>1.507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL INJURY</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.325</td>
<td>1.079</td>
<td>p = 0.628</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.732</td>
<td>1.049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESTRUCTION OF OBJECTS</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.233</td>
<td>1.141</td>
<td>p = 0.034</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.732</td>
<td>1.049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENTLESS ACTION</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.471</td>
<td>p = 0.697</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0.361</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGGRESSION</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>0.437</td>
<td>p = 0.670</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.335</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATYPICAL RESPONSE</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>p = 0.547</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>0.513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAGICAL THINKING</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.610</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td>p = 0.832</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.561</td>
<td>0.673</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGRESSION</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.537</td>
<td>1.227</td>
<td>p = 0.117</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>0.587</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILD POWER</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>0.370</td>
<td>p = 0.281</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td>0.316</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISHONESTY</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.634</td>
<td>1.043</td>
<td>p = 0.167</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.366</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENDLESS STORY</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td>1.616</td>
<td>p = 0.080</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0.734</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPARATION/GUILT</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.073</td>
<td>0.959</td>
<td>p = 0.267</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.829</td>
<td>0.803</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL CONTENT – NEGATIVE</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.395</td>
<td>0.877</td>
<td>p = 0.116</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-COMPLIANCE</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>0.687</td>
<td>p = 0.054</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERPERSONAL CONFLICT</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>0.549</td>
<td>p = 0.063</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL CONTENT – POSITIVE</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>4.195</td>
<td>2.239</td>
<td>p = 0.881</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>4.146</td>
<td>1.982</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOGIC/STRINGENCY (inverted loading)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.065</td>
<td>0.783</td>
<td>p = 0.225</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td>0.624</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p-value for the Mann-Whitney test comparing the scores between the countries
Items, such as danger, relationship with the objects (with other persons) end of danger, and anxiety behaviour were included in the factor that was named “Representation of Threat and Anxiety”, because of the threatening and anxious features of the items.

Table 24: Descriptive and Comparative Analysis of “Weak Parents”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>GROUP “BR”</th>
<th>GROUP “DE”</th>
<th>p-value*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOW POWER/INEFFECTIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATHER</td>
<td>N: 41</td>
<td>Min: 0</td>
<td>Max: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW POWER/INEFFECTIVE</td>
<td>N: 41</td>
<td>Min: 0</td>
<td>Max: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERMITTING FATHER</td>
<td>N: 41</td>
<td>Min: 0</td>
<td>Max: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERMITTING MOTHER</td>
<td>N: 41</td>
<td>Min: 0</td>
<td>Max: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGLECT FATHER</td>
<td>N: 41</td>
<td>Min: 0</td>
<td>Max: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGLECT MOTHER</td>
<td>N: 41</td>
<td>Min: 0</td>
<td>Max: 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The factor “Weak Parents” includes items that express a failure in the parents’ role. It is interesting that items referring to the father’s role consistently have higher factorial loadings than those for the mother’s. The results shown in tables 23 and 24 indicate that there was no difference between the groups of Brazilian and German children in “Representation of Threat and Anxiety” and “Weak Parents” that likewise in the Scales: “Poor Internal Control” and “Negative Parents Representation” (Tables 15 and 17, on page 96) indicate an equality between the two groups regarding the emotional regulation capacity as well as a weak mental representation of the parents.

The following tables 25 and 26 show the descriptive statistics of the extracted Factors “Narrative Competence and Social Empathy” and “Kind Parents” and the items that were included in them. The items in each Factor are presented in
decreasing order, according to their respective factorial loadings. The tables show also the comparison between the Brazilian (Br) and German (De) groups of children.

Table 25: Descriptive and Comparative Analyses of “Narrative Competence /Social Empathy”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>BR</th>
<th>DE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARRATIVE COHERENCE</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMBELLISHMENT</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONFLICT</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPATHY/HELPING</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFFECTION</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPLIANCE</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREATIVITY</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERBAL CONFLICT</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFFILIATION</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMOTIONAL RESPONSE TO INTERVIEWER</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCLUSION</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLEEP BY OTHER</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INVESTMENT IN PERFORMANCE</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENIAL (inverted loading)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO THEMES (inverted loading)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p-value for the Mann-Whitney test comparing the scores between the countries

The factor “Narrative Competence and Social Empathy” is characterized by two types of items. Some items assess the child’s performance in dealing with emotional conflict and in organizing his/her emotional experiences into coherent thought. This is referred to as narrative competence. Other items reflect pro-social or emphatic acts toward the social group.
Table 26: Descriptive and Comparative Analysis of: “Kind Parents”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Group=&quot;BR&quot;</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>p-value*</th>
<th>Group=&quot;DE&quot;</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>p-value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARENT/CHILD - AFFECTION FATHER</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.659</td>
<td>1.559</td>
<td>P = 0.021</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.878</td>
<td>1.552</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARENT/CHILD - AFFECTION MOTHER</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.561</td>
<td>2.062</td>
<td>P = 0.037</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.634</td>
<td>2.022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH POWER/COMPETENT FATHER</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.488</td>
<td>1.675</td>
<td>p = 0.181</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>1.673</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARITAL - HELPFUL</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.902</td>
<td>1.758</td>
<td>p = 0.051</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.171</td>
<td>1.263</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARENT/CHILD - NURTURANCE MOTHER</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.902</td>
<td>1.241</td>
<td>p = 0.067</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.244</td>
<td>1.338</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH POWER/COMPETENT MOTHER</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.488</td>
<td>1.583</td>
<td>p = 0.017</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.005</td>
<td>1.900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER SUPPORT - SIBLINGS</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.512</td>
<td>1.098</td>
<td>p = 0.004</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.829</td>
<td>0.892</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER SUPPORT - GRANDPARENT</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.415</td>
<td>0.706</td>
<td>p = 0.001</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td>0.664</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARENT/CHILD - PRAISE MOTHER</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.610</td>
<td>0.703</td>
<td>p = 0.268</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.643</td>
<td>0.674</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARENT/CHILD - COMPANIONSHIP MOTHER</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.634</td>
<td>1.019</td>
<td>p = 0.589</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.585</td>
<td>0.631</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILD - COMFORT</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.659</td>
<td>0.693</td>
<td>p = 0.520</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.537</td>
<td>0.552</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARENT/CHILD - NURTURANCE FATHER</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.390</td>
<td>1.046</td>
<td>p = 0.732</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.341</td>
<td>1.015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARITAL - SPECIAL RELATIONSHIP</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td>1.052</td>
<td>p = 0.811</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.415</td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARENT/CHILD - PRAISE FATHER</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.585</td>
<td>0.670</td>
<td>p = 0.322</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.439</td>
<td>0.594</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARITAL - NEUTRAL (inverted loading)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>1.949</td>
<td>p = 0.011</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.951</td>
<td>1.482</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARENT/CHILD - NEUTRAL FATHER (inverted loading)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.268</td>
<td>1.884</td>
<td>p = 0.306</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.878</td>
<td>1.763</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARENT/CHILD - NEUTRAL MOTHER (inverted loading)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>1.533</td>
<td>p = 0.144</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.317</td>
<td>1.980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| KIND PARENTS                | 41         | 1.3     | 4.7     | 2.769   | 740     | p=0.011  | 41         | 9       | 4.1     | 2.354   | 777     |         |         |         |         |

*p-value for the Mann-Whitney test comparing the scores between the countries

The factor “Kind Parents” includes items reflecting affectionate or supportive behaviours shown by parents towards their children, and by parents towards each other as a couple.

In Tables 25 and 26 it is evident that Brazilian children show significantly greater “Narrative Competence and Social Empathy”, and “Kind Parents” in their narratives than German children.
In summary the narratives of Brazilian children have higher scores than those of German children on the following factors: “Social Competence”, “Emotional Coherence and Adaptation Capacity”, “Moral Themes”, “Positive Parents Representation” “Narrative Competence and Social Empathy”, and “Kind Parents”. It seems therefore that the mental representations of Brazilian children give greater emphasis to positive social processes than those of German children. There are also more references to parental behaviours which may reflect an idealization of the parents.

5.1.5. RORSCHACH – BOARDS IV AND VII

The Rorschach inter-rater-reliability for this study was proved to be fairly good ICC mean = 0.82; variance = 0.02 and SD=0.13.

Due to the application of only two boards in this study, the usual Rorschach’s data analysis could be not done. A descriptive analysis of the responses was done instead. Aiming to compare the responses between the two groups of children – Brazilian and German and taking in to account country and gender, in case of significant interaction effect, the Two-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) - Post-hoc Tukey’s Test were applied after the variables were changed into ranks.

The following tables 27 and 28 show the Two-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) of two subject effects: country (Brazil and Germany) and gender (Male and Female) to compare the responses of Board IV and VII respectively. The main point
here was: there were only very few significant differences in all and even more so with respect to the country which moreover were not consistent over the two tables.

Table 27: Two-way Analysis of Variance to Board IV - Rorschach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPENDENT VARIABLE</th>
<th>EFFECT OF THE COUNTRY$^a$</th>
<th>EFFECT OF THE GENDER$^b$</th>
<th>COUNTRY VS. GENDER INTERACTION EFFECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>$F=2.98; p=0.0882$</td>
<td>$F=0.09; p=0.7636$</td>
<td>$F=1.83; p=0.1800$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>$F=9.24; p=0.0032^c$</td>
<td>$F=4.66; p=0.0340^c$</td>
<td>$F=2.51; p=0.1172$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>$F=1.13; p=0.2912$</td>
<td>$F=2.22; p=0.1406$</td>
<td>$F=3.40; p=0.0690$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>$F=4.14; p=0.0045^c$</td>
<td>$F=0.78; p=0.3793$</td>
<td>$F=2.78; p=0.0992$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>$F=0.64; p=0.4251$</td>
<td>$F=2.98; p=0.0881$</td>
<td>$F=0.01; p=0.9218$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do</td>
<td>$F=0.272; p=0.603$</td>
<td>$F=0.020; p=0.889$</td>
<td>$F=0.004; p=0.949$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fs</td>
<td>$F=1.95; p=0.1662$</td>
<td>$F=0.04; p=0.8373$</td>
<td>$F=0.04; p=0.1573$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>$F=0.025; p=0.874$</td>
<td>$F=0.007; p=0.932$</td>
<td>$F=0.513; p=0.473$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>$F=3.762; p=0.056$</td>
<td>$F=0.041; p=0.840$</td>
<td>$F=0.720; p=0.399$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>$F=2.37; p=0.1277$</td>
<td>$F=0.03; p=0.8728$</td>
<td>$F=0.49; p=0.4096$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>$F=2.944; p=0.090$</td>
<td>$F=0.016; p=0.901$</td>
<td>$F=1.879; p=0.174$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFl</td>
<td>$F=2.378; p=0.127$</td>
<td>$F=0.661; p=0.419$</td>
<td>$F=1.076; p=0.303$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shock</td>
<td>$F=0.085; p=0.771$</td>
<td>$F=1.920; p=0.170$</td>
<td>$F=0.085; p=0.771$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$F=0.075; p=0.784$</td>
<td>$F=0.000; p=0.995$</td>
<td>$F=0.075; p=0.784$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Comparing between Countries (Br and De)
(b) Comparing between Genders (Male and Female).
(c) Significant difference: De=88.6 > Br=60.5, independent of Gender.
(d) Significant difference: Male=83.3 > Female=63.3, independent of Country.
(e) Significant difference: De=1.22 > Br=0.90, independent of Gender.

The result of table 28 (Board IV) showed only significant difference concerning the total time of the board interpretation as well as the response G (perception of the whole).

Table 28: Two-way Analysis of Variance to Board VII - Rorschach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPENDENT VARIABLE</th>
<th>EFFECT OF THE COUNTRY$^a$</th>
<th>EFFECT OF THE GENDER$^b$</th>
<th>COUNTRY VS. GENDER INTERACTION EFFECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>$F=0.003; p=0.957$</td>
<td>$F=0.362; p=0.549$</td>
<td>$F=2.134; p=0.148$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>$F=1.603; p=0.209$</td>
<td>$F=1.186; p=0.279$</td>
<td>$F=2.543; p=0.115$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>$F=0.320; p=0.573$</td>
<td>$F=2.592; p=0.111$</td>
<td>$F=1.072; p=0.304$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>$F=0.006; p=0.937$</td>
<td>$F=1.44; p=0.705$</td>
<td>$F=0.420; p=0.519$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG</td>
<td>$F=0.095; p=0.759$</td>
<td>$F=4.435; p=0.038$</td>
<td>$F=0.085; p=0.759$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>$F=0.205; p=0.652$</td>
<td>$F=2.72; p=0.604$</td>
<td>$F=0.205; p=0.652$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dzw</td>
<td>$F=0.160; p=0.690$</td>
<td>$F=0.640; p=0.426$</td>
<td>$F=3.296; p=0.073$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>$F=0.347; p=0.558$</td>
<td>$F=2.340; p=0.115$</td>
<td>$F=1.009; p=0.319$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F--</td>
<td>$F=0.002; p=0.967$</td>
<td>$F=2.405; p=0.125$</td>
<td>$F=0.116; p=0.735$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hdf</td>
<td>$F=0.081; p=0.806$</td>
<td>$F=0.198; p=0.743$</td>
<td>$F=0.061; p=0.806$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>$F=0.053; p=0.819$</td>
<td>$F=0.452; p=0.503$</td>
<td>$F=0.275; p=0.601$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Td</td>
<td>$F=0.769; p=0.383$</td>
<td>$F=0.000; p=0.992$</td>
<td>$F=0.264; p=0.609$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>$F=2.667; p=0.107$</td>
<td>$F=0.256; p=0.614$</td>
<td>$F=0.937; p=0.336$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Md</td>
<td>$F=0.000; p=1.000$</td>
<td>$F=1.330; p=0.252$</td>
<td>$F=0.000; p=1.000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anat</td>
<td>$F=1.572; p=0.214$</td>
<td>$F=4.368; p=0.040$</td>
<td>$F=1.572; p=0.214$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>$F=2.615; p=0.106$</td>
<td>$F=4.868; p=0.030$</td>
<td>$F=5.594; p=0.021^d$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj</td>
<td>$F=1.540; p=0.218$</td>
<td>$F=0.112; p=0.739$</td>
<td>$F=0.311; p=0.543$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pfl</td>
<td>$F=5.015; p=0.028^e$</td>
<td>$F=3.649; p=0.060$</td>
<td>$F=0.325; p=0.471$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shock</td>
<td>$F=0.328; p=0.568$</td>
<td>$F=0.897; p=0.347$</td>
<td>$F=0.085; p=0.771$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andere</td>
<td>$F=0.178; p=0.675$</td>
<td>$F=0.217; p=0.643$</td>
<td>$F=1.234; p=0.270$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Comparing between Countries (Br and De)
(b) Comparing between Genders (Male and Female).
(c) Significant difference: De=0.22 > Br=2.78E-02, independent of Country.
(d) Significant difference between Genders in the Country: De Male=0.35 > De Female =0.00.
(e) Significant difference: Br=0.17 > De=4.88E-02, independent of Gender.
The result of table 27 showed only significant differences between the Brazilian group and Germany concerning the response DG (detail to whole perception) with higher value in German group, as well as the botanic theme (higher value in Brazilian group). A difference between the genders in Germany group concerning sexual responses is also observed.

5.1.6. SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS

In spite of the different perspectives of the tools that were applied in this study (in the work with the parents and their child), the results of child’s assessments matched up to the results of parents’ assessments, and both are able to answer the questions of this study. A summary of these results will be presented next, pointing out the answers of each question.

**Socio-Demographic Data:** the samples equality could be proved.

**Children Behaviour Check List (CBCL):** although, in this study, a significant difference between the groups in Internalizing Scale (higher values in Brazilian sample) was presented, it is necessary to emphasise the absence of a Brazilian CBCL Standardization. This argumentation is based on another study with 482 Brazilian children from five different socioeconomic classes; this study aimed a comparison of the expression of behavioural problems and the socio-economic status (Bordin et al. 2004). The results of the Bordin study showed likewise high values in Internalizing Scale in the Brazilian population\(^\text{18}\) that supports the argument that most likely that it is according to Brazilian standards a rather normal population.

\(^{18}\) 45.9% of the whole sample was compiled by clinical and borderline to Internalizing Problems, according to American Standardization - the guidelines provided by Achenbach – 2001.
Questionnaire Part I – The most important observation here is about the family’s structure in child’s daily activities, while in Brazil the parents organize themselves, making use of the support and help from other (e.g. maid/child’s siblings/grandparents) in order not to let their child by him/herself; in Germany they organize themselves developing the child’s individuality and self responsibility. (Question 1 and 2)

Questionnaire Part II – Two types of expectation behaviours from the parents toward their child were observed. The Brazilian parents have a higher expectation regarding the more pro-social actions as attitudes/feelings of their child. And the German parents expect more individual actions as attitude/feelings of their child. Furthermore in Brazilian parents’ group was observed a dissatisfaction regarding their child’s emotional maturity\textsuperscript{19} as showed the values of the Factor Structural-Self. (Questions 3 and 4)

MacArthur Story Stem Battery – MSSB - In spite of the different origin of the scales and extracted factors, the results of both statistical methods showed good agreement. No difference was observed between the Brazilian children group and German one regarding the emotional regulation capacity, behavioural disturbance, narrative coherence and negative parents’ representation. The results of the “Poor Internal Control” scale as well as the “Narrative Coherence” scale exemplify well the absence of behavioural disturbance in both groups\textsuperscript{20}. The results of the “Narrative Coherence” Scale exemplify the equality between both children groups on the narrative performance. The results of the scale “Negative Parents' Representation”

\textsuperscript{19}Based on the mean of the Ratio

\textsuperscript{20}These empirical results that high light the questionable CBCL results due to the absence of a Brazilian Standardization. These empirical results reinforce the argumentation that most likely the obtained result in CBCL is according to Brazilian standards a rather normal population.
as well as the factor “Weak Parents” are equally the same. One of the important observed differences between the two groups refers to pro-social actions and family representation. The results of the scales: “Social Competence”, “Emotional Coherence and Adaptation Capacity”, “Moral Themes” and of the factor: “Narrative Competence and Social Empathy” showed a significant difference between the two groups (Brazilian and German) with higher values in Brazilian children’s group, indicating a mental representation to more to pro-social acts. This argumentation can be well exemplified through the descriptive and comparative analyses of the items, which compose the factor “Narrative Competence and Social Empathy” (Table 25, page 102). The items that express the performance in narrative competence showed no significant difference between the Brazilian children’s group and German one, reaffirming the obtained results of Narrative Coherence Scale; however the significant differences appeared in the items that express the performance in social/empathic acts (higher values in Brazilian sample). Likewise a significant difference in the score values to positive family representation in Brazilian sample was observed. The scale “Positive Parents’ Representation” and the factor “Kind Parents” exemplified well this family representation difference between both groups. Both results were equally the same and showed also higher values in Brazilian children’s group (Question 5). Another important difference between the two groups expresses a highly significant cultural difference in the mental representation of social violence, which in contrast with Germany, is a problem that affects the daily life in Brazil, which is characterized by the threat of mugging, breaking in and kidnapping. Interestingly, in Brazil this contrast was not directly represented in a high level of anxiety but as an expression of mistrust against the environment.
Rorschach – Boards IV and VII - taking in account the goal of using this tool in this study, the results showed no significant difference in the responses between the two children’s groups: Brazilian and German, as well as between both boards.

5.2. Hypotheses Examination

As it has been pointed out previously the results of child’s assessments matched up to the results of parents’ assessments, and through two descriptive and comparative tables from the child’s assessments it will be possible to examine two hypotheses of this study, however the other hypotheses of this study could not be examined, only with these results. So to confirm or to refute the other Hypotheses of this study the Multiple Linear Regression Analysis was used, aiming to study which variable better jointly discriminates the obtained scores of the instruments (CBCL Scales; MSSB Factors, or items; Attitudes/Feelings Factors; items of Questionnaire; socio-demographic variables and the groups Br and De)

5.2.1. Hypothesis 1:

“Expansive behaviour will be associated with representations of fathers as weak, and this will be equally true in the Brazilian and German groups.”

To analyse the relation between other variables and the response variable TOTAL SCORE FOR EXTERNALIZING of CBCL, the Multiple Linear Regression Analysis was used with the following explanatory variables:

- NEGATIVE FATHER-CHILD INTERACTION - MSSB Item
- FATHER LOW POWER/INEFFECTIVE CHARACTERISTIC - MSSB Item
- SCORE OF REPRESENTATION OF THREAT AND ANXIETY - MSSB;
- SCORE OF WEAK PARENTS - MSSB;
- PHALLIC NARCISSISTIC OBJECT RELATION - MSSB Item;
• IMPRISONMENT/CONTROLLING OBJECT RELATIONS; MSSB Item
• CHILD LOW POWER/INEFFECTIVE CHARACTERISTIC; MSSB Item
• CHILD REFUSE/DENIAL OF THE SEPARATION FROM PARENTS; MSSB Item
• SCORE OF PERCENTAGE OF FATHERS’ PARTICIPATION IN CHILD’S DAILY ACTIVITIES
  - Questionnaire;
• PARENTAL MARITAL STATUS (Status1=Divorced vs. Married; Status2=Other vs. Married).

Table 29: Results of Multivariate Linear Regression Analysis to Total Score for Externalizing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>RESPONSE VARIABLE</th>
<th>EXPLANATORY VARIABLES</th>
<th>PARAMETER (STANDARD ERROR)</th>
<th>P-VALUE</th>
<th>R² PARTIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SCORE FOR EXTERNALIZING Brazil (n=41)</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1. FATHERS’ PARTICIPATION IN CHILD’S DAILY ACTIVITIES *</td>
<td>65.17 (2.53)</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>11.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. CHIL...</td>
<td>0.047)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SCORE FOR EXTERNALIZING Germany (n=41)</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1. CHILD REFUSE/DENIAL OF THE SEPARATION FROM PARENTS *</td>
<td>41.52 (3.98)</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. CHILD LOW POWER/INEFFECTIVE CHARACTERISTIC *</td>
<td>0.179 (0.056)</td>
<td>0.0028</td>
<td>16.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.124 (0.059)</td>
<td>0.0424</td>
<td>8.64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The variable is changed into ranks; R² Total to Germany: 25.57% and to Brazil: 11.64%.

It was made use of the Stepwise criterion for variables selection.

5.2.1.1. Hypothesis 1: Brazilian Sample

Through the results a significant inverted relation is observed between Total Score for Externalizing Behaviour and Fathers’ Participation in Child’s Daily Activities in Brazilian sample (i.e., the higher the score of the father’s participation in the child’s life is, the lower the Externalizing Score of the CBCL will be and vice-versa). For the Externalizing score in the Brazilian group The Fathers’ Participation in Child’s Daily Activities explains 11.64% of variance. That means: “Expansive Behaviour” in Brazilian sample has a correlation with the fathers’ absence in child’s daily activities; and not directly with the weak representation of the father.

In this way the Hypothesis 1 is not supported in the Brazilian Sample

5.2.1.2. Hypothesis 1: German Sample
In the German Sample, a significant close relation is observed between the Score for Externalizing Behaviour, and the score of “child refuse/denial of the separation from parents” followed by the score of “Child low power/ineffective characteristic”, which means: the child is portrayed as lacking skill, being unable to do something (the higher the score for Externalizing is, the higher the scores of the child refuse of separation as well as the scores of the child ineffective characteristic will be) For the Externalizing score among the German group “the child refuse/denial of the separation from parents” and the “Child low power/ineffective characteristic” explain 25.57% of variance. So there is no link between the Expansive behaviour and weak representation of the father.

In this way the Hypothesis 1 is not supported in the German Sample.

5.2.1.3. Comparison of the results between the two groups

A difference in the relation between the response variable and the explanatory variables of the Multiple Analyse Regression can be observed between the two groups. The Score for Externalizing Behaviour in Brazilian sample is connected to the relationship between the children and their father (absence the father in the child daily activity). In German sample is connected to personal feature (e.g. the refusal of the child in accepting his/her separation/exclusion from parents as well as the child’s failure).

5.2.2. Hypotheses 2 and 3:

“Fathers in the German sample will be represented as more punitive than fathers in the Brazilian sample.”
“There will be an association between the portrayal of fathers as weak and mothers as strong and harsh in the narratives of the children. This will be equally the case in the Brazilian and German groups”

To analyse the relation between “Father Representation” and “Mother Representation” a descriptive and comparative analyses of Positive and Negative Parents Representation divided into Mother and Father Figures were used.

Table 30: Descriptive and Comparative Analyses of Sub-Scales Positive and Negative Parents Representation divided into Mother and Father Figure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP= “BR”</th>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>MIN.</th>
<th>MAX.</th>
<th>P-VALUE*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POSITIVE INTERATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOTHER-CHILD</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>p=0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FATHER-CHILD</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>p=0.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEGATIVE INTERATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOTHER-CHILD</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>p=0.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FATHER-CHILD</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>p=0.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOTHER HIGHER POWER/COMPETENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FATHER HIGHER POWER/COMPETENCE</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>p=0.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOTHER LOWER POWER/INEFFECTIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FATHER LOWER POWER/INEFFECTIVE</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>p=0.032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP= “DE”</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>MIN.</th>
<th>MAX.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p-value for the Mann-Whitney test comparing the scores between the countries.

5.2.2.1. Hypothesis 2: Comparison of the Results between the two groups

The results show no significant differences between German children group and Brazilian one regarding the Positive and Negative Father’s Representation. Through this result the Hypothesis 2 can be not supported.

Significant differences were observed between the two groups regarding the Mother-child positive interaction (higher values among Brazilian children sample) as well as Mother low power/ineffective (higher values among German children
sample), however these results show no association between the portrayal of fathers as weak (Hypothesis 3), mainly in Brazilian group that had the higher values to mother-child positive interaction $p=0.023$; mean=1.74 and SD= 0.84. Taking in account these results, Multiple Linear Regression Analysis was used to analyse the relation between other variables and the response variable LOW POWER/INEFFECTIVE FATHER of MSSB. The explanatory variables for this Regression are:

- POSITIVE INTERATION MOTHER-CHILD - items from MSSB
- SCORE OF REPRESENTATION OF THREAT AND ANXIETY - MSSB;
- NEGATIVE INTERATION MOTHER-CHILD - items from MSSB;
- NEGATIVE INTERATION FATHER-CHILD - items from MSSB;
- MOTHER HIGHER POWER/COMPETENCE - item from MSSB
- Parental Marital Status (Status1=Divorced vs. Married; Status2=Other vs. Married).

Table 31: Results of Multivariate Linear Regression Analysis to Low Power/Ineffective Father.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>RESPONSE VARIABLE EXPLANATORY VARIABLES</th>
<th>PARAMETER (STANDARD ERROR)</th>
<th>P-VALUE</th>
<th>$R^2$ PARTIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOW POWER/INEFFECTIVE FATHER *</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>29.13 (7.03)</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil (n=41)</td>
<td>1. NEGATIVE INTERATION FATHER-CHILD *</td>
<td>0.603 (0.102)</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>43.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. MOTHER HIGHER POWER/COMPETENCE *</td>
<td>-0.333 (0.104)</td>
<td>0.0027</td>
<td>12.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW POWER/INEFFECTIVE FATHER *</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>30.52 (5.59)</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany (n=41)</td>
<td>1. REPRESENTATION OF THREAT AND ANXIETY *</td>
<td>0.372 (0.122)</td>
<td>0.0044</td>
<td>20.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Marital Status1</td>
<td>-17.842 (7.102)</td>
<td>0.0165</td>
<td>17.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marital Status2</td>
<td>22.376 (13.433)</td>
<td>0.1042</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The variable is changed into ranks; $R^2$ Total to Germany: 37.58% and to Brazil: 55.56%. It was made use of the Stepwise criterion for variables selection.

5.2.2.2. **Hypothesis 3: Brazilian Sample**

A close relation in the Brazilian sample regarding the Score for Low Power/Ineffective Father and the score for Negative Interaction Father-Child was observed (the higher the value of the negative interaction between father-child is, the higher the value of the weak representation of the father will be) as well as an
inverted relation regarding the *Mother Higher Power/Competence* (i.e., the higher the value of the mother power/competence is, the lower the value of the weak representation of father will be and vice-versa). For *Low Power/Ineffective Father* score among the Brazilian group the *Negative Interaction Father-Child* as well as an inverted relation to *Mother High Power/Competence* explain 55.56% of variance. The inverted relation between the *Low Power/Ineffective Father* and the *Mother High Power/Competence* (12% of variance) supports the refutation of Hypothesis 3 in the Brazilian sample. Then, the Hypothesis 3 is not supported in Brazilian sample.

### 5.2.2.3. Hypothesis 3: German Sample

In the German Sample could be also observed a significant close relation regarding the score for *Low Power/Ineffective Father* and the score for “*Representation of Threat and Anxiety*” (the higher the value of the weak representation of father is, the higher the value of the representation of threat and anxiety will be) as well as a significant inverted relation between the *Low Power/Ineffective Father* and *Marital Status* 1- (the higher the value of the weak representation of father is, the higher the value of married couples will be, in other words the higher the value of the divorced couples is, the lower the value of the weak representation of father will be). For *Low Power/Ineffective Father* score among the German group “*Representation of Threat and Anxiety*” and the “*Marital Status*” explain 37.58% of variance. This result can not support the Hypothesis 3, due to the lack of a direct association between the “weak father representation” and “mother figure”. Concluding the Hypothesis 3 is not supported in the German group.

### 5.2.2.4. Comparison of the Results between the two groups
The joint relation between the Low Power/Ineffective Father and the Negative Interaction Father-Child (43.57% of variance) suggests that, in the Brazilian children group, the mental representation of the father as a weak figure can be directly connected to the quality of the relationship supported by the fathers toward their child. In this way, again the relationship appears as one of important feature in the Brazilian group dynamic.

On the other hand, in the German group, the close relation between the Low Power/Ineffective Father and married status (17.28% of variance) can suggest a problem concerning the parent’s role performance in their married relationship. Furthermore the relation between Low Power/Ineffective Father and “Representation of Threat and Anxiety” (20.30% of variance) brings up a new interpretation of Hypothesis 1 in the German sample. Through this close relation, it is possible to observe that in the German sample the “Weak Father Representation” does not have a direct implication and an influence on the child’s behaviour as an expansive behaviour (Hypothesis 1), however keeping this mental representation of threat and anxiety to him/herself (defensive process) as threatening and anxious feelings. Again personal features appear as important variable in the German group.

5.2.3. **Hypothesis 4:**

“High Social Competence will be connected to a good perception of the child’s place in his/her family as an element that stands aside from the parental couple. It means that the child can admit his/her exclusion from the couple. This will be equally true in the Brazilian and German group.”
To analyse the relation between other variables and the response variable “TRIANGULAR OBJECT RELATIONSHIP “ of MSSB the Multiple Linear Regression Analysis was made with the following explanatory variables:

- EXCLUSION; MSSB variable–
- SCORE OF DARING-SELF- Feelings; 
- SCORE OF SOCIAL LEADER SELF - Feelings;  
- SCORE OF NARRATIVE COMPETENCE AND SOCIAL EMPATHY - MSSB;  
- SCORE OF KIND PARENTS- MSSB;  
- MARITAL POSITIVE INTERACTION –MSSB variable ; 
- AGE PLACEMENT (Age 1=Youngest vs. only child; Age 2= oldest vs. only child; Age 3=Other vs. only child);  
- PARENTAL MARITAL STATUS (Status1=Divorced vs. Married; Status2=Other vs. Married);  
- TOTAL SCORE FOR TOTAL PROBLEM - CBCL.

Table 32: Results of Multivariate Linear Regression Analysis to Triangular Object Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP RESPONSE VARIABLE</th>
<th>EXPLANATORY VARIABLES</th>
<th>PARAMETER (STANDARD ERROR)</th>
<th>P-VALUE</th>
<th>R(^2) PARTIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazil (n=40) TRIANGULAR OBJECT RELATIONSHIP *</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>84.05 (12.83)</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. KIND PARENTS</td>
<td>-12.53 (4.63)</td>
<td>0.0101</td>
<td>14.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. AGE PLACEMENT</td>
<td>19.54 (7.21)</td>
<td>0.0102</td>
<td>14.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany (n=41) TRIANGULAR OBJECT RELATIONSHIP *</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>63.07 (5.30)</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. EXCLUSION</td>
<td>-0.437 (0.134)</td>
<td>0.0024</td>
<td>21.85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The variable is changed into ranks. ; R\(^2\) Total to Germany: 21.85% and to Brazil: 28.86%. It was made use of the Stepwise criterion for variables selection.

5.2.3.1. Hypothesis 4: Brazilian Sample

A close inverted relation in Brazilian sample in the score for Triangular Object Relationship, and in the score for “Kind Parents” was observed (i.e., the higher the value of representation of kind parents is, the lower value of the triangular object relationship will be and vice-versa) As well as for Triangular Object Relationship and
Age placement 2 (the higher the values of the oldest siblings are, the higher the value of the triangular object relationship will be). For the Triangular Object Relationship score among the Brazilian group the, “Kind Parents” and age placements 2 explain 28.86% of variance.

No link was found between Triangular Object Relationship and Social Competence. So the Hypothesis 4 is not supported in Brazilian group.

5.2.3.2. Hypothesis 4: German Sample

In German Sample a close inverted relation was also observed in the Score for Triangular Object Relationship and in the score for Exclusion (i.e., the higher the score of exclusion is, the lower the score of triangular object relationship will be and vice-versa). For the Triangular Object Relationship score among the German group “Exclusion” explains 21.85% of variance.

No link was found between Triangular Object Relationship and Social Competence. So the Hypothesis 4 is also not supported in German group.

5.2.3.3. Comparison of the Results between the two groups

The inverted relation between the Triangular Object Relationship and “Kind Parents” (14.76% of variance) express how the high values in the mental representation of kind parents have an influence on getting the triangular object relationship. That means, if the child has a mental representation of his/her parents toward to more kind features, or also, if the child idealize his/her parents then it will be more difficult to get the triangular relationship, because the child can’t stay aside
of the parents couple, due to his/her idealization of these figures. The close relation between Triangular Object Relationship and the oldest siblings can partially support the argument: “good perception of the child’s place in his/her family, as an element that stands aside from the parental couple. It means that the child can admit his/her exclusion from the couple”, due to the acceptance of siblings’ existence. In summary, the child accepts that he/she is not the unique element, who is between the parents’ couple. However this result shows no link to “high social competence”.

In German group, the inverted relation between Triangular Object Relationship and Exclusion can suggest how the child can identify his/her place in the family and consequently in the society. In this case, the results would be interpreted as the necessity to include the child in the family group, to provide him/her a triangular relationship.

Summarizing, Hypothesis 4 was not supported in either the German or the Brazilian groups. A comparison of the results obtained from the Multiple Regression Analyses suggested different cultural patterns expressing the way “the child can identify his/her place as a social element in society.”

5.2.4. Hypothesis 5:

“When the parents’ figures are strong and harsh it will be expected that the child will display more mistrust against the environment. This will be equally the case in the Brazilian and German groups”
To analyse the relation between other variables and the response variable “EXPRESSION OF MISTRUST AGAINST THE ENVIRONMENT” of MSSB Multiple Linear Regression Analysis was made with the following explanatory variables:

- POSITIVE PARENTS-CHILD INTERACTION – MSSB
- NEGATIVE PARENTS-CHILD INTERACTION - MSSB
- PERCENTAGE’ SCORE OF CHILD’S PARTICIPATION IN HER/HIS DAILY ACTIVITIES - Questionnaire;
- PERCENTAGE’ SCORE OF OTHER’S PARTICIPATION IN CHILD’S DAILY ACTIVITIES - Questionnaire
- CHILD LOWER POWER/INEFFECTIVE
- AGE PLACEMENT (Age 1=Youngest vs. only child; Age 2= Oldest vs. only child; Age 3=Other vs. only child);
- SIBLINGS’ SUPPORT
- GRANDPARENTS’ SUPPORT

Table 33: Results of Multivariate Linear Regression to Expression of Mistrust against the Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>RESPONSE VARIABLE</th>
<th>EXPLANATORY VARIABLES</th>
<th>PARAMETER (STANDARD ERROR)</th>
<th>P-VALUE</th>
<th>R² PARTIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazil (n=41)</td>
<td>EXPRESSION OF MISTRUST AGAINST THE ENVIRONMENT*</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>7.662 (6.732)</td>
<td>0.2624</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. POSITIVE PARENTS-CHILD INTERACTION*</td>
<td>0.570 (0.110)</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>35.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. YOUNGEST</td>
<td>16.588 (5.780)</td>
<td>0.0068</td>
<td>13.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. NEGATIVE PARENTS-CHILD INTERACTION *</td>
<td>0.255 (0.110)</td>
<td>0.0249</td>
<td>06.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany (n=41)</td>
<td>EXPRESSION OF MISTRUST AGAINST THE ENVIRONMENT*</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-15.81 (7.169)</td>
<td>0.0337</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. NEGATIVE PARENTS-CHILD INTERACTION*</td>
<td>0.490 (0.110)</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>27.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. POSITIVE PARENTS-CHILD INTERACTION *</td>
<td>0.388 (0.102)</td>
<td>0.0006</td>
<td>16.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. CHILD LOWER POWER/INEFFECTIVE*</td>
<td>0.373 (0.105)</td>
<td>0.0011</td>
<td>14.09%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The variable is changed into ranks; R² Total to Brazil: 55.29% - R² Total to Germany: 58.16%; It was made use of the Stepwise criterion for variables selection.

5.2.4.1. Hypothesis 5: Brazilian Sample

In the Brazilian sample, the results showed a close relation in the score for Expression of Mistrust against the Environment, and in the score for Positive Parents-Child Interaction followed by Age placement 1 – Youngest and Negative
Parents-Child Interaction (the higher the score value for Positive Parents-Child Interaction is, together with Age placement – Youngest and Negative Parents-Child Interaction; higher the score value for expression of mistrust against the environment will be). For the Expression of Mistrust against the Environment score among the Brazilian group the Positive Parents-Child Interaction, Youngest age placement and Negative Parents-Child Interaction explains 55.29% of variance. And the relation between Expression of Mistrust against the Environment and Negative Parents-Child Interaction can support the Hypothesis 5 in Brazilian group.

5.2.4.2. Hypothesis 5: German Sample

In German sample, the results show also a close relation in the score for Expression of Mistrust against the Environment, and in the score for Negative Parents-Child Interaction followed by Positive Parents-Child Interaction and Child Lower Power/Ineffective (the higher the score value for Negative Parents-Child Interaction is, together with the score of Positive Parents-Child Interaction and Child Lower Power/Ineffective; higher the score value for expression of mistrust against the environment will be). For Expression of Mistrust against the Environment the score among the German group the Negative Parents-Child Interaction, Positive Parents-Child Interaction and Child Lower Power/Ineffective explain 58.16% of variance. The relation between the Expression of Mistrust against the Environment and the Negative Parents-Child Interaction (27.77% of variance) can also support the Hypothesis 5 in the German sample. The Negative Parents-Child Interaction is also strong and naturally harsh due to its negative characteristics. In this case, the Spearman’s Rho correlation coefficient between the items, which compiled the Negative Parents-Child Interaction, and the Expression of Mistrust against the
Environment, was proved to be fairly good too: Verbal aggression ($r_s=0.451^{**}$) followed by Permitting/ without border ($r_s=0.346^*$), Physical aggression($r_s=0.325^*$).

**5.2.4.3. Comparison of the Results between the two groups**

In Brazilian group the relation between the *Expression of Mistrust against the Environment* and the *Positive Parents-Child Interaction* (35.98% of variance) can also support the Hypothesis 5; however the features strong and harsh can be explained through a dialectically understanding. In this way, the mental representation of positive parents showed to be strong and harsh, when due to the idealization of the positive parents/family group, a protective bubble (world) is built, where the parents represent a security/perfect world to their child, that keeps the pattern of united family, however simultaneously the child remains under the guidance of their parents, that brings about a mistrust against the environment. This argument is supported through the correlation analyses between the items, which compiled the Positive Parents-Child Interaction and the Expression of Mistrust against the Environment. The Spearman’s Rho correlation coefficient between them was proved to be fairly good: *Play/companionship* ($r_s=0.494^{**}$), *Authoritative discipline/guidance* ($r_s=0.472^{**}$), *Nurturance/Protection* ($r_s=0.447^{**}$). The relation between the *Expression of Mistrust against the Environment* and Youngest (13.74% of variance) can clearly express the family protection toward the youngest – keeping the protective bubble.

In German group, the relation between the *Expression of Mistrust against the Environment* and the *Positive Parents-Child Interaction* (16.30% of variance) likewise in Brazilian group support the Hypothesis 5. The same dialectic features of the positive parents representation can be observed. This argument is supported
again through the correlation analyses between the items, which compiled the Positive Parents-Child Interaction and the Expression of Mistrust against the Environment. The Spearman’s Rho correlation coefficient between them was proved to be fairly good: Nurturance/Protection ($r_s=0.489^{**}$).

The relation between the Expression of Mistrust against the Environment and Child Lower Power/Ineffective (14.09% of variance) in German group could express, on the other hand, more and more the presence of personal features, which probably can be interpreted as cultural pattern in the understanding of the child social identity development in this group. The Hypothesis 5 could be supported in both groups, and again the obtained result from the Multiple Regression Analyses bring up the existence of different cultural patterns in the quality of the relationship that is established between the parents and their child in the two groups. While in Brazilian group, the idealization of the interaction with the parents is the main characteristic (variance = 36%) that causes the child’s mistrust, due to the building of a protective bubble; in the Germany group the negative interaction with the parents is the main characteristic (variance= 27.8%) that causes the mistrust followed by a personal failure (child lower power/ineffective).

5.2.5. Hypothesis 6:

“There will be representations of violence in the society resulting in mistrust against the environment, which is in everyday reality dangerous / aggressive in Brazil. There is a difference between the Brazilian sample and German one.”
This Hypothesis is supported according to the results of the Table 22, on page 99.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP = “BR”</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>P-value*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXPRESSION OF MISTRUST AGAINST THE ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>p = 0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p-value for the Mann-Whitney test comparing the scores between the countries.

5.2.6. Hypothesis 7:

“If the child is engaged with these themes (violence), then it is expected that he/she will have a lower Narrative Coherence.”

This Hypothesis is not supported according to the results of the Table 16, on page 96.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP = “BR”</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>MIN.</th>
<th>MAX.</th>
<th>P-VALUE*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NARRATIVE COHERENCE</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>p=0.549</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP = “DE”</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>MIN.</th>
<th>MAX.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NARRATIVE COHERENCE</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p-value for the Mann-Whitney test comparing the scores between the countries.
CHAPTER 6

DISCUSSION
6.1 Discussion of the Results

The findings described in Chapter 5 indicate that there are differences in the roles of Brazilian and German parents with their children, and that Brazilian and German parents have different expectations regarding qualities that are important to a child’s development. Furthermore, there were differences in the way that Brazilian and German children represented family relationships in their play.

The relationships between the child’s mental representations of family relationships in the MSSB, parental roles and expectations assessed by questionnaire, and the child’s adjustment assessed using the CBCL, were explored using Multiple Linear Regression. A series of hypotheses was tested, these results of the Multiple Analyses Regression fitted very well with the results of the child’s assessments and parents ones to.

The tendency to more individual features in the relationship representation and mental organization in the Regression Analyses observed in the German group (in chapter 5, Hypotheses 1, 4 and 5, pages 110, 117, 120) has a correspondence with the German parents’ expectations toward their child to more individual actions as attitude/feelings. And it is connected to the role of each member in the family as perceived by the parents. In the German group, the parents reported that they organize themselves towards developing the child’s individuality and self responsibility. In other words they value their individual features. In contrast, the tendency for the group or family relationship features to be independent predictors in
the Multiple Regression Analyses in the Brazilian group (in chapter 5, Hypotheses 1, 3, 4 and 5, pages 110, 114, 117, 120) has a correspondence with the Brazilian parents’ expectations that pro-social attitudes and feelings are important to the child’s development. The reported roles of each family member also relates to these expectations. In Brazilian group, the parents report that they organise the family life, making use of support and help from others (e.g. maid/child’s siblings/grandparents) in order not to let their child be by him/herself without support from an older family member. In other words Brazilian parents lay great stress on the family/group organisation as well as the supportive relationship between the elements of the group.

The results of the Multiple Regression Analyses suggested that the children are able to assimilate (cognitive process) their parents’ expectations, which is reflected in their play. Thus the children’s play assessments can be seen as a key opening the door to broad our understanding of the parents’ role as a cultural filter in the child’s development. Robinson (2000) has previously discussed the need to examine how children in different cultural settings represent their social and cultural practices. The study reported here detected cross-cultural variations in the children’s mental representations, in that the Brazilian and German groups differed from each other. They therefore also reaffirm the findings of the Memphis New Mother Study conducted by Robinson et al. (2000) that the MSSB is well suited to exploring cross-cultural variations in children’s representations of family life.

Other cross cultural studies, such as that of Bontempo (1989) have compared Brazilian and American subjects concerning the impact of social desirability on attitudes. This was assessed by administering questionnaires under two conditions,
either in a public setting or privately and anonymously. The questionnaire included questions about how the subject was likely to act when the in-group expected a behaviour that was costly to the individual. The results showed that under both conditions (public and anonymous collection) the Brazilians said they would do what was expected from them and thought they were more likely to behave in ways that were costly but pro-social. In other words the Brazilians had internalized the in-group norms so that conformity to the in-group appeared enjoyable to them. On the other hand the Americans reported that they would do what was expected of them only in the public, but not in the anonymous condition. The results of the study described by Bontempo accord well with the results of this study not only concerning the conscious expectations of the Brazilian parents regarding the importance of pro-social adaptation, but also the mental representations of Brazilian children seen in the MSSB scales: “Social Competence”, “Emotional Coherence and Adaptation Capacity”, “Moral Themes”; and in the MSSB factor: “Narrative Competence and Social Empathy”, which expresses the absorption and the conformity of the in-group norms. These results are further supported by the study of Gouveia; Albuquerque and Espinosa (2002) who examined the values associated with in-groups in two cultures, Brazil and Spain. Within the Brazilian group the best predictors of identification with in-group norms were ‘belonging’, ‘tradition’, ‘emotion’, ‘power’, ‘social order’, ‘affectivity’ and ‘privacy values’. Within the Spanish group the best predictors were ‘belonging’, ‘tradition’, ‘privacy’ and ‘simulation’. Gouveia’s results accord well with the results of this study, mainly regarding the factor COMPETENT-SELF that represents well his Brazilian in-group norms.

Another study that shows accordance with the present one is reported by Parin (1990). His study described differences in the behaviour patterns between
German and Italian cultures regarding the manner in which the Germans and Italians have confronted their Nazi and Fascist pasts. His thesis is that Italians have discussed the brutality of the war years more candidly and intensively than Germans, who have repressed memories of their guilt, using denial and self-induced amnesia to avoid confronting their past. Parin tries to understand these different cultural processes through the relationship constellation between mother and the child. In Italy this is, basically characterized by mothers who offer care and support for the development of the child’s self-esteem, and who do not view dependence as a negative characteristic in development. By contrast, according Parin in Germany the mothers require more performance and individualization from their child. This emphasis on the German child’s performance (personal feature) and individualization was also observed in this study, through the German parents’ attitudes/feelings and expectations – factor “Self-Assertion and Individuality”, which expressed more personal competence and power.

As it has been pointed out, significant differences were identified between Brazilian and German children regarding pro-social mental representations. Furthermore cultural frame differences could be observed, between the Brazilian and German groups, not only in family organisation but also in the values and expectations of the parents toward their children. The findings may be best understood as an expression of two different cultural patterns or models, in which, each one of the two aforesaid cultures is dominated by different models of preconscious emotional organization: an "individual competence model", which is operated by German parents and children, and a “group model” or “family idealization model” seen in Brazilian children and their parents.
In the „Individual Competence Model“: individuality, self-sufficiency, self-esteem and competence are the most important characteristics, and this appears to be more characteristic of the German parents and their children. This assertion is supported by the factors “Self-Assertion and Individuality (Narcissistic-Self)” and “Daring-Self”, which express the German parents’ conscious expectation and recognition regarding their child’s emotional maturity, to more individual actions as attitude/feelings of their child, as well as power and domain against the environment. Furthermore the results of the parents’ assessment showed also that the German parents organize themselves more in promoting their children’s individuality and self responsibilities. The German children, through the cognitive process of adaptation (assimilation and accommodation) internalised their parents’ values as an “Individual Competence Model”. However this internalisation of parents’ values is expressed by mental representations which are not only conscious patterns of thinking, but also at least in important parts, preconscious and unconscious concepts which are regulating the perceptions of interactions with others and the child’s own behaviour.

In the “Group Model” or “Family Idealization Model”: community spirit, solidarity, social competence, social empathy /help, family union were the most important characteristics. This appeared to be the core model internalised by Brazilian parents and their children. This assertion is supported by the factors “Competent Self” and “Social Leader Self”, which represent the Brazilian parents’ conscious expectation and recognition regarding their child’s emotional maturity contributing to more emotional competence and behaviour regulation, in which social relationships and social adaptation are valued. The Brazilian children, like the German children, absorbed their parents’ values, via cognitive adaptation, and hence internalised “Family Idealization”. The mental representations of these internalised
values are well expressed in this study by the results in the MSSB scales: “Social Competence”, “Emotional Coherence and Adaptation Capacity”, “Moral Themes”; “Positive Parents’ Representation” and the MSSB factors: “Narrative Competence and Social Empathy”, “Kind Parents”, where the child’s successful cognitive adaptation to more pro-social acts and family relationships could be observed.

This interpretation of the data in terms of different ‘models’ accords well with the concepts of Triandis (1989), who incorporated Greenwald and Pratkanis’ (1984) distinction between private, collective and public, in explaining cultural differences.

The major argument concerning cultural differences presented by Triandis (1989) is that cultures differ in the kinds of information they sample from the environment. Major differences can be found between cultures that are simple or complex, tight or loose, and individualist or collectivist. He argued that the people in individualist cultures, such as those of North America and North and Western Europe (including Germany) sample with high probability, elements of the personal self, which is characterized by autonomy and independence from the group. People from collectivist cultures, such as those of Asia, Africa and South America (including Brazil), tend to sample mostly elements of the collective-self, which is characterized by interdependency between the elements of the group, and group acceptance is the main characteristic for this people. The concepts of Individualism and Collectivism were first used in the 18th Century. Individualism was characterized by ideas such as freedom of the individual from the state, freedom of association with others, and freedom of speech. This was contrasted with authoritarianism which was characterized by ideas such as submission to an authority, such as the king and denial of freedom of the individual way of life. However he states that this contrast between the ideas of the necessity to do what an in-group specifies, contrasted with
the idea of the freedom to decide how to behave, is older than 18th Century. In psychology these terms were introduced with Hofstede’s book (1980). After submitting the value judgments of samples from 40 countries, using factor analyses, he identified a factor that contrasted individualism and collectivism. The scientific approach to the measurement of individualism and collectivism was taken further by Hui (1988), and since then more has been published.

Triandis (1999, 1995) proposed five defining attributes describing universal dimensions of the constructs of individualism and collectivism. These were; definition of the self; structure of goals; emphasis on norms versus attitudes; emphasis on relatedness versus rationality and cognition. These also show a robust concordance with the most of the data from this study. In the following sections the five defining attributes are presented in connection with the data from this study:

**SELF:**

It is clear that this study could not lead to an exact definition of “self”, since this was not its aim, and in addition the construct “self” might be also comprehensive to come to a clear definition in the narrow sense. Nevertheless, some structural aspects of the “self”, and especially the parents’ expectations toward their children’s self development, could be assessed in this study and led to important results. Through the agreement between the parents’ and the children’s assessments one has a profile of the family environment that is presented to the child and to which he/she needs to adapt, in order to achieve good cognitive and emotional development. In this case, the parents’ expectations Factors provide an indication of what kind of self is expected of the child: the “Self-Assertion and Individuality” (characterized by items such as: self assertion, impulsiveness and insolence) in German sample and the
“Competent-Self” (characterized by items such as: self-assurance, self-respect, companionship) in Brazilian sample. As a consequence, the children are able to assimilate and accommodate these demands from their parents, which according to some developmental frameworks (c.f. “Genetic Epistemology”, “Cultural-Historic School”) is to be seen as cognitive-emotional adaptation process. This assertion could also be seen in the results using MSSB scales and factors as well as in the results of the Multiple Regression Analyses, used to examine the Hypotheses, which were constructed with the aim of looking at the different associations between the significance of mother and father roles across cultures, and consequently to understand better the identification process (described previously in chapter 1 and 2). As the data showed previously, in the German sample the majority of the Regression Analyses supported the tendency of the child personal features in the relationship representation and mental organization (i.e. Hypotheses 1, 4 and 5), indicating the assimilation of the German parents’ expectations to more personal competence and power. By contrast, in the Brazilian sample the same Regression Analyses (to Hypotheses 1, 4 and 5) were characterized most of the time by a tendency to the group/family relationship features, likewise indicating the child’s assimilation of the Brazilian parents’ expectations to more social/family relationships and social adaptation. This was reinforced by the MSSB scales: “Social Competence”, “Emotional Coherence and Adaptation Capacity”, “Moral Themes”; and the MSSB factors: “Narrative Competence and Social Empathy”, which express the absorption of the in-group norms.

At this point these data can be also interpreted using the “Model” understanding in agreement with Triandis self concept, which has the different dimensions of Individualism and Collectivism. According to him:
The culture of *Individualism* views the self as autonomous and independent from the group, and decisions are made individually. It uses *individuals* as the units of analysis of social behaviour; and it is concerned mostly with “their” own success.

The culture of *Collectivism* views the self as interdependent with others, which is accompanied by sharing of resources, in a manner similar to what happens in families. It uses groups as the units of social behaviour analysis, and it is concerned with the success of their group.

**GOALS:**

As it has been pointed out that through the parents’ assessment it could be seen that each group (Brazilian and German) has a different goal expectation toward their children. Whereas the Brazilian parents have higher expectations regarding the attitudes/feelings of their children directed towards more pro-social actions, the German parents’ expectations refer more to the individual actions of the children. Making use of Triandis’ models conceptualization, the meaning of the goal in each group can be also interpreted as:

- *‘the individualistic culture’* (German group) the individual goals are often not correlated with in-group goals. Individualists sample mostly their personal goals, and pay little attention to the in-group goals. Priority is given to personal goals.

- *‘the collectivist culture’* (Brazilian Group) the individual goals are usually compatible with in-group goals. Collectivists sample in-group goals and pay little attention to personal goals. Priority is given to in-group goals.
The collectivist goal attribute is consistent with the higher expectations of the Brazilian parents' regard for pro-social actions as an expression of good emotional maturity their children found in this study. This demand is well illustrated by the dissatisfaction of Brazilian parents group regarding their child's emotional maturity, expressed through the value of the ratio (RM > 1.0).

**EMPHASIS ON NORMS VERSUS ATTITUDES**

The findings from this study showed also a difference in parents' recognition of their children's attitudes and feelings that were well exemplified through the factors: “Daring-Self” (higher values in German sample), which express active approach towards the environment and “Social Leader Self” (higher values in Brazilian sample) express also an active approach towards the environment, however not against the environment but aiming at a social adaptation. These data are in agreement Triandis' defining attribute *norms versus attitudes*, as is described below:

- In **Individualism** (German group): the determinants of social behaviour among individualists are primarily attitudes, personal needs. The individualists give more importance to the attitudes than the norms. The social obligations of individualists are fluid and may be converted to obligations to the large society. The concept of well-being depends on the satisfaction with the self and the emotions are associated with self-satisfaction.

- In **Collectivism**: the determinants of social behaviour among collectivist involve norms and attitudes. The collectivists tend to be more formal and to depend on rules for social behaviour. The social obligations of collectivists are quite focused. For them an important goal is to fulfil their
duties and obligations. The concept of well-being depends on fitting in and having good relationships with the in-group, which requires close attention to the norms of in-group.

The results of children’s assessments in the Brazilian group can also be understood as a feature of the **norm attribute**. In other words, the results of the MSSB scales: “Social Competence”, “Emotional Coherence and Adaptation Capacity”, “Moral Themes”; and the MSSB factors: “Narrative Competence and Social Empathy” in the group of Brazilian children can be understood as an expression of the Brazilian children’s mental representation of the well-being concept, which depends on fitting in and having good relationships with the in-group. Following this interpretation, the tendency of the data in the regression analyses in the Brazilian group to more group/family relationship features, can also be seen as an expression of the well-being concept. The increase in value of in-group norms in the collectivist culture is fundamental. On the other hand, the increase in value of the attitudes and personal needs in the individualist culture can also support the tendency of the data in the regression analyses in the German group to more individual features.

**EMPHASIS ON RELATEDNESS VERSUS RATIONALITY**

“Relatedness refers to giving priority to relationships and taking into account the needs of others, even when such relationships are not advantageous to the individual. Rationality refers to the careful computation of the costs and benefits of relationships” (Triandis, 1999)
In this study, the assessment of the family organization in the child’s daily activities centred on school indicated two different profiles of relationships in the family organization. As it has been pointed out the Brazilian parents reported that they are more likely than German parents to organize daily activities to ensure that their children are not by themselves, and not without support from an older family member, laying great stress on the conformity and obedience in the organisation as well as the supportive relationship between the elements of the group. By contrast the responses of the German parents indicated that they promoted their children’s individuality and self responsibilities. These data fit in well with Triandis’ defining attribute relatedness versus rationality, which is described as:

- **Individualism** (German group): the individualists sample the profit and loss of relationships. In conflict situations the individualists are primarily concerned with achieving justice. People in individualist cultures usually establish non-intimate and short-term relationship.
  
  o “The child-rearing pattern emphasizes self-reliance, independence; children are allowed a good deal of autonomy and are encouraged to explore their environment. Similarly creativity and self-actualization are more important traits and are emphasized in child-rearing in the professional social class” (Triandis, 1989)

- **Collectivism** (Brazilian Group) the collectivists sample the needs of others and the loyalty associated with the relationship. The collectivists in conflict situations are primarily concerned with maintaining their relationship with others and they prefer methods of conflict resolutions that do not destroy the
relationships. People in collectivist cultures usually establish intimate and long-term relationships.

- “Collectivism is associated with child-rearing patterns that emphasize conformity, obedience and reliability. Such patterns are usually associated with rewards for conformity to in-group goals, which leads to internalization of the in group goals. Thus, people do what it is expected from them, even if that is not enjoyable.” (Triandis, 1989)

**COGNITION: environment is seen as changeable versus fixed**

The data of the recognized attitudes/feelings factor “Daring-Self” showed that German parents see their child as being insolent, impulsive, and having self assertion, in other words expressing more active approach and power towards the environment. Making use of Triandis’ conceptualization of individualism cognition, the German group see themselves as more or less stable (stable personality, attitudes, and rights) and the environment as changeable.

Another important difference between Brazil and Germany is concerned with the social environment. In contrast with Germany, the Brazilian environment is characterized by the threat of mugging, break-ins and kidnapping. This is a problem that affects the daily life in Brazil. And this threatening environment could be represented by the Brazilian children, in the assessment of their mental representations (MSSB scale “Expression of mistrust against the environment”), as avoidance of conflict situations, which was interpreted as mistrust of a violent environment. This contrast was not directly represented in a high level of anxiety but as an expression of mistrust against the environment. In the case of Brazilian group, the data from the parents’ and children’s assessments can be jointly interpreted as
an organization that tries to “fit in” the environment. In other words, the threat of the violent environment in Brazil induces the Brazilian parents to act out in a protective way, trying to maintain a successful process of development and individualization for their child. And to achieve this, the parents organize themselves in the child’s daily activities, making use of the support and help from the others (e.g. maid/child’s siblings, grandparents) in order not to let their child be without the support of a member of the family and exposed to the environment (e.g. 100% of Brazilian children do not go to school or come back to home by him/herself, there is always someone who carries and picks him/her up) In this way a model of an ideal family is offered, where the child can find all support that he/she needs. However this ideal family through the building of a protected world (protective bubble) promotes also mistrust against the environment.

This assertion is also supported by Triandis’ conceptualization of collectivist cognitions. According to him people in collectivist cultures see the environment as more or less fixed (by stables norms, obligations, duties) and themselves as changeable.

Summarizing, the results of children’s and parents’ assessments suggest that the cultural patterns of Brazilian children and their parents may be characterised by a "group model" or “family idealization model”. This may provide a secure environment that promotes health mental and social development to the child, in the face of social violence outside the family.

The interpretation of the models as an explanation for the different data from the German and Brazilian groups fits strongly with Triandis’ theory, which as consequence supports and characterizes the presented two cultural patterns: „Individual Competence Model“, and “Group/Family Model”.
Concluding, the empirical data from this study reveal not only the existence of two different cultural patterns, but also some new aspects that may help us to better understand the child’s identification with cultural patterns and cast light on the process of identity formation in the transitional period of early latency. It could be shown through the assessment of the child’s inner world (mental representations) and the parents’ conscious expectations; children learn from and respond to the respective models in the relationship with their parents. In this way, this study could make links to some of the psychoanalytic premises regarding not only the child’s identification process with his/her parents, in latency, but also the development of the superego formation. The cultural patterns and principles were successfully absorbed in both groups: Brazilian and German. Another point that calls attention concerns cognitive development. No difference was shown in the Narrative Coherence between the two groups, in spite of the existence of two different cultural patterns. This result is in opposition to Freud’s proposal: “the cognitive development is a sub product from the personality or from social interaction, and not the contrary” and backs more Piaget’s formulation, “both structures, cognitive and affective, are distinct in their origin and essence; so they can develop in correlation with one another, however the development of one does not determinate the existence of the other. In other words they can be complementary, but not be excluded.”

Summing up, the questions posed in this study could be answered, and the goals could also be achieved. However new questions were raised about the conceptualisation of cultural transmission via conscious and unconscious identification with complex relationship models. Likewise, the question of how these patterns and models could have an influence or could be observed in clinical samples is a key issue for further studies and advances in knowledge.
6.2. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY AND OPEN QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCHES

The study was the first to compare the representations of family relationships of children from two contrasting cultures. The groups of children came from similar social backgrounds, and were recruited in similar ways. New measures were devised of parents’ reports of family roles and of their expectations regarding development, and this allowed questions to be addressed regarding parental roles and expectations and children’s representations.

Although the results of the analyses have been interpreted as representing cross-cultural differences, it is possible that the groups were not similar in ways that have not been recorded. For example it is difficult to compare the social class of Brazilian and German families because the cultures are so different, due to the difference in the social hierarchy features in both countries. It is therefore possible that the differences described in this study arise from this concept of social hierarchy. Future studies might compare different social classes within countries as well as differences between countries. The two groups also appeared to differ in that the Brazilian children were reported by their parents as having much higher rates of internalizing problems on the CBCL than the German children. It is difficult to know how this should be interpreted. It may be that the groups did differ, or it may reflect problems with the use of the CBCL in a Brazilian sample. The result of Bordin study (Bordin et al., 2004) with 482 Brazilian children from five different socioeconomic classes; likewise this study, had high values in Internalizing Scale in the Brazilian population, so it supports the previous last argumentation of the CBCL using.
Another point that needs to be observed is the validation by independent studies of the new tools (i.e. Questionnaire - FOPEI) and new Scales (i.e. Negative Representation of Parents, Positive Representation of Parents and Mistrust against the Environment) – different the classical MSSB - created and tested in this study. This, in it self, would be a most valuable contribution, as the FOPEI and the modified version of the MSSB are easy to handle and the new version of the MSSB has resulted in good inter-rater reliability and good statistical data. In this way and making use of these tools, it would be interesting to look more closely some of the hypotheses of this study, such as the Hypotheses 5 and 6 (on page 55), which can bring up new questions for new researches aiming to investigate these themes in details. For example, there are probably causes of violence in children that are common to all cultures, and others that vary across cultures. A greater understanding of the commonalties and differences will contribute to the development of psychotherapies that have some common elements across cultures, and also have variations that reflect the cultural differences. Taking this in account it would be also interesting to apply this approach to clinical samples, such as maltreated children, or delinquent children from different countries (i.e. Brazil and Germany). Another possibility of research would be to develop further studies of commonalities and differences in developmental processes across cultures, focusing on latency (keeping the close look in the identification process with the parents and social rules), and examining a wider range of contrasting samples, for example immigrant children in Germany contrasted with children born in Germany of German parents. Anyway, to increase the number of subjects in each group of this study would be also important to further studies.
For some moment

We have been together

Me …… in the author role

You …… in the reader role

We don’t know each other!!!

Maybe we are from different cultures.

But what it matters?

We have just talked to each other …

The writing was our encounter …

The thought was our speech

Now it is time to say goodbye…

But if by chance

You can understand my doubts…

See me in your doubts…

Then we have already known each other …

And I can tell you:

“- It is great to see you again!!!”
MENTAL REPRESENTATIONS OF PARENTS AND FAMILY STRUCTURE OF THE FIRST GRADE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CHILDREN FROM TWO COUNTRIES – BRAZIL & GERMANY: SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES

SUMMARY

This study was designed to explore differences between German and Brazilian latency children in their socio-cultural identity, emotional organization and quality of their identification with parental figures, using a standardized play assessment. The possible role of parents as a cultural filter in explaining cross cultural differences was also examined. The sample comprised two groups: one from Brazil and the other from Germany. Each group was composed of 41 non-clinical children (23 boys and 18 girls) and 41 parental couples. The age range of groups was 6 to 8 (Brazilian group mean age 7.3, SD 0.4 and German group mean age 7.5, SD 0.6) and they were from similar socio-economic backgrounds. Children were assessed using the MacArthur Story-Stem Battery (MSSB: Emde et al. 1990, 2003), and ratings were made using an established scoring method (Günter, et al, 2001) and further codes developed in Tübingen (Franieck, et al 2003). Parents completed the Child Behaviour Checklist and a questionnaire created for this study, the Family Organization and Parents’ Expectations Inventory - FOPEI (Franieck, 2002). The FOPEI was designed to assess what parents think about their child’s attitudes and feelings and what they would expect from the child in order to be equipped for the “struggle for life”. The comparisons between the groups were made using Mann-Whitney-U-Test and ranked variables were assessed jointly in multiple linear regression. Scores from the MSSB reflecting emotional regulation capacity, behavioural disturbance, narrative coherence and negative representations of parents did not differ significantly between the Brazilian and German groups. However Brazilian children had significantly higher scores on scales assessing pro-social behaviours, idealization of the family, and avoidance of conflict situations. This avoidance of conflict was interpreted as mistrust of a violent environment. Brazilian parents reported that they are more likely than German parents to organize daily activities to ensure that their children are not by themselves, and that they have higher expectations regarding pro-social actions and attitudes and feelings of their children. The
responses of the German parents indicated that they promoted their children’s individuality and self responsibilities, and that they expected more individual actions as attitude/feelings of their child. The results suggest that the cultural patterns of Brazilian children and their parents may be characterised by a "group model" or "family idealization model". This may provide a secure environment that promotes health mental and social development to the child, in the face of social violence outside the family. By contrast German parents and children give more emphasis to an „individual competence model“. Empirical data reveal new aspects to better understand the child's social identification in the early school time.
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ATTACHMENTS
DECLARATION OF CONSENT TO TAKE PART IN RESEARCH PROJECT
BRAZIL – GERMANY

CHILD: ..............................................................................................................

Last name                                      First Name

..............................................................................................................

Birth date

Person responsible: -----------------------------  -----------------------------------

Last name                                      First Name

Address:---------------------------------------------------------------------------------  

Complete Address

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Telephone Number

I declare that I was properly informed about the aim and development of Research Project Brazil – Germany and in this way I give consent that my son/daughter take part in the group of children representing the Brazilian/German Group. I do not have anything to declare, and I am in agreement with the research of one’s own free will. Sign my name:

..................................................................................................................  ..........................................................

Place, date                                      Signature of person responsible

I declare also that I am aware that the appointment with my son/daughter will be video-taped and that the name of him/her and also my name will be confidential. I consent to the use of this film for scientific purposes. I do not have anything to declare.

I attract particular attention to the fact that the participation in this study can also be carried out if I will not agree o.g. with the using of the Video recordings. Furthermore this consent can be revoked independently by the further participation in the study at any time informally in writing or verbally. I sign my name:

..................................................................................................................  ..........................................................

Place, date                                      Signature of person responsible
DECLARATION OF CONSENT FOR THE EXECUTION OF RESEARCH PROJECT BRAZIL - GERMANY

I am aware of the Research Project Brazil – Germany, and the aim of the Project has been explained to me by Dr. Michael Günter, Senior Lecture and Consultant, Department of Psychiatry e Psychotherapy of children and adolescent, University of Tübingen. I give consent to Maria Leticia C. F. Franieck, Psychologist, to conduct the research at my school____________________________, where I am the school’s principal.

My declaration of consent is valued so far as the parents of the children that will take part in this research, who have also provided a written declaration of their consent.

I am aware that I can contact, if I so chose, M. Leticia C. F. Franieck, Psychologist, at the following address: (Brazilian or Germany address) to get information concerning the results and conclusions of this research.

I am also aware that in the Research Project Brazil – Germany the identity of the children will be kept confidential and that all of the gathered material will be used only for academic and scientific purposes.

Place, date ___________________________ Signature of school’s principal
**ATTACHMENT 2**

**QUESTIONNAIRE (Franieck, 2002)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child’s name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birth’s date: Age: Sex:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Who answers?  
Mother ( ) Father ( ) The couple ( ) Others ( )  
Who? ________________________

1. School: ________________________________________________________________

2. Siblings:  □ no one  □ 1  □ 2  □ 3  □ 4  □ more, how many : __________

3. the age of siblings:

4. Position of child:  □ only child  □ youngest  □ middle  □ oldest

5. The families live by:  
   a) Apartment   □ own  □ rent  
   b) House   □ own  □ rent  

District: ________________________________________________________________

Has the child a bedroom of her own?  □ Yes  
□ No. Who divides with his/her? __________

6. Parents marital status:  
   □ Married and living together  □ separated since:  
   □ no married and living together  □ divorced since: .................
   □ Never living together  □ widowed

7. The child lives together with:  
   **Mother:**  
   □ natural father  □ stepmother or adoptive mother  □ new partner of the mother  □ no mother  
   □ natural mother

   **Father:**  
   □ natural mother  □ stepfather or adoptive father  □ new partner of the father  
   □ no father

   **Others:**  
   □ Siblings. How many?: __________  
   □ Grandparents  □ Other relatives  □ Orphanage

**PLEASE, FILL OUT THE ELEVEN FOLLOWED QUESTIONS, AND EVERY ITEM OF THEM. THE QUESTIONS CONCERN TO YOUR CHILD’S DAILY SCHOOL ACTIVITIES.**
1. **WHO WAKES UP THE CHILD?** HOW OFTEN?  
   - MOTHER ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )  
   - FATHER ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )  
   - BY HERSELF/HIMSELF ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )  
   - OTHERS: WHO? ______ ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

2. **WHO GIVES THE BREAKFAST?** HOW OFTEN?  
   - MOTHER ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )  
   - FATHER ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )  
   - BY HERSELF/HIMSELF ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )  
   - OTHERS: WHO? ______ ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

3. **WHO PREPARES THE SNACKS?** HOW OFTEN?  
   - MOTHER ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )  
   - FATHER ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )  
   - BY HERSELF/HIMSELF ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )  
   - OTHERS: WHO? ______ ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

4. **WHO CARRIES THE CHILD TO SCHOOL?** HOW OFTEN?  
   - MOTHER ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )  
   - FATHER ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )  
   - BY HERSELF/HIMSELF ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )  
   - OTHERS: WHO? ______ ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

5. **WHO CATCHES THE CHILD AT SCHOOL?** HOW OFTEN?  
   - MOTHER ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )  
   - FATHER ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )  
   - BY HERSELF/HIMSELF ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )  
   - OTHERS: WHO? ______ ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

6. **WHO HAS LUNCH WITH THE CHILD?** HOW OFTEN?  
   - MOTHER ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )  
   - FATHER ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )  
   - BY HERSELF/HIMSELF ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )  
   - OTHERS: WHO? ______ ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
7. WHO HELPS THE CHILD TO DO HER/HIS HOMEWORK? HOW OFTEN?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>never</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>often</th>
<th>ever</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOTHER</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATHER</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BY HERSELF/HIMSELF</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHERS: WHO?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. WHO HELPS THE CHILD TO ORGANIZE THE SCHOOL’S BAG? HOW OFTEN?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>never</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>often</th>
<th>ever</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOTHER</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATHER</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BY HERSELF/HIMSELF</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHERS: WHO?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. WHO TAKES THE CHILD TO BED? HOW OFTEN?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>never</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>often</th>
<th>ever</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOTHER</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATHER</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BY HERSELF/HIMSELF</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHERS: WHO?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. WHEN THE CHILD HAS A PROBLEM AT SCHOOL, WHO SPEAKS WITH THE TEACHER? HOW OFTEN?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>never</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>often</th>
<th>ever</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOTHER</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATHER</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE COUPLE</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHERS: WHO?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. WHEN THE CHILD HAS A PROBLEM, WHO SPEAKS WITH HER/HIS? HOW OFTEN?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>never</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>often</th>
<th>ever</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOTHER</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATHER</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE COUPLE</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHERS: WHO?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please, fill out the blanks and answer what you really believe.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes/Feelings of</th>
<th>How deep is each of these attitudes/feelings for a good child’s growth and development?</th>
<th>How deep is each of these attitudes/feelings in your child?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Companionship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distrust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insolence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impulsiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-respect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-assertion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-assurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-help</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-sacrifice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MacArthur Story Stem Battery

Story Stems in the order of the Presentation

0 Birthday (Warm-up story)
1. Barbecue (attachment/parental sympathy versus authority)
2. The lost keys (controversy between parents, family conflict, relationship)
3. Gift for Mom or Dad (Sex identification, triadic conflict, choice)
4. Monster in the dark (fear, uncertainty)
5. Injured Child (community, exclusion, Physical injured)
6. Looking for Barney (loss, separation, attachment)
7. Departure (attachment/ separation anxiety)
8. Reunion (reunion quality)

Instructions for the administration of the MacArthur Story Stems
(After Bretherton et al. 1990/1996)

The original intention of the development of the MacArthur Story Stem Battery was to present a standard assessment, which can be done by using the classical collection of 13 stories, or to adapt it specifically either by excluding stories or by adding new stories to the interests of a researcher and to the aims of a study respectively. In any case it is recommended that additional stories should be evaluated carefully in a pilot phase.

The stories must be presented in a standardized way to all children, in order to obtain useful data. Therefore a careful training of the interviewers is recommended, to enable them to use the same protagonists, to play the story stems in the same way and the same prompts across children.

The children in the story stems have always the same sex as the examined child. The older child is usually introduced as main protagonist.

We use playmobil characters, but one can use easily different play figures, to cheer up the children to play. However, the figures should be able to stand.

The Following abbreviations are used in the manual to identify the various story figures:

- M = mother figure
- F = father figure
- G = grandmother figure
- C1 = older brother/sister (George/Susan)
- C2 = younger brother/sister (Bob/Jane)
- C3 = friend
- D = family dog (Barney)
- I = Interviewer
- S = Subject (Child)

Further instructions for coding can be found in the coding manual.

* Translated by Franieck
Warm-up: Susan’s/George’s Birthday

Theme: Introduction, modelling of narration with family figures
Props: Table, birthday cake
Characters: All the family characters, including the dog (but not including the friends and other non-family characters)

I: You know what? It is Susan/George’s birthday and Mom made her/him this beautiful cake (bring out cake). It’s time to celebrate.

M: “Come on grandma and dad, Jane/Bob and Susan/George it’s time to celebrate Susan/George’s birthday.”

I: Can you get the family ready at the table?

Subject

M  F  G  C1  C2  Table prop with cake on it

Interviewer

I: Show me and tell me what happens next.

(Let the child play with the characters or tell a story yourself if the child is in need of help. Show to the children by acting or saying, how the figures can move or talk. Remember, however, that demonstrations or leading prompts should not be used for the 9 subsequent story stems. These should be presented in the standard fashion described for story stems 1-9).

Ideas for prompts to get the child involved:
1. Show me how they eat the cake/blow out the candles.
2. What might Susan/George say about her/his beautiful cake?
3. If the child wants to sing „Happy Birthday“, by all means join him/her and sing along

Some notes about the „Warm-up story“

The “Warm-up story” is the framework to stretch for playing, dramatic representing and telling of stories. In the special, at the end of this phase the children must fulfil at least three of the criteria, which are specified below. If they do not do this, the further development of the child could be so reduced that it would be difficult to interpret the narratives. The criteria are
1. Talk to the interviewer.
2. Handle the dolls.
3. Speak in different roles.
4. Say something, which is connected to the birthday story.
**Barbecue (= Parallel story of „Hot gravy“)**

**Theme:** Disobedience/parental empathy versus authority  
**Props:** Fire, sausages  
**Characters:** Mother, Father, Child1, Child2

I: The whole family goes outing and makes a pick-nick. They grill sausages. Mother and Susan/George are at the fire. Father und Claudia/Marc are sitting at the table.

Subject

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>fire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interviewer

M: „The sausages smell very good. But they are not ready yet.“ „Take care! Don’t go too near to the fire.“

C1: „Yami!!!, they look great. I can’t wait any more. I want to taste a sausage now. “

(George/Susanne puts her hand into the fire).

C1: „Ow! I’ve burned my hand! It hurts!! “

I: Show me and tell me what happens next.

Required issue prompt 1: (If no one helps the child)

I: What’s the matter with Susan/George? Did she/he hurt her/his hand? What do they do about the hurt hand?

Required issue prompt 2:

I: Did someone do anything about the sausage?
The Lost Keys

Theme: Parental conflict, relationships
Props: None
Character: Mother, Father, Child 1

I: Susan/George comes into the room and sees Mom and Dad looking at each other like this (show angry expression).

Subject
M > < F

C1
Interviewer

M: (Angrily) „You lost my keys!“

P: (Angrily) „I did NOT!“

M: „Yes you did, you always loose my keys!“

P: „I did not lose them this time. “

I: Show me and tell me what happens next.

Issue Prompt: (If child does not enact end or resolutions of conflict).

I: „What’s going to happen about mom and Dad’s argument?“
Gift for Mom or Dad

The child who has made a beautiful drawing at the school, need to choose to whom he/she will
give the drawing (Mom or Dad).

Theme: sexual identification, triadic relationship, choice,
Props: the build
Character: Mother, Father, Child 1

Subject

M
C1
F

Interviewer

I: George/Susanne had a discussion with Mom in the morning. After that he/she goes to
Dad and tries to convince him on going to eat an ice cream together after the school

George/Susanne made a beautiful build at the school and he/she brings it to home. When
he/she arrives at home, he/she meets Mom and Dad talking together.

M + F: “Hello George/Susanne! What do you have in your hand?”

C: “It is a gift that I made myself at the school.”

M + F: “For who is this gift?

I: Show me and tell me what happens next.

Issue Prompt: (if the child chooses to give the gift for Dad)
I: „What’s matter with the discussion with Mom?
Issue Prompt: (if the child chooses to give the gift for Mom)
I: What’s matter with the discussion with Mom? Did Dad go to eat ice-cream?
Monster in the dark

Theme: Fear, uncertainty
Props: 2 armchairs
Characters: Mother, Father, Child1

I: It is evening. Mom and Dad are sitting in the living room. Susan/George is upstairs in her/his bedroom playing. Suddenly, the lights go out and Susan/George hears a noise (The interviewer scratches the surface of the table with her/his fingernail)

Subject
M
F
Interviewer

C1: (Susan/George goes a few steps, takes a deep breath and holds her breath.) „It is a monster“ (with frightened voice)

I: Show me and tell me what happens now.

Note: If it remains unclear at the end of the story what the noise was, ask the following question:

Was there really a monster? What happened to the monster?
Injured Child

Theme: Community, exclusion, physical injury
Props: Table, plaster foot
Characters: Mother, Father, Child1, Child 2

I: Here is the family in the kitchen, they already ate their breakfast. Look at Susan/George! She/he had an accident with her/his foot, and therefore she/he needs to use a plaster.

                  Subject
                  M

        C2      Table      C1 (with plaster on his foot)

                  F

                  Interviewer

M (Joyful to Dad) „Today is your day off; let’s do something all together!”

P: „Yes something, that the whole family enjoys. “

M+P: „Kids, what would you like to do? “

C2: „I would like to go ice skating (in winter) / ride a bike (in summer).“

I: Show me and tell me what happens next.

Note: If the Subject denies the injury of C1, say:

I: Look, Susan/George has a plaster on his foot and she/he cannot ice skate/ride a bike. What does the family do now?
Looking for Barney

Theme: Loss, separation
Props: None
Characters: Child 1, Mother standing off to the side, the dog only appears in part II of the stem.

I: Susan/George has been thinking about playing with her/his favourite dog Barney ever since she/he woke up this morning.

Subject

M C1

Interviewer

C1: “Mom, I am going out into the backyard to play with Barney. “

M: „OK Susan/George. “

I: So Susan/George goes out to the yard.

C1: „Oh, no!! Barney is gone! “(worried Voice)

I: Show me and tell me what happens next.

Note: Children frequently run to the prop box and ask for Barney. If they do, say:
First tell me the story, Barney is not there now. Show me what Susan/George does in the story.

Barney – Reunion with the lost dog

Theme: Reunion
Props: None
Character: Child1, dog, mother standing off the side

Subject

M C1

Interviewer

I: (Brings back Barney, places on the edge of the table away from child) Look who’s back (in an excited tone)

I: Show me and tell me what happens next.
Departure

**Theme:** Loss, separation anxiety, attachment  
**Props:** Car  
**Characters:** Mama, Papa, Child 1, Child 2, grandmother

Subject

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>GMom</th>
<th>C2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Auto</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interviewer

I: Mom and Dad are going on a trip. The Auto is already in front of the house.

Mom: „OK, Guys, Dad and I are going on a trip. Bye we see you tomorrow. Grand mom will take care of you

I: Show me and tell me what happens next.
Reunion

Theme: Reunion quality
Props: Car
Characters: Mama, Papa, Child 1, Child 2, grandmother

On the next day the Grandma looks at through the window and says:

Grandma: “Look Guys!! Mom and Dad are coming back… I can see their Auto coming!!!

I: Show me and tell me what happens next.
Narrative Coding Paper designed by Franieck & Koch

VT-Code:___________      Test/Date: ________

Sex:                          
 f  m  

Age:  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10  11  12

Group:                          

Coder: ________________________________

Story Stems nr.

Can man Code:    yes    no

A. **Content Themes:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 01:</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 02:</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 03:</td>
<td>R/J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 04:</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 05:</td>
<td>AG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 06:</td>
<td>DES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 07:</td>
<td>DAG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 08:</td>
<td>DNA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 09:</td>
<td>RES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 10:</td>
<td>E/H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 11:</td>
<td>REH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 12:</td>
<td>ICL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 13:</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 14:</td>
<td>N/C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 15:</td>
<td>E/C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 16:</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 17:</td>
<td>AFL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 18:</td>
<td>BLM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 19:</td>
<td>AFC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 20:</td>
<td>T/T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 21:</td>
<td>DSH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 22:</td>
<td>P/D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 23:</td>
<td>R/G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 24:</td>
<td>VC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 25:</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 26:</td>
<td>SO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 27:</td>
<td>SEXA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 28:</td>
<td>TREP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 29:</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 30:</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 31:</td>
<td>PI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 32:</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 33:</td>
<td>OA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 34:</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 35:</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 36:</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 37:</td>
<td>REP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: ________________________________
## B. Narrative emotional Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Danger (DAN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>End of Danger (EDAN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Regression (RG)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>Child Power (POW)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>Emotional Incoherence/ Positive (INCP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>Emotional Incoherence/Negative (INCNEG)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
<td>Final Content (FIN)</td>
<td>No Final Content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Affect
- **3.1** Sad.
- **3.2** Fear
- **3.3** Angry
- **3.4** destruction-injury
- **3.5** n.n.b.

## C. Specific affects / behaviors codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Control (CRL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Denial (DNL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Creativity (CREA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>Affect: Positive (APOS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>Affect: Negative (ANEG)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>Narrative Coherence (NC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>- No Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>- Logic/Stringency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>- Embellishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>- Conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>Investment in Performance (PER)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8</td>
<td>Emot. Response to interw. (EBU)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9</td>
<td>Anxiety Behavior (ANC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10</td>
<td>Relationships with Objects (RELO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11</td>
<td>Endless Story (ES)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12</td>
<td>Discontent with the toys/CRL II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## D. Coding the parental and child representations in the Narratives

### D 01. Parent-child interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Neutral</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Positive parent-child interaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Affection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Nurturance/Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Play/companionship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Praise/encouragement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Authoritative discipline/guidance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Negative parent-child interaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>verbal Aggression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Physical Aggression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Neglect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Rejection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Permitting/without border</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D 02. Marital Interaction

**Neutral**

**Positive interaction**
- a. helpful / friendly / warm relationship
- b. Reparation
- c. sensitively, tenderly, caring, supporting
- d. special relationship

**Negative interaction**
- a. unfriendly / aggressively
- b. Rivalry
- c. Exclusion

---

D 03 Parent Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Father</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. low power/ineffective</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. high power/competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D 04 Child Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. low power/ineffective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. high power/competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Superpower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Disobeys/ noncompliant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. obedient/compliant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. comfort/takes care of parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D 05 Other Nurturance/support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Siblings provides nurturance/support for the child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Grandparent provides nurturance/support for the child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

E. CONTENT CODES SPECIFIC TO THE PARENTS’ CONFLICT STORY STEMS

The only following four Story Stems concern:
- Lost keys/ lost call
- Visiting relatives
- Pizza for dinner
- Punishment

- E 01.Conflict expression/resolution
  - a. conflict resolution resolved unresolved escalated 0 1
  - b. spread of conflict
  - c. child involvement in conflict
  - d. boundary maintenance
E.02 Child behavior in response of conflict
a. direct intervention 0 1
b. siding with one parent

c. addressing the source of the conflict
d. distract parents

e. physical withdrawal
f. seek social support
g. distract self
h. Emote
i. get help

E.03 Expectances 0 1
a. negative
b. positive

E.04. Attributions of Conflict 0 1
- child
- mother
- father
- others (comment verbatim)

E.05. Resolutions of Conflict 0 1
- child
- mother
- father
- others (comment verbatim)

F. CONTENT CODES SPECIFIC TO THE SEPARATION/REUNION STORIES
(Concerning: Barney / Departure / Reunion)

F.01. Child response to separation 0 1
a. acceptance/neutral or positive affect
b. distress/anxiety/sadness
c. protest/anger
d. indifference/disregard
e. searches for absent figure (dog or parent)
f. negation for exclusion/control
g. aggressive/ sadism

F. 02. Child response to reunion 0 1
a. positive affect
b. distress/anxiety/sadness
c. anger
d. indifference
e. exclusion
f. aggressive/ destructive
CODE LIST OF CONTENT THEMES

I. No Themes (NT)

II. Relationship Themes
1. Competition (CM)
2. Sharing (SH)
3. Rivalry/Jealousy (R/J)
4. Exclusion (EX)
5. Aggression (AG)
6. Destruction of objects (DES)
7. Death by aggression (DAG)
8. Death by accident (DNA)
9. Resurrection (RES)
10. Empathy/Helping (E/H)
11. Refused Empathy/Helping (REH)
12. Interpersonal Conflict Resolution (ICR)
13. Compliance (CP)
14. Non-Compliance (N/C)
15. Escalation of Conflict (E/C)
16. Shame (SM)
17. Affiliation (AFL)
18. Blame (BLM)
19. Affection (AFC)
20. Teasing/Taunting (T/T)
21. Dishonesty (DSH)
22. Punishment (P)
23. Reparation/guilt (R/G)
24. Verbal Conflict (VC)
25. Sleep by self (SS)
26. Sleep by other (SO)
27. Sexualized activity (SEXA)
28. Thinking of reproduction (TREP)
29. Magical Thinking (MT)
30. Agent less Action (AA)
31. Personal Injured (PI)
32. Imagination of flight (IF)
33. Oral aggression (OA)
34. Poison (P)
35. Monster (M)
36. Atypical response (AR)
37. Repetition (REP)
 SOME EXAMPLES OF THE CODING SYSTEM FROM MACARTHUR STORY STEM BATTERY’S NARRATIVE CODING MANUAL - Tübingen-Basel Version (Günter et al., 2001)- Revision and Attachment Parental Representations (Franieck et al., 2003)

A) Content Themes:

Item 04 - Exclusion (EX)

1 = exclusion of others:
One character prevents another from joining in an activity or a character gets sent away. One child tells another that they can’t join (even if that is not enacted). Here it is important that the others, who remain, continue an activity without the excluded figure. Going to jail is not exclusion, sending the dog away is not exclusion.

Example: Parents sending a child to their bedroom (may be combined with punishment / reprimand (S.13), if appropriate).

2 = self-exclusion:
A character excludes her/himself from an activity or others. This includes isolation and withdrawal from a conflict. It becomes implicitly clear also that the joint activity of the others continue.

3 = both, 1 and 2:

Item 05 - Aggression (AG)

Interpersonal acts of aggression. (Pay attentions to facial expressions and vocalizations that may or may not co-occur with physical or verbal aggression). Aggression against a dog is not coded. Also the dog being aggressive to people is not coded under aggression.

1 = verbal aggression:
Name calling, including shaming, personal insults that are well-regulated vs. dysregulated. A single instance without exchange of words is coded here. Multiple exchanges are also scored as Verbal Conflict (VC) (S.14). This code includes also playful aggression between
peers and siblings with no intent to hurt – this should also coded under “Other” on back page as a comment that is a playful aggression.

2 = physical aggression:
Physical aggression between children and adults, or may be between children or between adults with the intention to hurt. It refers to aggression, which was provoked and which is still controlled.
Example: Parents fighting.
Children knocking each other over to cause pain or hurt.

3 = unprovoked or deregulated aggression:
Use this code when there is no clue why there is aggression as well as aggression that is deregulated. Usually one will have to code conflict escalation (KE) (S.10) too.
Example: The child knocks everyone down at end of story.

4 = the child assaults an adult.
This should also be coded under atypical answers

Item 10 - Empathy/Helping (E/H)
A character or the subject either identifies with or demonstrates an understanding of the thoughts or feelings of another through action. This may be demonstrated by an anxious, worried or concerned facial expression, or tone of voice, by a movement or a gesture towards the victim. Also the character seeking reassurance from the victim attempts to divert the victim’s attention, sharing something with the victim, or helping the victim by performing an act to relieve distress.

Helping behavior would include one doll helping another to perform a task or providing assistance so that a job gets done correctly or faster. This does not include one doll doing an act independently for another such as Mom cleaning up the juice or the subject cleans up the room.
Example: A figure offers a toy to the injured person.
Someone says: “I hurt my knee once too”
Mom doll assists child doll in whipping up the juice.
Mom assists child in looking for Barney. (However it must be clear that the child turned to her and that she helps).
Mom or Dad says that the child may come along on trip.

Do not include: If Mom (alone) is looking for Barney, independent of the request for assistance of the child: “Ok, so I look for him?”
Item 13 - **Compliance (CP)**

This refers to situations, in which a character yields to the rules or requests of an adult, and does what is asked. The child must have demonstrated some understanding of the stem to make the compliance meaningful. Children can also show compliance between each other.

*Example:* The child wipes up the juice upon request from parents.
The child cleans up the room upon request.
The child goes to room upon request but must say child is going to room now.
The friend says that the little sister can join their game, after big sister asks if she can.

Item 19 - **Affection (AFC)**

Any display of hugs, kisses, compliments, warm or caring touch or praise. **The direct verbal or physical interaction is important here.** Pay attention to the affect expressed in the voice: a parent’s gentle and soothing voice is an expression of affection. Do not include touch that is a normal part of the game such as everyone holding hand in “Ring around the Rosy”.

*Example:* Mom telling child they did a good job: “You have done very well!”
Affection towards an animal
“-You are wearing a beautiful dress today”

**B) Narrative Emotional Codes:**

Item 38 - **Danger Theme (DAN)**

This theme refers to the presence of a theme, which involves danger in the narrative. The danger theme may be either completely new or it may represent the continuation of a danger theme, which was already presented (e.g. the monster, lost dog) or a clear worsening of the danger.

Code the highest number present. Do not code threats, just code dangers, which are present in the story. (It is coded e.g., when a thunderstorm happens and for the family, which is on a trip in the park, that is meant as a danger. A threatening thunderstorm, which could break out, is not coded).

“Usual” aggression (e.g. characters hitting each other or fighting) and dying (without an explanation of what caused the death) are not considered dangers and are therefore not coded. If a character dies due to a defined danger (e.g. by murder or by being eaten by an animal), the event is coded here and under DAG (S.7) and/or OA (S.33) also.
Unusual or severe aggression (such as a character is getting a hammer to hit the other character; characters dropping off a cliff; or furniture or objects attacking people) are considered danger, and must therefore be coded.

Notice: The narrative must clearly show that the presented danger causes fear in a character.

0 = missing/no danger theme present
1 = continuation of the danger theme:
This code is to be used when the child keeps the danger theme, which was presented in the story stem, going or simply repeats it once. The child can develop a logical continuation of the theme with increasing expectation

Example:
Barney:  Child expresses sadness and/or fear. The search goes just beyond house and garden.
Lost Key:  Parents continue to argue

2 = new danger or clear worsening of the danger:
This code is to be used if a new danger is created (which was not present in the story stem) or if there is a clear worsening of the danger. Clear worsening can also occur if help is unobtainable and the child is bothered by this. Getting lost is a danger

Example:
Barney:  dog hurts itself, is driven over, animal is not found . Dog remains longer than one week away
Lost Key:  The child fears that the parents may get divorced. Alternatively, it escalates to a brawl or a divorce.

Item 39 - End of Danger (EDAN)

This variable can only be coded if 1 or 2 in DAN was coded before!
In any case of doubt, keep to the formal evaluation!
Note: do not confuse DAN2 with DAN, in particular!
This code concerns the degree danger resolution that was introduced into the play.

0 = no assessment possible.
1 = complete rescue from the danger = complete dissolution of danger.

Each history:  History ends with a good turn. e.g., the child is healthy again.
2 = rescue with restriction
This category is assigned altogether more rarely: usually rather 1 or 3 should be coded.

Lost Key: Parents get along with each other; however, they are still fed up with one another. The reconciliation was not played/mentioned explicitly.

Each history: The conclusion is apparently o.k., although an ambiguity still continues to exist.

3 = no rescue
This code is assigned, if irreparable changes are played/presented, when something bad remains also.

Lost Key: If parents will be divorced, separated, or one of the parents goes away.

Each history: Person dies, is eaten, remains lying on the floor and receives/gets no assistance; although the danger does not persist.

Item 41 - Child Power (POW)

1 = Inappropriate Parental role Child Power
This refers to when the child tries to resolve situations in a way, which seems to portray them as a parents or little adult. These actions are usually appropriate for an adult or parent to do, but not a child. The child in the story may tell the parents, what they must do, as if the parents were the children. This may also represent a pseudo-mature position. (The child may be trying to take care of the parents).

Examples:
Lost Key: The child separates parents, or scolds the father and punishes him, or says to parents: “You stop that!” or “Don’t fight!” if the child takes the blame, although she/he did not take the keys, use this code.

Any story: The children drive car

2 = Inappropriate Grandiose Child Power
This refers to when the child demonstrates a superhuman power. Examples include the child beating up and killing the monster, triumphing over their friend (in a big way, not just getting the ball but displaying great powers such as fancy karate moves), the child being able to fly or swim under the ocean, or the child scaring the monster away or the children using Grandma as soccer ball (demonstrating great power over people). Do not code simple fighting with adults, parents or dog; more clear power needs to be show such as triumphing over the dog in a big way or kicking the dog around as a soccer ball. Do not code turning the TV upside down or using TV as a soccer ball (which is power over objects, not power over people).
C) **Performance:**

**Item 50 - Narrative Coherence (NC)**

Addresses the degree to which the child responds to the stories stem with a logical sequence of events as well as the degree of elaboration, which is brought to response.

Conflict Not Handled

0 = No response or "I don’t know what happens." Child may repeat a portion or the entire story stem without any additions.

1 = not coherent: fragmented shifts in story line. Child does not return to original story stem.

2 = Child stays within story line but does not address the conflict or story. A portion of the story may be incoherent.

3 = Child exhibits an understanding of the conflict but does not offer any resolution when a resolution is expected or does not offer an ending to the story. A portion of the narrative may be incoherent.

Conflict Handled by Changing Constraints

4 = Child handles the conflict by changing constrains, that was presented in the original stem or prompt. Narrative may include incoherent shifts.

Example: “Mom says it’s OK to have cookies”

5 = Child demonstrates an understanding of the conflict or story and handles it indirectly by offering an easier solution.

Example: In Keys child says: “The fight between parents stop.”

In Crowd, the friend just walks away without his/her ball.

Understanding the Story, Embellished +, Incoherent

6 = Child demonstrates an understanding of the conflict or story and/or offers a resolution without any story embellishment. Typically, these stories are very short. Child offers the minimal amount necessary to tell the story. A segment of the story is incoherent.
8 = Child demonstrates an understanding of the conflict or story and offers a resolution with some story embellishment. A segment of the story is incoherent.
Understanding the story, Embellishment and Coherent

7 = The same as 6 without incoherence, but clear elaboration conflicts. And / or hesitating, repulsive telling (“removing as corkscrew”)

9 = The same as 8 without incoherence.

10 = A very coherent, logical, sequential series of events that are related to the story stem. Child may add to the story but does not change the original stem. An understanding of the conflict and a resolution to the conflict are presented, or an understanding of the story and an ending to the story are provided when there is no conflict. There are not incoherence shifts in the story and there is a lot of embellishment

D) Coding the parental and child representations in the Narratives

Positive Parent-child Interaction

Item 61. Nurturance/Protection: (coded to mother and father separately)
This code applies when a parental figure addresses the physical and emotional needs of a child, especially when the child has experienced vulnerability of some kind (e.g. is tired, worried, injured, or afraid). This code is used when a parent offers help, comfort, or protection to a child, either spontaneously or when asked. Nurturing/protection are not to be confused with situations when a parent grants the child a favour or privilege. In the latter case, the affection code is used.

Item 64 - Authoritative discipline/guidance: (coded to mother and father separately)
This code captures authoritative parental discipline themes. Authoritative discipline for misbehaviour is defined here as verbal reprimands and directions (sometimes accompanied by reasoning), assigning a time-out or deprivation of privileges. This code does not include yelling at a child or spanking a child.

Negative Parent-child Interaction

A negative representation will be characterized by inappropriate, insensitivity and harsh and rejecting interactions.
Item 65 - Verbal Aggression: (coded to mother and father separately)
Code if parent is verbally aggressive toward child; i.e., the parent insults, demeans, yells at, or otherwise expresses hostility verbally toward the child.

Item 67 - Punishment: (coded to mother and father separately)
Coded if punishment communicates primarily a sense of parental power and control over the child and not the provision of reasonable consequences for misbehaviour (e.g. being grounded forever; child is sent to room and told she will have no food).

Marital Interaction
These codes refer to how parent has interacted with one another: how the child interprets and describes his/her perception of his/her parents’ relationship (between them). The focus here is not concerning the relationship of the child with its parents or with one of them. It refers to the parent’s relationship with each other from the view of the child.

Item 71 – Neutral
The parents are not involved in the story, or their contribution is entirely negative. This rating captures parental actions through their relationship with each other that are neutral, neither positive or negative

Positive
Parents express affection, warmth, support, etc., toward each other, either verbally or physically.

ITEM 72 = HELPFUL / FRIENDLY / WARM RELATIONSHIP
The pair of parents helps each other.

Item 73 = Reparation
The parents can apologize after a controversy or a conflict.

ITEM 74 = SENSITIVELY, TENDERLY, CARING, SUPPORTING
Parents go around tenderly with one another, hug themselves, give themselves a kiss, and go hand in hand.

Item 75 = special relationship
Parents sleep in the parent’s bedroom, or sleep together on the same bed.
Negative
Parents express conflict, anger, tension, etc., toward each other, either verbally or physically.

Item 76 = *unfriendly / aggressively*
Parents insult themselves, strike themselves devaluations, and make themselves reproaches.

Item 77 = *Rivalry*
The parents see each other as an adversary, sometimes as an enemy.

Item 78 = *Exclusion*
One element of parents’ couple excludes itself from the other one, after a controversy or a conflict. Also if an element of parents’ couple shoots the other one out, in order to make one new couple with the child.

**E). Content codes specific to the parents’ conflict Story Stems** *(Lost Key)*

*Conflict Expression/Resolution*

**Item 88 - Conflict Resolution**

1: *Resolved* (conflict has been resolved through a mutually satisfying process; e.g. negotiation, compromise)
2: *Unresolved* (parents have stopped arguing but have not resolved the underlying issue, some ill feelings remain between them, or it is unclear whether the issue was resolved; e.g. simply stopped arguing, one parent gave in)
3: *Escalated* (conflict is left unresolved, and has resulted in serious escalation; e.g. physical aggression, one parent leaving)

**Item 90 - Child Involvement in the Conflict.**
Code if the child becomes involved in the conflict (e.g., parents yell at child, ask child for explanations, child interrupts conflict, asks parents not to fight).
Child behaviour in Response to conflict

Attributions

Attributions are statements that describe why the conflict occurred, or why it occurred as it did. They often are preceded by words like “because...” Code the identity of the person whom was seen as fault or blame for the conflict. More than one person can be coded.

Resolutions

Resolutions are statements that describe who resolved the conflict or who tried to resolve the conflict. Code the identity of the person was seen as to resolve the conflict. More than one person can be coded.

F) CONTENT CODES SPECIFIC TO THE SEPARATION/REUNION STORIES (Barney / Departure / Reunion)

Child Response to Separation

Item 111 - Acceptance/neutral or positive affect:

the child notes that the parents are leaving and says goodbye, then becomes engaged in another activity with sibling, grandparent.

Item 114. Indifference/disregard.

Child does not acknowledge parents’ leaving or dog’s absence, or expresses indifference uncaring about the separations.

Item 117 - Denial/Control:

In “Departure” the child attempts to avoid the separation and tell a story about the trip of the parents. She does not play with children and grandmother figures or play a little. The stem of story is focused on the parents’ trip.

Item 118. Aggressive/Sadism:

In “Departure”, the child plays with her siblings and the grandmother in aggressive and sadistic way. She kicks her siblings or the grandmother or throws some object on them.
**Child Response to Reunion**

**Item 122 - Indifference:**

Child does not seem to notice and/or care that parents/dog have returned; the child ignores parents/dog.

**Item 123 - Exclusion:**

In “Reunion”, the child focuses on the reunion between the parents and grandmother. Alternatively, the parents forget that they have children. On the other hand, the grandmother returns to her home immediately.

**Item 124 - Aggressive / Destructive:**

In “Reunion”, the child tells about an accident that happened with the whole family or with a member of it.
Dear Parents,

To broaden the scientific knowledge in the field of Child’s Psychological, taking into account the socio-cultural changes resulting from the actual globalization process, we are developing a scientific research project comparing Brazilian and German children regarding their development, identity, feelings, and family relationships. The aim of this research is to study and to better understand the psychological development of children as social members of our society. The questions are: How do children grow up in two different cultures during this time? What kind of developmental similarities and differences do the children exhibit? How is the family structure established in these two cultures? The research will consist of two groups of 6-8 year old children, one from Brazil and the other from Germany. Scientific confidentiality will be respected. In the results, codes will be
substituted for the participant’s names. It will not be done individual child’s diagnostic and any individual result that can be given either.

To gather research information, one appointment (approximately 45 min) will held with each child. At this appointment, the child will play with Playmobil figures. Stories will be introduced to the child (demonstrated by the Playmobil figures). The child will finish the story with their own ending. Additionally, two boards with ink blots will be introduced to the child, and the child will explain what she sees and what the ink blots look like. On the principle of no individual diagnostics, each appointment will be valued subsequently as an element of the children’s group. The aim is to study each group of children (Brazilian and German) and not to study each individual child. To aid the evaluation of each appointment, all appointments will be video-taped. Subsequently, the playing of all children from each group will be observed. Moreover, it is necessary to ask for the collaboration of the parents to fill-in two questionnaires concerning information about the children. The basic information is helpful and important to the research.

The results and conclusions of this research will be presented in the future, in the form of a lecture for the parents.

We would like to ask for the parents’ comprehension of this project and consent that their children take part in this research.

If you consent, we ask you to please fill-out and sign the authorization on the next page and send it to us as soon as possible. We will contact you by telephone to schedule an appointment with your child. All appointments will take place at the school. For more information, or to answer any questions, please make direct contact with us by telephone.

Cordially,

PD Dr. Med. Michael Günter                       M. Leticia C. F. Franieck
Psychologist
THE EXAMINER’S INTRODUCTION TO THE CHILD

**Researcher:** “Do you know why you are here with me and what we will do?”

**Child:** “No” or “Yes!! You are a researcher/you are doing a research.”

**Researcher:** “Do you know what it means?”

**Child:** “No!” or “Yes! My mother explained me, but I do not know how explain you now!!” or “You are comparing Brazilian and German children!”

**Researcher:** “Ok!! I will tell you exactly what we will do here. You know, I would like to know how the children play. I have forgotten how to play is. Look at me, I grew up, I become old and I can not play as a child. In spite of this you are here. Can you play with me? If we play together I will see how the children play. You know, some of your friends have played with me. It was great! Would you like to play with me?”

**Child:** “Of course!” / “Yes!”

Sometimes: “How old are you?”

The question was answered aiming to establish a good rapport with the child …

"You are really old!” or “My grand mother is also ...... years old!”

Sometimes: “Do you have kids?” …

The question was answered keeping the same aim above. Sometimes it could be observed, that the child felt more confident after the answers.

**Researcher:** “Well, do you know what it is?” (The camera is introduced)

**Child:** “It is a camera, isn’t it?”

**Researcher:** “Yes!! You know, I will video recorder our play-game. As I have just told you, I have played with a lot of children and really I can not remember all the play-games, that I’ve done with all the children Furthermore I’ve told you that I am old. So I need to recorder our play-game and afterwards I can see it again.

I will show you how you will be in the camera. Look at here… it is you!!”
Ok! Say goodbye to you now!!! Forget this camera and let’s start our play-game. I tell you the rules of our play-game.

I have some dolls with me. With these dolls I will tell you some stories. I will always begin the stories and suddenly I will stop to tell and then you will tell me and show me what happens next. You will always finish the story, and will tell me when is over, ok??. It will be funny.

Let’s start???