

9-2016

# Perceptions of Money: Relationships between Remembered Parental Rejection, Extrinsic Life Aspirations and Maladaptive Attitudes toward Money

Rebecca J. Smith

*The Graduate Center, City University of New York*

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

Follow this and additional works at: [https://academicworks.cuny.edu/gc\\_etds](https://academicworks.cuny.edu/gc_etds)

 Part of the [Clinical Psychology Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Smith, Rebecca J., "Perceptions of Money: Relationships between Remembered Parental Rejection, Extrinsic Life Aspirations and Maladaptive Attitudes toward Money" (2016). *CUNY Academic Works*.  
[https://academicworks.cuny.edu/gc\\_etds/1547](https://academicworks.cuny.edu/gc_etds/1547)

This Dissertation is brought to you by CUNY Academic Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Dissertations, Theses, and Capstone Projects by an authorized administrator of CUNY Academic Works. For more information, please contact [deposit@gc.cuny.edu](mailto:deposit@gc.cuny.edu).

PERCEPTIONS OF MONEY: RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN REMEMBERED PARENTAL  
REJECTION, EXTRINSIC LIFE ASPIRATIONS AND MALADAPTIVE ATTITUDES  
TOWARD MONEY

by

REBECCA JO SMITH

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Psychology in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City University of New York

2016

© 2016

REBECCA JO SMITH

All Rights Reserved

Perceptions of Money: Relationships between Remembered Parental Rejection, Extrinsic Life Aspirations and Maladaptive Attitudes toward Money

by

Rebecca Jo Smith

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Psychology in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

---

Date

---

Paul Wachtel, Ph.D.

Chair of Examining Committee

---

Date

---

Maureen O'Connor, Ph.D.

Executive Officer

Supervisory Committee:

Elliot Jurist, Ph.D., Ph.D.

Steve Tuber, Ph.D.

Diana Diamond, Ph.D.

Peter Fraenkel, Ph.D.

## ABSTRACT

Perceptions of Money: Relationships between Remembered Parental Rejection, Extrinsic Life Aspirations and Maladaptive Attitudes toward Money

by

Rebecca Jo Smith

Advisor: Paul Wachtel, Ph.D.

This study examined the extent to which maternal rejection, paternal rejection, maternal care, and maternal overprotection predict extrinsic life aspirations as well as maladaptive money attitudes in young adults. Additionally, this study sought to determine if the Adult Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire correlates with the Parental Bonding Instrument. The variable, extrinsic life aspirations, was examined to determine if it mediates between parental rejection and maladaptive money attitudes. Finally, the present study examined gender differences with regard to parental rejection, extrinsic life aspirations, and maladaptive money attitudes. A multiple regression analysis was conducted in a college sample of 366 participants using self-report measures.

Results: Maternal rejection and paternal rejection were not found to be significant when predicting to extrinsic life aspirations, but greater maternal care and greater maternal overprotection were both found to be significantly associated with extrinsic life aspirations. Maternal rejection was found to predict higher endorsement of maladaptive money attitudes in respondents, but paternal rejection was not significant. Maternal care was not significantly associated with maladaptive money attitudes, but maternal overprotection was significantly and positively associated with the maladaptive money attitude composite score. There was a strong and significant negative correlation between the Parental Acceptance-Rejection total score for

the mother and the Parental Bonding Instrument maternal care score. A moderately strong positive correlation was found between the Parental Acceptance-Rejection total score for the mother and the Parental Bonding Instrument maternal overprotection score. When examining gender differences in the prediction of greater endorsement of maladaptive money attitudes, a significant effect was found for maternal rejection, but not paternal rejection for both males and females. The significant effect size was slightly stronger for males than it was for females. There were no significant effects for gender of subjects when maternal and paternal rejection were analyzed in relation to extrinsic life aspirations. In a broad sense, this study supports Gellerman's (1963) hypothesis that money attitudes vary from person to person as a function of their life history. Clinical implications are also reviewed.

## Acknowledgements

Paul Wachtel has been my mentor, advisor, professor, and dissertation chair. He deeply cares about all of his students and I am thankful to have had the chance to work with him. He has helped me continue to move forward with this process, even when I felt stuck and unsure of how to proceed, and he has helped me hone my research skills. I have an enormous amount of respect for him and am grateful for his guidance.

I would also like to thank Elliot Jurist and Diana Diamond. They have given me helpful and thought provoking feedback that has made this project more interesting and informative. I have learned a lot from both of them and am especially thankful for their encouragement. I also want to thank Steve Tuber and Peter Fraenkel for being on my committee and for all that you have taught me over the years.

My husband has supported me throughout graduate school and I am thankful for his love, friendship, and partnership. We have been together for many years and I cherish the life and family we have created. He is an incredible father to our son and I trust him with my heart.

My son, who is on the verge of taking his first steps, has grounded me. He has taught me what is really important in life. I cherish playing together, watching him develop, and especially reading to him; some of my own favorite childhood memories are when both of my parents read to me.

I want to thank my mother for believing in me and my father for instilling in me a love of books and knowledge. My in-laws have also been a tremendous source of support. Lastly, I want to thank my colleague and dear friend, Adrienne Lange, for her friendship. She has been a source of strength and has helped me persevere.

**Table of Contents**

Abstract	v
Acknowledgments	vii
List of Tables and Appendices	x
Introduction	1
Literature Review	1
Psychological Perspectives and Attitudes toward Money	1
Parental Acceptance-Rejection Theory (PARTheory)	11
Self-Determination Theory (SDT): Intrinsic and Extrinsic Life Aspirations	29
Brief Overview of the Current Study	36
Methods	43
Participants	43
Procedure	44
Measures	45
Results	51
A Priori Hypothesis on Maternal/Paternal Rejection and Extrinsic Life Aspirations	52
A Priori Hypothesis on Maternal Care, Maternal Overprotection, and Extrinsic Life Aspirations	52
A Priori Hypothesis on Maternal/Paternal Rejection and Maladaptive Money Attitudes	53



A Priori Hypothesis on Maternal Care, Maternal Overprotection, and Maladaptive Money Attitudes	54
A Priori Hypothesis on Correlations between the Parental Acceptance- Rejection Questionnaire and the Parental Bonding Instrument	55
A Priori Hypothesis on Mediation between Maternal/Paternal Rejection and Maladaptive Money Attitudes	57
A Priori Hypothesis on Gender Differences in Relation to Maternal/ Paternal Rejection, Extrinsic Life Aspirations, and Maladaptive Money Attitudes	57
Discussion	62
Differentiating between Maternal Rejection and Maternal Care	63
Relationships between the Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire and the Parental Bonding Instrument	64
Maternal Rejection, Paternal Rejection and Extrinsic Life Aspirations	65
Maternal Care, Maternal Overprotection and Extrinsic Life Aspirations	66
Maternal Rejection, Paternal Rejection and Maladaptive Money Attitudes	68
Maternal Care, Maternal Overprotection and Maladaptive Money Attitudes	70
Parental Rejection, Extrinsic Life Aspirations, Maladaptive Money Attitudes, and Gender Differences	72
Cross-Cultural Issues and Attitudes toward Money	72
Clinical Implications	76
Limitations of the Study	79
Conclusion and Future Directions	81
References	92

## List of Tables and Appendices

Table 1: Means and Standard Deviations of the Independent and Dependent Variables	52
Table 2: Simultaneous Regression Analysis for PARQ Mother and PARQ Father Predicting Extrinsic Life Aspirations	52
Table 3: Simultaneous Regression Analysis for PBI Care Mother and PBI Overprotection Mother Predicting Extrinsic Life Aspirations	53
Table 4: Simultaneous Regression Analysis for PARQ Mother and PARQ Father Predicting Maladaptive Money Attitudes	54
Table 5: Simultaneous Regression Analysis for PBI Care Mother and PBI Overprotection Mother Predicting Maladaptive Money Attitudes	55
Table 6: Correlations of PARQ Mother, PBI Care Mother, and PBI Overprotection Mother	56
Table 7: Simultaneous Regression Analysis for PARQ Mother and PARQ Father Predicting Extrinsic Life Aspirations for Males	58
Table 8: Simultaneous Regression Analysis for PARQ Mother and PARQ Father Predicting Extrinsic Life Aspirations for Females	59
Table 9: Simultaneous Regression Analysis for PARQ Mother and PARQ Father Predicting Maladaptive Money Attitudes for Males	60
Table 10: Simultaneous Regression Analysis for PARQ Mother and PARQ Father Predicting Maladaptive Money Attitudes for Females	60
Appendices	83
Appendix 1: Survey Items	83
Appendix 2: Consent Form	89

## **Introduction**

In a very important and perceptive comment, Gellerman (1963) asserted that “the money motive varies from person to person as a function of his life history. In a sense a man’s reaction to money summarizes his biography to date” (p. 166). This study represents an attempt to further explore and extend this significant point. I begin with a review of the literature on psychological perspectives and attitudes toward money, followed by an overview of Parental Acceptance-Rejection Theory (PARTheory). Next, Self-Determination Theory (SDT), with a particular focus on intrinsic and extrinsic life aspirations, is reviewed. Literature supporting the focus of the current study which involves exploring the relationships between remembered parental acceptance-rejection, life aspirations, and attitudes toward money will be discussed throughout the literature review. The purpose of the present study is to determine if perceived parental acceptance-rejection as remembered from childhood correlates with and contributes significantly to intrinsic-extrinsic life aspirations as well as to specific attitudes toward money in adults. The present study is rooted in the literature, but is also distinctive in that it extends what has been studied previously by looking at it from a different perspective and utilizing measures that have not been brought to bear in relation to each other before.

## **Literature Review**

### **Psychological Perspectives and Attitudes toward Money**

Financial concerns are the leading cause of stress in America today. The most frequently cited causes of stress for Americans continue to be money, work, and the economy: 69% of Americans report money as the primary cause of stress followed by work (65%), and the economy (61%) (APA, 2014). In *Paper Promises: Debt, Money, and The New World Order*, Coggan (2012) wrote that early man made and settled deals by barter involving the exchange of

goods and services for other goods and services. Money is simultaneously a medium of exchange, unit of account, and a store of value. Over time, money has spanned the gamut from precious metals through paper to entries on a computer screen. In taking a long-term perspective, it is important to remember that when compared to an agricultural economy, “the shift to a more monetary economy, with all its faults, has been accompanied by a vast improvement in longevity, a drive towards democracy, greater equality of opportunity and so on. Money has helped this happen” (p. 24).

But the monetization of modern life has had a large downside as well. Based on average after-tax income data from 2007, the top 1% attained \$1,319,700 while the bottom 20% amounted to \$17,700 (Congressional Budget Office, 2010). Stiglitz (2012) the Nobel prize-winning economist remarked that the 2007-2008 financial crisis, and recession that followed, has made these inequalities worse for working and middle class Americans beyond stagnating wages, unemployment, and lost homes. The high price of inequality includes slower economic growth, a decreased sense of justice, a weakened democracy, and the erosion of confidence in America’s market economy and democracy. According to Richard Sennett (1998, 2006), the modern workplace, particularly in the sectors of global finance, technology, legal and insurance services, presently emphasizes short-term labor in which workers at all levels are viewed as disposable and replaceable. Job security and long-term relationships with organizations have declined highlighting some of the negative consequences of global capitalism, including the changing of jobs numerous times over the course of one’s working lifetime, the increase of unemployment due to downsizing, and the inability of the market to generate jobs for everyone, which all have negative consequences on workers’ psychological well-being. The development and maintenance of character depends on commitment, trust, and loyalty but the principle of

short-term task labor corrodes these very values (Sennett, 1998). Financial concerns, income inequality, socioeconomic status, the nations mushrooming deficit, the state of the economy, job insecurity, unemployment, underemployment, and the consequences of global capitalism are all multifaceted, interrelated, and acknowledge the impact of broader social and political landscapes that shape perceptions of money.

Mankind has been using money for thousands of years, yet most people spend very little time pondering the nature of money. The word itself originates from a title of the Roman deity Juno Moneta, the goddess of advice and warning (Coggan, 2012). In the social sciences, money has not been a major research topic (Zelizer, 1989). Aside from pathological gambling, clinical psychology “has done little to identify problematic money behaviors as an area of concern or offer interventions for disordered money behaviors” (Klontz, Bivens, Klontz, Wada, & Kahler, 2008, p. 295). Money has the ability to symbolize that is not limited to market value (Fenichel, 1938; Ferenczi, 1914/1976; Freud, 1908/1976; Furnam, 1984; Gellerman, 1963; Krueger, 1986; Tang, 1992; Wachtel, 2003, Wernimont & Fitzpatrick, 1972). The first empirical study of the psychological meaning of money was conducted by Wernimont & Fitzpatrick (1972) only 42 years ago. It was an exploratory study in which money values were measured using a modified semantic differential format involving 40 adjective pairs. The sample consisted of 533 subjects from a large Midwestern city and they were separated into 11 groups including nuns, scientists, managers, salesmen, engineers, secretaries, and college students. Work experience, gender, and socio-economic level were the factors that were found to influence money attitudes.

Before that time, Freud (1908/1976) in “Character and anal erotism” conceptualized an “anal” theory of money in which money and defecation were hypothesized to be unconsciously linked. Freud referred to money as the “Devil’s gold” and wrote that “we know that the gold

which the devil gives his paramours turns into excrement after his departure, and the devil is certainly nothing else than the personification of the repressed unconscious instinctual life” (p. 76). Dimen (2012) understood this metaphor to indicate the “capacity to make everything less than it is and so to make us doubt what it was we had in mind when we worked so hard to get it – that capacity, says Freud, is what money has” (p. 114). She expanded on Freud’s metaphor by alluding to the contradiction between money and love and asserts that not only do they not go together, they also undo and negate one another leading to alienation. In the paper “On Beginning the Treatment”, Freud (1913) wrote about the practical matters of money in relation to setting the treatment fee. He equated sex with money and stated that: “Money matters are treated by civilized people in the same way as sexual matters – with the same inconsistency, prudishness and hypocrisy” (p. 131). He recommended that the analyst be aware of this, to remove the shame that surrounds these topics, and to treat money matters with candor.

In theorizing about money’s relation to psychopathology, development, and character, psychoanalysts expanded on Freud’s (1908/1976) “anal” theory of money. Jones (1918) elaborated on the anal erotic character and concurred that money is a symbol of feces in the unconscious. Ferenczi (1914/1976) added to the literature by designating money a specific role in the developmental process with regard to the acquired ability to conceptualize money as a symbol. He went on to assert that the original anal pleasures progress into a fascination with mud and dirt eventually developing into a love of money; the adult enjoyment and possession of money represents a constructive reaction formation to repressed anal eroticism. Abraham (1917/1976) speculated that the anxious retention of money is only one unconscious motive and that the excessive spending of money could be characterized clinically in terms of adults who struggle with emotionally separating from their parents and becoming independent. He observed

that this group of compulsive spenders reported that the act of spending money appeared on the surface to relieve their anxiety or depression, and that the buying of material objects which did not appear to have any lasting value symbolized “gratifications of a repressed desire” (p. 101). In “The Drive to Amass Wealth”, Fenichel (1938) added that it is not only the unconscious attitude toward feces that can be projected on to money, but that “the attitude toward introjections of every kind can be projected on to money” (p. 83). The meaning of money was elaborated on, by Fenichel, to have nearly any meaning in the unconscious; he discussed both rational and irrational sources of interest in money as well as introducing the concept of “reciprocal action” between the individual’s instinctual internal structure and the social context that influences and modifies that structure thereby continually influencing, shaping, and creating each other.

In “Full Pockets, Empty Lives: A Psychoanalytic Exploration of the Contemporary Culture of Greed” (2003), Wachtel reflected on the ways in which individual dynamics of greed both influence and mirror the broader consumer American culture. Money appears straightforward and yet nearly “nothing is more symbolic in its very nature. Money only has meaning as something that stands for something else, as a social phenomenon, as part of a web of interpersonal obligations, and as a symbol of individual aspirations, fantasies, desires” (p. 107). He proceeded to assert that contemporary American society advertises shopping as a solution to feelings of depression, anxiety, and emptiness and that compulsive shopping can be viewed as a form of self-medication accompanied by merely temporary improvement in mood. He defined greed as “a form of self-deception, a kind of false consciousness in which what really matters is obscured by a pressing and singleminded focus on material wealth” (p. 105); greed can be understood psychologically as a defense against low self-esteem. More broadly, status and money can be used as extrinsic substitutes for genuine self-esteem, intimacy, and interpersonal

connection. Wachtel went on to assert that success is defined materialistically for many Americans and that contemporary American culture can be described as a culture of greed: “The quest for more and more money and material goods fills a hunger that comes from elsewhere” (p. 120).

And yet, to not have money is not necessarily the same thing as being hungry for it. Gellerman (1963) postulated in his book *Motivation and Productivity* that the concept of money can be thought of as a projective device in which to measure a person’s underlying attitudes toward life as well as their previous life experiences. His theory of money motivation took into account the conundrum of individual differences in terms of the fact that “for some people money is everything all of the time, that for others money is everything some of the time but not all of the time, and that for still others money means very little at any time” (p. 160). The theory proceeded that “*the money motive varies from person to person as a function of his life history.* In a sense a man’s reaction to money summarizes his biography to date” (p. 166, italics in original). According to Gellerman, money is imbued with a dual representation of emotional and material values therefore it can be conceptualized as a reflection of both the irrational and logical nature of humans. He asserted that it is one’s fundamental outlook on life that ultimately determines how the person will respond to the prospect of earning money.

Gellerman’s (1963) theory of money motivation proceeded to focus on a specific group of men who have “often grown up in a *rejecting* atmosphere in which the fact that they were unwelcome and unloved was all too apparent...they learn from bitter experience to trust hardly anyone” (p. 167, italics added). Gellerman went on to state that early in life these children adapt to their rejecting home environment and become well equipped for survival in what is perceived as an untrustworthy and fiercely competitive world. As these children turn into adults they



become savers, not spenders, and their preoccupation with money is connected to their extreme independence. This group has been conditioned to “think of life itself, and business too, as a dog-eat-dog affair” (p. 168). For this rejected group of men, money comes to symbolize love and security, but not power:

It would seem that in the case of the pure money motive, money has come to symbolize love and security: the deprived experiences of childhood for which the individual still hungers even though he has no hope of receiving them from other people...The symbolic meaning of money for the hard-bitten, purely money-driven person is an idealized mother who loves, shelters, and above all is constant. (Gellerman, 1963, p. 168)

The fact that money “also has a rational economic function helps to obscure the deeper source of its strength as a motivator” (p. 168). Gellerman concluded his chapter on “The Money Motive” by asserting that the money motive associated with the desire for power, as well as the wish to be of service to other people, remained a mystery to him. In connection to the hypothetical ways in which growing up in a rejecting atmosphere may shape perceptions of money as put forth by Gellerman (1968), Wachtel & Blatt (1990) found support for the idea that feelings of low self-worth, emotional deprivation, and dependency are correlated with extrinsic materialistic strivings which appear to serve a compensatory function.

In *The Last Taboo: Money as Symbol and Reality in Psychotherapy and Psychoanalysis*, Krueger (1986) wrote that “most of us have learned to talk more easily about sex, yet remain seclusive, embarrassed, or conflicted about discussing money. Money may be the last emotional taboo in our society” (p. vii). According to Krueger, money has “metaphoric emotional value” that can be resolved or neglected in therapy and the practice of exchanging money for

therapeutic services are curiously among the least written about and openly discussed interactions that take place in psychotherapy. Krueger wrote that: “Money is probably the most emotionally meaningful object in contemporary life; only food and sex are its close competitors as common carriers of such strong and diverse feelings, significances, and strivings” (p. 3).

Money can consciously and unconsciously represent the ability to satisfy physiological as well as safety and security needs (Oleson, 2004). It can also symbolize enjoyment, achievement, power, prestige, success, ability, adequacy, goodness, and evilness (Furnham, 1984; Lau, 1998; Tang, 1992, 1995; Wernimont & Fitzpatrick, 1972; Yamauchi & Templer, 1982), self-esteem, acceptance, rejection, affection, and disdain (Krueger, 1986). It can denote a buffer, support (Engelberg & Sjoberg, 2006; Gellerman, 1963), love, reliability (Gellerman, 1963), status, respect from others, luxury of time, freedom of choice (Goldberg & Lewis, 1978), autonomy, control, and lack of control (Tang, 1993), or any other imaginable individual and culturally determined meaning (Fenichel, 1938; Krueger, 1986). The representations of money are influenced by society at large (Fenichel, 1938; Wachtel, 2003) as well as “cultural background, family values, developmental experiences, and emotional needs” (Krueger, 1986, p. 4). People come to understand money differently because of different socialization experiences (Lau, 1998).

Previous empirical research has shown that factors known to influence money attitudes include: extrinsic and intrinsic value orientations (Lau, 1998), education level (Furnham, 1998), socioeconomic level (Wernimont & Fitzpatrick, 1972), age (Bailey & Lown, 1993; Furnham, 1998; Tang, 1992), gender (Bailey & Gustafson, 1986; Furnham, 1984, 1998, Gresham & Fontenot, 1989; Jindal, 1990; Wernimont & Fitzpatrick, 1972), work experience (Wernimont & Fitzpatrick, 1972), income (Furnham, 1984; Jindal, 1990; Tang, 1992); academic achievement (Jindal, 1990); geographical location (Bailey et al., 1994), work ethic (Tang, 1992), social,

political, and religious values (Tang, 1992), emotional stability and sensitivity (Bailey & Gustafson, 1991), emotional intelligence (Engelberg & Sjoberg, 2006); level of need satisfaction (Oleson, 2004); and compulsive behavior (Hanley & Wihelm, 1992).

Oleson (2004) looked at correlations between money attitudes and Maslow's hierarchy of needs and found that "as individuals progress through the theoretical stages of Maslow's hierarchy of needs, it appears that money becomes less and less important to individuals" (p. 91). Engelberg & Sjoberg (2006) studied money attitudes in relation to emotional intelligence and discovered a similar finding in which individuals who scored high on emotional intelligence were found to value money less as a sign of status, prestige, and power when compared to individuals who scored low on emotional intelligence.

In the article, "Money: What it means to Children and Adults", Lau (1998) used a sample of 1,463 Chinese university students and examined the relationship between intrinsic and extrinsic values using the Rokeach Value Survey and compared them to money attitudes using an unknown money scale. Lau found that perceptions of money were correlated with value preference. Money was seen as lower in importance for those who placed a higher value on the intrinsic aspects of life and therefore money could not be used as an indicator of success for those individuals. Likewise, those who placed a higher value on the achievement, security, and enjoyment domains tended to view money as more important when compared to those low on those values. These findings indicate that money is more important to those who place greater importance on the extrinsic aspects of life. Although money may arouse moralistic and emotional reactions in grown-ups, Lau also showed that children ages five and six perceived money to be primarily functional in nature and did not have similar emotional reactions. Value systems are developed over time and knowing people's value system can shed light on their attitudes toward

money. It was recommended that “The combination of value orientation and socialization experience is a more specific path in generating meaningful results in the future” (p. 305).

Mechanisms of money attitude development, particularly materialistic life aspirations, appear to originate from the family environment, but this has only been studied in terms of intrinsic and extrinsic aspirations in adolescents and young adults (Cohen & Cohen, 1996; Kasser, Ryan, Zax, & Sameroff, 1995; Rindfleisch, Burroughs, & Denton, 1997; Williams, Cox, Hedberg, & Deci, 2000). In adults, money can represent a sense of security and support that can take the place of a social network for money-oriented people (Engelberg & Sjoberg, 2006). Tang (1992) found that people who value money as a sign of achievement experience a low level of satisfaction with work and overall life satisfaction. On the other hand, budget-conscious individuals did not tend to perceive money as an extrinsic symbol of power and prestige (Furnham, 1984), and did not tend to associate money with stress and anxiety (Tang, 1993, 1995). From the book, *The Money Trap*, Gallen (2002) explored the conceptualization of a “money disorder” which he proposed has underlying emotional causes and functions as a way to avoid feeling a range of unresolved and intense feelings. He defined money disorders as “the emotional and spiritual imbalances that express themselves as continuing problems with money and work” (p. 2). The conceptualization of disordered money behaviors was expanded on and defined by Klontz et al. (2008) as “maladaptive patterns of financial beliefs and behaviors that lead to clinically significant distress, impairment in social or occupational functioning, undue financial strain or an inability to appropriately enjoy one’s financial resources” (p. 295-296). Disordered money behaviors are not caused by a lack of money (Gallen, 2002; Klontz et al., 2008). Klontz, Kahler, and Klontz (2008) propose that the most chronically destructive financial behaviors and beliefs are related to money scripts, which are internalized in childhood, and are

often unconscious. Destructive money scripts don't necessarily reflect reality and are rooted in painful emotions associated with past events and relationships that are frequently passed down through generations and therefore may require financial therapy or psychotherapy to help achieve insight and resolution.

It is important to study the psychological aspects of economic perception and behavior because as we live "in an era in which the greenhouse effect, the destruction of the ozone layer, acid rain, and other such environmental threats are becoming increasingly imminent, it is essential to be clearer about the relation between economic growth and human welfare" (Wachtel & Blatt, 1990) in order to raise our awareness with regard to the consequences of our actions as we make everyday decisions and go about our lives. Likewise, mechanisms of money attitude development need to be better understood specifically by combining socialization experience and value orientation. In particular, remembered parental acceptance-rejection and parental bonding have not been examined with regard to money attitudes in the adult population in general, or in the young adult college population to date.

### **Parental Acceptance-Rejection Theory (PARTheory)**

Ronald Rohner's parental acceptance-rejection theory (PARTheory) is an evidence-based theory of lifespan and socialization development that proposes a universal relation between perceived parental acceptance-rejection in childhood and the psychological adjustment of individuals in both childhood and adulthood (Rohner, 1975/2000b, 1980, 1986/2000a, 1999, 2004, 2005). Parental acceptance refers to parental feelings and behaviors such as love, warmth, comfort, affection, support, and nurturance. On the other side of the continuum, parental rejection is defined as a significant withdrawal or absence of parental love, affection and warmth and by the presence of a range of psychologically and physically hurtful affects and behaviors

toward children (Rohner, 1975/2000b). In Rohner's (1975/2000b, 2005) PARTheory, four distinct classes of parental behavior include: warmth-affection, hostility-aggression, indifference-neglect, and undifferentiated rejection. Parental warmth and affection include verbal praise and compliments, as well as physical behaviors that involve kisses, hugs, etc. Parental hostility and aggression involve verbal manifestations including cursing, sarcasm, belittling, nagging, scolding, humiliation, and saying cruel and thoughtless things to or about the child; it also includes physical behaviors such as pinching, shoving, hitting, kicking, throwing things, and scratching. Parental indifference and neglect include physical and psychological unavailability of the parent in which the parent does not pay attention to the needs of the child. Undifferentiated rejection refers to a lack of clear behavioral indicators in which parents are not aggressive, neglecting, or unaffectionate, but the individual believes that his parents do not love or care about him (Rohner, 1975/2000b, 1986/2000a, 2004; Rohner & Cournoyer, 1994; Khaleque & Rohner, 2002a; Rohner & Khaleque, 2005).

Parental acceptance is essential to the healthy emotional and social development of children and adults (Rohner, 1975/2000b) and is associated with feelings of connectedness to one's family (Dwairy, 2010). In general, children tend to experience more parental acceptance than rejection (Khaleque, Rohner, Riaz, Laukkala, & Sadeque, 2007). On the other side of the spectrum, parental rejection has consistent negative effects on personality characteristics and the psychological adjustment of both children and adults worldwide: "In particular – according to the theory – rejected children and adults are likely to feel anxious and insecure" (Khaleque & Rohner, 2002, p. 55). PARTheory's personality subtheory attempts to explain and predict major psychological or personality consequences of perceived parental acceptance and rejection that tend to be related to mental health. PARTheory's coping subtheory deals with the question of

how some rejected individuals appear to be able to withstand parental rejection without suffering the negative mental health consequences that the majority of rejected individuals do; one of the social cognitive factors that seems to help rejected children cope with perceived rejection is a differentiated sense of self. Parental acceptance and rejection occur in complex ecological contexts, therefore PARTheory's sociocultural systems model and third subtheory provides a way of thinking about parental acceptance-rejection within the context of broader societies (Rohner, 1986/2000a; Rohner, Khaleque & Cournoyer, 2005). The experience of rejection involves a symbolic process that requires the development of a sense of "self" and "other" which does not fully occur until after the first year of life; before the rejection process has its full symbolic impact the capacity for language is most likely required (Rohner, 1986/2000a).

The negative effects of parental rejection include seven measurable characteristics that are expected to vary depending on the form, intensity, and duration of parental rejection experienced as postulated by the personality subtheory of PARTheory: 1) immature dependence or defensive independence 2) hostility, aggression, and passive aggression 3) emotional instability 4) emotional unresponsiveness 5) impaired self-esteem 6) impaired self-adequacy and 7) negative world view (Khaleque & Rohner, 2002a; Rohner, 2000b, 2004; Rohner, Khaleque, & Cournoyer, 2005). PARTheory is a theory of socialization that attempts to explain and predict significant correlates, antecedents, and consequences of worldwide parental acceptance-rejection. PARTheory postulates that all children will respond in the same predictable ways when they experience themselves to be unloved (rejected) or loved (accepted) by their primary caregivers regardless of variations in culture, race, ethnicity, age, and gender. Intracultural and cross-cultural evidence converge in support of potential universal correlates of parental acceptance-rejection, which has been empirically supported by research in dozens of nations

internationally studying both children and adults (Khaleque & Rohner, 2002a; Khaleque & Rohner, 2012; Rohner, 1975/2000b; Rohner, 1980; Rohner, 1986/2000a ; Rohner & Britner, 2002; Rohner & Cournoyer, 1994).

The study by Rohner & Cournoyer (1994) compared eight sociocultural groups: Egypt, India (Bengali), India (Telugu), Korea, Puerto Rico, St. Kitts, United States (Blacks) and United States (Whites) in which the same two robust factors, the Acceptance factor and the Rejection factor, emerged in all eight groups. A meta-analysis based on 43 studies involving 10,050 subjects was conducted by Khaleque & Rohner (2002a) involving most of the major ethnic groups in the United States as well as respondents from Africa, Asia, South America, Europe, and the Caribbean, found that perceived parental rejection is universally associated with negative effects on the psychological adjustment and behavioral functioning of both children and adults. It was also found that the magnitude of the association between perceived rejection and psychological maladjustment tends to be stronger in childhood as compared to adulthood, which is to be expected given that the direct impact of the family-of-origin is diluted by extrafamilial people including peers and significant others (Rohner, 1986/2000a). These findings were expanded on in Khaleque & Rohner's (2012) meta-analysis based on 66 studies involving 22 countries on five continents and including 19,511 subjects in which the mean unweighted and weighted effect sizes for correlations between paternal and maternal acceptance-rejection with offspring's psychological adjustment were found to be significant across all cultures studied for children and adults. In a recent study involving 2,884 Arab, Indian, French, Polish, and Argentinean adolescents, Dwairy (2010) found that parental rejection was cross-culturally associated with adolescent psychological disorders and to a lesser extent, parental acceptance was associated with better psychological adjustment. Interestingly, parental rejection was



discovered to be more common among families from a low socio-economic level and with little education. Fathers were also found to be less accepting and more rejecting when compared to mothers; likewise, male adolescents were less accepted and more rejected than female adolescents, but significant interactions between parents' sex and adolescents' sex were not found (Dwairy, 2010).

Rejected children are likely to develop distorted mental representations of the world around them, of significant others, and of the self (Rohner, 2004). Perceived rejection seems to be “universally associated with a cluster of negative beliefs about one’s own personal worth, about one’s competence, and about the very nature of life and the universe itself” (Rohner & Britner, 2002, p. 26). Children, adolescents, and adults who feel they have been rejected by their parents have distinct personality traits and characteristics that can be explained as follows:

We as human beings – all human beings – have a profound, generalized need for positive response (love, approval, warmth, affection) from the people who are important to us. The bare minimal care that we must have for physical survival is not enough for normal psychosocial development. The need for positive response is probably rooted in man’s biological and evolutionary development, and it is reinforced in the experience of infantile instrumental dependency. The absence or significant withdrawal of warmth and affection is sufficient to produce massive and predictable consequences for personality functioning. For example, rejection inhibits or distorts aspects of normal personality functioning, such as feelings of positive self-esteem and self-adequacy (i.e. positive self-evaluation). All of us tend to view ourselves as we imagine significant others view us and if our parents rejected us as children, we are likely to define ourselves as *unworthy* of

love, and therefore as unworthy and inadequate human beings. In this way, we develop a sense of overall negative self-evaluation. (Rohner, 1975/2000b, p. 53, italics in original)

Parental rejection and acceptance can be thought of as a continuum on which all humans can be placed in which warmth and affection are at one end of the continuum and the absence of warmth and affection are at the other end; this continuum more broadly forms the warmth dimension of parenting (Rohner, 1975/2000b, 1986/2000a). It is important to realize that parents may be rejecting toward their infants and later accept them, or vice versa, they may be warm toward their infants and later reject them. However, most parents give their infants a reasonable amount of affection and warmth. Parental rejection has negative consequences on children and adults, but “the negative effects of parental rejection can be muted, for example, if the child is able to establish warm, responsive relations with his siblings, peers, or other adults. Effective psychotherapy can also render startling transformations in an individual” (Rohner, 1975/2000b, p. 50). Adults are not only affected by past experiences, but are also impacted by current experiences including the economic and political climate, the stress of economic depression and recession, war, relational discord including the threat of losing a loved one, and by ordinary daily experiences (Rohner, 1975/2000b).

Adults who were rejected as children tend to struggle with intimacy and have trouble becoming deeply involved in affectionate relationships. They are often less emotionally stable and tend to experience unpredictable shifts in mood, lose their composure under minor emotional stress, have low self-evaluation, and can be aggressive, passive aggressive and hostile: “Such adults are inclined to view the world, life, the very universe itself, as being an unfriendly, uncertain, insecure, and often hostile place in which to live” (Rohner, 1975/2000b, p. 103). The intensity of the relationship between specific personality characteristics and parental acceptance-

rejection tends to decrease over time and it is not always clear why some personality traits remain unchanged, or even intensify, while others become muted and less intense (Rohner, 1975/2000b). Parental rejection has been associated in children and adults with attachment disorders, substance abuse, various forms of psychopathology, psychological adjustment problems, academic problems, behavior problems, and troubled interpersonal relationships. On the other hand, parental acceptance has been correlated with a range of positive outcomes including the development of prosocial behavior, positive peer relations, and psychological well-being (Rohner & Britner, 2002).

It is important to keep in mind that *more* of a good thing is not always *better*. For example, extremely high levels of parental affection in conjunction with overprotective and highly controlling parental behaviors can be experienced as intrusive and invasive by the child. Intrusive parental control involves the manipulation of a child's behavior and can occur in the context of very high levels of parental affection; it is considered to be a form of parental insensitivity that is based on the parents' own motivations and needs rather than the needs of the child (Hughes, Blom, Rohner, & Britner, 2005). Parental psychological control refers to parenting behaviors that intrude upon children's feelings and thoughts and is used by parents who implement excessive manipulative parenting techniques (Barber, 1996). The construct was originally identified by Schaefer (1965) who found that psychologically controlling parents were experienced by their children as being overprotective, directive, possessive, intrusive, and controlling through guilt. Parental behavioral control is considered to be distinct from psychological control in that it focuses on the child's behaviors (Barber & Harmon, 2002) though this distinction may not be so clear-cut (Wang, Pomerantz, & Chen, 2007).

Parental care and parental overprotection have also been studied in direct relation to each. The Parental Bonding Instrument (PBI; Parker, Tupling, & Brown, 1979) is a self-report questionnaire that assesses adults' conscious perceptions of how well their parents mastered basic nurturing and caretaking tasks. The "care" subscale measures the level of perceived parental nurturance, warmth, and empathy while the "overprotection" subscale measures the level of perceived parental psychological and behavioral control and intrusion. Low scores on overprotection indicate the perception of the parent as encouraging of autonomy, independence, and individuation. The two subscales can be analyzed as continuous variables or intersected to yield four possible categories of parenting: neglectful (low care, low protection), affectionless control (low care, high protection), affectionate constraint (high care, high protection), and optimal (high care, low protection).

Mothers who scored higher on the overprotection subscale of the PBI, as determined by self-report from a sample of 75 mothers of postgraduate students, also scored themselves higher on trait anxiety, Type A characteristics, obsessionality, and reported having a need to control as well as a more external locus of control. Likewise, they scored their own mothers as being more overprotective and as less caring (Parker & Lipscombe, 1981). A study involving 80 clinically anxious subjects was carried out by Silove, Parker, Hadzi-Pavlovic, Manicavasagar, & Blaszczynski (1991) in order to determine parental representations of patients with anxiety disorders. For the entire sample, it was determined that the highly anxious patients were much less likely to report 'optimal parenting' when compared to controls, and were more likely to report "affectionate constraint" and "affectionless control" parental style representations of their parents. Both affectionate constraint and affectionless control involve high parental protection.

The “affectionless control” pattern involving low parental care and high parental protection has been found to also be associated with depression (Parker, 1981; Parker, 1983a), schizophrenic relapse (Parker, Fairley, Greenwood, Jurd, & Silove, 1982; Parker, Johnston, & Hayward, 1988), and with early-onset schizophrenia (Parker et al., 1982). Parker (1983a) conducted a case-controlled study of 125 neurotic depressives using the PBI and found that 67% of the patients and 37% of the controls scored one or both parents as high on affectionless control. It was concluded that depressives tend to perceive themselves as having been exposed to an absence of parental care combined with high parental overprotection. However, much of the research that has found affectionless control to be associated with adult psychopathology has relied on clinical populations presenting with one or two disorders or highly select community samples (Enns, Cox, & Clara, 2002). A follow-up study by Mackinnon, Henderson, & Andrews (1993) was conducted using a sample of 922 adult twins who completed the PBI and the Composite International Diagnostic Interview. It was found that care exhibited a stronger relationship with depression than did protection. When both terms were included in an additive manner, an interactive term involving both care and protection was not required. Therefore affectionless control as a risk factor for depression was not supported by this study. In a community study involving 3,684 adults, Parker, Hadzi-Pavlovic, Greenwald, & Weissman (1995) found that low parental care from both parents was more likely to be reported by subjects meeting criteria for a lifetime episode of major depressive disorder and that low parental care appeared to be associated with an increased chance of psychopathology in general; the dimension of overprotection was not analyzed in this particular study. In a nationally representative US sample conducted by Enns, Cox, & Clara (2002) involving 5,877 adults from the US National Comorbidity Survey, parental overprotection and parental care were examined

simultaneously as continuous variables and it was found that lack of parental care was the variable most consistently associated with adult psychopathology. The overall impact of parenting as assessed by the PBI accounted for 1-5% of the variance in the incidence of adult mental disorders. Mackinnon, Henderson, Scott, & Duncan-Jones (1989) established that the estimated relative risk for perceiving parents as scoring high on affectionless control in the general population is considered to be low in comparison to estimates calculated from samples with psychiatric disorders.

Systematic empirical research on families and children began around the 1930's and developmental theory focused on the mother-child relationship as did psychoanalytic theory, learning theory, and attachment theory. The influence of fathers' behavior in both the development of child and adolescent psychopathology as well as the psychological well-being of children and adults has historically been largely ignored (Phares & Compas, 1992; Rohner & Veneziano, 2001). One of the earliest studies to examine the impact of both paternal and maternal parenting styles studied the patient records of 64 withdrawn and aggressive children ranging in age from 3-14 years who were being treated at a child guidance clinic. It was found that paternal rejection/negative attitude accounted for 42% of the children, paternal acceptance/positive attitude (31%), paternal overprotection (11%) and paternal ambivalence (16%). In comparison, maternal rejection/negative attitude accounted for 50%, maternal acceptance/positive attitude (8%), maternal overprotection (33%), and maternal ambivalence (9%) (Fitz-Simmons, 1935). Peterson, Becker, Hellmer, Shoemaker, & Quay (1959) studied 31 families at a guidance clinic and compared them with 29 non-clinic families in which all children ranged in age from 6-12 years. Both fathers and mothers of maladjusted children were judged to be less sociable, less well-adjusted, more autocratic, and experienced more disciplinary

contention when compared to the control group. The results indicated that fathers were at least as important as mothers in the form and occurrence of emotional and behavioral maladjustment in children.

More recently, the presence of paternal psychopathology has been found to be a sufficient, though not necessary condition for the development of child and adolescent psychopathology (Phares & Compas, 1992). Amato (1994) studied 471 young adults based on a national sample and found that closeness to fathers made a unique and independent contribution to offspring life satisfaction and happiness, and was negatively correlated with psychological distress. Parental divorce weakened the salience of the father-child relationship for young adults' life satisfaction. Closeness to stepfathers was also found to be related to the psychological well-being of offspring. In a study involving 113 adult women recruited from a private medical clinic, Dominy, Johnson, & Koch (2000) found that obese women with Binge Eating Disorder perceived their fathers as significantly more rejecting than their mothers when compared to obese women without an eating disorder. In another study conducted by Komarovsky (1976) involving 62 males randomly selected from the senior class of an American Ivy League male college, 44% of the sample reported that their most frequent grievance with their fathers was their father's lack of warmth, closeness and involvement.

Paternal caregiving style, specifically a lack of paternal affection and support (paternal rejection) has been shown to predict specific outcomes in children, adolescents, and adults better than maternal caregiving style, including: children's sense of God as nurturing (Dickie et al., 1997), conduct problems in children (Chen, Liu, & Li, 2000; Eron, Banta, Walder, & Laulicht, 1961; Grant et al., 2000), childhood and adolescent delinquency (Andry, 1962; Kroupa, 1988), depression in adolescence and young adulthood (Barrera & Garrison-Jones, 1992; Lefkowitz &

Tesiny, 1984), and substance abuse in children, adolescents, and adults (Brook & Brook, 1988; Campo & Rohner, 1992; Emmelkamp & Heeres, 1988). Paternal caregiving style was found to be the sole significant predictor of specific outcomes when compared to maternal caregiving style including: children's perceived academic competence (Wagner & Philips, 1992), children's grades in school (DuBos, Eitel & Felner, 1994), adolescent attachment security (Tacon & Caldera, 2001), adolescent self-esteem (Bartle, Anderson, & Sabatelli, 1989), and adolescent substance abuse (Brook, Whiteman, & Gordon, 1981; Jiloha, 1986). Presently, not very much is known about why the influence of paternal caregiving style (i.e. father acceptance-rejection) is sometimes greater than the influence of maternal caregiving style (Rohner & Veneziano, 2001).

Carl Rogers (1961/1995), the American founder of humanistic psychology, asserted that creating a climate of unconditional positive regard and acceptance are the basis for the facilitation of personal growth and mental health, not only in the therapeutic relationship, but in all relationships. In his book, *On Becoming a Person: A Therapist's View of Psychotherapy*, he wrote about the therapeutic relationship and defined acceptance of the client by the therapist as follows:

By acceptance I mean a warm regard for him as a person of unconditional self-worth – of value no matter what his condition, his behavior, or his feelings. It means a respect and liking for him as a separate person, a willingness for him to possess his own feelings in his own way. (1961/1995, p. 34)

Rogers went on to postulate that the same lawfulness governs all relationships, not just the therapeutic relationship. In terms of parent-child relationships, he asserted that “it seems reasonable to hypothesize that if the parent creates with his child a psychological climate such as



we have described, then the child will become more self-directing, socialized, and mature” (1961/1995, p. 37). A new field of human relationships was what he conceptualized as possible and emergent.

Winnicott (1965), an English pediatrician and psychoanalyst, postulated that when the mother’s mood predominates it can result in a sense of alienation for the child, not only from feelings of relatedness with the mother, but from the child’s authentic sense of self. In *Attachment, Play, and Authenticity: A Winnicott Primer*, Tuber writes:

A True Self connoted good-enough mothering, a capacity to have a central, isolated core, and a capacity for creative interaction between self and others. A False Self connoted overcompliance with mother, a need to hide or even dissociate from one’s central core, and significant limitations in the capacity to feel real. (2008, p. 50)

Parental acceptance-rejection theory was “initiated almost four-and-a-half decades ago in response to claims by Western social scientists that parental love is essential to the healthy social and emotional development of children” (Roher, Khaleque, & Cournoyer, 2005). Which Western social scientists Rohner et al. (2005) are referring to is unclear because they are not directly cited, but it is believed that PARTheory is indirectly influenced by Rogers’s theory of unconditional positive regard (1961/1995) and Winnicott’s True Self/False Self dichotomy as well as his idea of the good-enough mother (1965), and directly influenced by security theory and attachment theory.

Attachment theory is the combined work of Bowlby and Ainsworth (Ainsworth & Bowlby, 1991). Mary Ainsworth was a student of William Blatz at the University of Toronto in the early 1930’s and Blatz introduced her to security theory (Blatz, 1940, 1966) which is a theory

about personality development. Security is defined as the subjective feeling of being safe regardless of whether one is actually safe and purports that young children need to develop a secure dependence on their parents before venturing out into unfamiliar surroundings (Ainsworth, 2010). Ainsworth became interested in understanding early interpersonal relationships and how they influence personality development; she expanded on Blatz's security theory in terms of her concept of the attachment figure as a secure base from which the infant can explore the world. Blatz's theory examining insecurity-security is associated with various forms of dependence-independence including immature dependent security, insecurity, independent security, and mature dependent security (Blatz, 1966). Ainsworth (1967) observed the development of infant-mother attachment in Uganda and formulated the concept of maternal sensitivity to infant signals; eventually she classified patterns of infant-mother attachment as ambivalent, avoidant, and secure (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall, 1978).

The English child psychiatrist, John Bowlby, formulated the basic principles of attachment theory. Bowlby was influenced by the object-relations approach to psychoanalysis, but disagreed with aspects of the Kleinian approach to child psychoanalysis in terms of the view that children's emotional difficulties were largely due to fantasies generated from internal conflict. Bowlby considered his own approach to be ethological (1969, 1988) and was concerned with the effects of maternal separation and deprivation on young children. Based on empirical evidence, he asserted that for mental health to develop it is essential that "the infant and young child should experience a warm, intimate, and continuous relationship with his mother (or permanent mother substitute) in which both find satisfaction and enjoyment" (Bowlby, 1952, p. 11) in order for the child to grow up psychologically healthy. Attachment behavior was defined by Bowlby in his first volume of the attachment trilogy, *Attachment* (1969), as behavior that has

a healthy and natural function in which proximity to an attachment figure is sought by the young child. Attachment behavior is considered to serve the biological function of protecting the child from danger, especially predators and is “regarded as a class of social behavior of an importance equivalent to that of mating behavior and parental behavior” (1969, p. 179). Attachment behavior is activated by anything that is frightening to the child including the mother appearing or being inaccessible (Bowlby, 1969, 1988).

Attachment theory preceded parental acceptance-rejection theory. According to Hughes et al. (2005), attachment theory and parental acceptance-rejection theory developed along independent but parallel lines in which there are significant similarities as well as differences. The similarities between attachment theory and PARTheory include incorporating an evolutionary perspective, drawing from the concept of internal working models which come from the outside but then are internalized (attachment theory) or mental representations (PARTheory), and alluding to the biologically based need for positive response, including caregiver sensitivity in attachment theory and parental acceptance in PARTheory. For example, a positive correlation of .545 ( $p < .01$ ) between attachment theory’s main construct of parental sensitivity and PARTheory’s main construct of parental acceptance was found by Hughes et al. (2005) using a sample of 21 primary caregivers (19 mothers, 2 fathers) observed with their children ages 2-3.5 years (11 boys, 10 girls) using the Preschool Strange Situation.

More similarities between the two theories include, for example, that immature dependence and defensive independence, as defined in PARTheory’s personality subtheory, are similar to ambivalent and avoidant attachment behaviors respectively (Hughes et al., 2005). Collins & Read (1990) created a parental caregiving style measure which assessed perceptions of attachment history with parents and was adapted from Hazen & Shaver’s (1987) adult

attachment categorical measure in which romantic love was conceptualized as an attachment process. The subjects consisted of 80 female and 38 male undergraduates at a California university and the caregiving measure consisted of three parenting styles that were found to be associated with adult romantic attachment as measured by the Adult Attachment Scale: 1) Warm/Responsive parental caregiving style (correlated with a secure style of attachment in which the individual feels comfortable with closeness), 2) Cold/Rejecting parental caregiving style (correlated with an avoidant style of attachment involving difficulty trusting and depending on others), 3) Ambivalent/Inconsistent parental caregiving style (correlated with an anxious style of attachment in which the individual feels afraid about being unloved or abandoned). It was found that:

Consistent with attachment theory, memories of relationships with parents were related to subjects' feelings about security in adulthood. In general, those with a more secure attachment style perceived their parents to have been warm and not rejecting, whereas those with an anxious attachment style reported their parents to have been cold or inconsistent. (Collins & Read's, 1990, p. 654)

The warm/responsive parental caregiver style is similar to Rohner's conceptualization of acceptance and the cold/rejecting style is similar to the indifference-neglect class of parental behavior that makes up part of the rejection umbrella of PARTheory. Granted, PARTheory does not seem to capture some of the paradoxes of attachment theory. For example, Rohner did not conceptualize an equivalent to the ambivalent/inconsistent parenting style which can be viewed as a limitation of his theory, but his conceptualization of multiple forms of rejection is a strength of PARTheory. What follows is a description of what an ambivalent/inconsistent style of

parenting looks like as well as a hostile-aggressive form of parenting (which Rohner's theory does account for):

Thus a sarcastic mother who says hostile, thoughtless, unkind things to her child (i.e. who is verbally aggressive) but who also hugs and kisses her child (i.e. is physically responsive) will probably produce a less disturbed child than a mother who is both verbally and physically aggressive. (Rohner, 1975/2000b, p. 49)

A primary caregiver who is severely rejecting and who is also hostile-aggressive, abusive, as well as inconsistent toward the child may shape the attachment behavior in such a way that leads to a disorganized form of attachment. The child faces the dilemma of protecting themselves from the caregiver and maintaining a relationship with them.

The main difference between attachment theory and PARTheory involves the order of the mechanism of influence. Attachment can be thought of as the mediator between parental acceptance-rejection/care and psychological outcomes in the child. Degrees of attachment insecurity-security and attachment behavior have to come from somewhere and are obviously shaped by something. What shapes attachment behavior can be operationalized as the quality of the parent-child relationship in general and in particular parental acceptance-rejection, parental care, or caregiver sensitivity. Parental attitude and behavior therefore influence attachment behavior in children and when attachment is conceptualized as a mediator variable it helps to explain the mechanism of this influence. More differences between attachment theory and PARTheory include methodological differences, behaviors viewed as categorical versus dimensional, and the focus of the research. Attachment theory initially relied on behavior observations and laboratory research while PARTheory has relied primarily on self-report

questionnaires, though Rohner's use of a multi-method research strategy has gone beyond psychological survey research and also includes holocultural research, ethnographic, and anthropological community studies cross-culturally as well as within the United States (Hughes et al., 2005; Rohner & Cournoyer, 1994). Attachment behaviors have been viewed in the past as categorical outcomes by attachment theory which reflects qualitative differences versus degrees of parental behaviors which reflect dimensions or continua as conceptualized by PARTheory. Attachment theory originally focused on infants and toddlers and PARTheory focused on school-aged children, adolescents, and adults (Hughes et al., 2005).

### **Relevance to the present proposal.**

The empirically validated cross-cultural emphasis of Rohner's parental acceptance-rejection theory, its breadth of parenting behaviors which are conceptualized on a continuum, as well as the ability to study adults' self-reported perceptions of their childhood make this theory particularly suitable for this study. It is clear from the literature that although Rohner's PARTheory has been found useful in explaining multiple forms of maladjustment as well as adjustment, it has yet to be empirically researched in association with intrinsic and extrinsic life aspirations as well as adult attitudes toward money. Likewise, the Parental Bonding Instrument (Parker et al., 1979) has also not been empirically researched in association with intrinsic and extrinsic life aspirations as well as adult attitudes toward money. As will be elaborated on in the next section, the studies that have examined maternal and paternal parenting styles in relation to intrinsic and extrinsic values have not used the constructs of parental acceptance-rejection or parental bonding. These studies have found significant relationships between parenting style and intrinsic/extrinsic aspirations, but did not examine paternal influence separate from maternal influence (Kasser, Ryan, Zax, & Sameroff, 1995; Williams, Cox, Hedberg, & Deci, 2000). The

gap in the literature between the quality of parent-child relationships and the impact this may have on perceptions and symbolic representations of money in adults is in need of attention in order to determine if a significant relationship exists between these two variables in light of the central role financial perceptions and behaviors have in every-day modern life for all adults.

### **Self-Determination Theory (SDT): Intrinsic and Extrinsic Life Aspirations**

Self Determination Theory (SDT) was co-developed by Edward Deci and Richard Ryan (1985, 2000) and asserts that all humans have basic psychological needs that are necessary for the well-being and growth of their personality and cognitive structures, similar to basic physical needs. Basic psychological needs are considered to be universal and are viewed from an organismic metatheoretical perspective which stresses the innate tendency of all human beings to develop an ever more unified, integrated, and elaborated sense of self, but this tendency can't be taken for granted. There are specific social-contextual factors that can hinder this fundamental process, just as there are factors that support this tendency which can be thought of as a dynamic potential.

The three basic psychological needs as proposed by self-determination theory include: competence, relatedness, and autonomy. Competence is not an acquired skill, but rather is a felt sense of effectiveness and confidence in one's ongoing interactions with the environment. Relatedness refers to having a sense of secure belonging, feeling connected to others, and being cared for and caring for others. Autonomy is different from independence, and refers to the perceived source of one's own behavior in terms of the experience of one's behavior as an expression of the self (Ryan & Deci, 2002). The construct of "goals" or "aspirations" refer to representations of future states that are associated with some affect or desire (Pervin, 1989). Self-

determination theory asserts that when life goals are focused on obtaining praise and rewards, motivation tends to be externally regulated leading to gradual decreases in adjustment. In contrast, when life goals fulfill the basic psychological needs for competence, relatedness, and autonomy, motivation towards these goals tends to be internally regulated and people experience integration and personality growth (Kasser & Ryan, 2001). Therefore, goals that are believed to provide direct satisfaction of the basic psychological needs are *intrinsic aspirations* and goals that are more related to external signs of worth and are therefore less likely to provide direct need satisfaction are *extrinsic aspirations* (Ryan & Deci, 2002).

Intrinsic aspirations include personal growth (self-acceptance), meaningful relationships (affiliation), and community contribution (community feeling) and examples of extrinsic aspirations include wealth (financial success), fame (social recognition), and image (attractive appearance). Extrinsic goals as represented on the Aspirations Index (Kasser & Ryan, 1996) have come to be described as materialistic goals in the literature. Wealth, fame, and image all involve striving for external rewards and praise from others (Kasser, 2002). Intrinsic aspirations are calculated relative to extrinsic aspirations because they comprise one bipolar continuum. For this reason, what is intrinsic and what is extrinsic is less clearly distinct because they are not separate constructs but are rather mirror images of each other that vary by degree. The relative strength of intrinsic aspirations has been found to be significantly positively related to greater well-being and less distress. Likewise, the relative strength of extrinsic aspirations, particularly financial success aspirations, has been found to be associated with increased depression, anxiety, and physical symptoms as well as decreased vitality and self-actualization (Kasser, 2002; Kasser & Ryan, 1993, 1996). Therefore, the content of the goal makes a difference in that intrinsic goals provide more psychological need satisfaction as compared to extrinsic goals. This being said, it



is important to realize that aspirations for financial success are not necessarily maladaptive; aspirations for financial success become maladaptive when extrinsic aspirations are overemphasized relative to intrinsic aspirations (Kasser & Ryan, 1993, 1996).

In *The High Price of Materialism*, Kasser (2002) asserts that “because society tells us repeatedly that money and possessions will make us happy, and that they are significant goals for which we should strive, we often organize our lives around pursuing them” (p. 4). He reflects on the seemingly counter-intuitive fact that when people obtain more material goods and money, they don’t become more psychologically healthy or more satisfied with their lives. Gains in wealth have little to no incremental payoff in terms of well-being or happiness once people are above poverty levels. Even simply aspiring to have greater wealth is associated with a decrease in well-being and an increase in psychological and physical distress for people of both genders regardless of age or income (Kasser, 2002; Kasser & Ryan, 1993; Kasser & Ryan, 1996). Materialistic values are associated with low self-actualization and well-being, as well as more narcissism and antisocial behaviors in college students, entrepreneurs, and business students (Carver & Baird, 1998; McHoskey, 1999; Roberts & Robins, 2000; Srivastava, Locke, & Bortol, 2001).

Harlow (1953) first used the term “intrinsic motivation” to explain why the rhesus monkeys, in one of his experiments, spent many hours working on mechanical puzzles without the use of a tangible rewarded system for their behaviors; it was determined that the activity itself was the reward. Ryan & Deci (2002) explain the difference between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation:

Intrinsically motivated behaviors are those whose motivation is based in the inherent satisfactions of the behaviors *per se*, rather than in contingencies or reinforcements that are operationally separable from those activities....whereas extrinsic motivation is focused toward and dependent on contingent outcomes that are separable from the action *per se*. (p. 10, italics in original)

Intrinsic motivation is apparent from the beginning of life and can take the form of interest, spontaneity, and curiosity (Ryan, Sheldon, Kasser, & Deci, 1996). Extrinsically motivated behaviors are not inherently interesting. Therefore if the behaviors are not extrinsically rewarded, then people are unlikely to do them. When intrinsically motivated behaviors are then rewarded with money, such as when subjects begin getting paid for working on interesting puzzles, the subjects lose interest in the task because their relationship to the task becomes instrumental and strained (Deci, 1995). The role of the social environment is critical and, “to the extent that an aspect of the social context allows need fulfillment, it yields engagement, mastery, and synthesis; whereas, to the extent that it thwarts need fulfillment, it diminishes the individual’s motivation, growth, integrity, and well-being” (Ryan & Deci, 2002, p. 9). Adults with relatively central extrinsic aspirations tend to engage more frequently in distracting daily activities, such as television watching, drinking, and smoking, as compared to more meaningful daily activities such as thinking about one’s future, helping friends, or helping someone with a problem (Sheldon & Kasser, 1995). Distracting activities can be a means of attempting to reduce tension and manage frustration by mindlessly escaping the self (Baumeister, 1991). Cohen & Cohen (1996) studied a diverse group of over 700 twelve- to twenty-year-olds and found that compared to nonmaterialistic teenagers, those with a high orientation toward materialistic values, were more likely to have difficulties with emotional expression and

controlling impulses, to isolate themselves socially, believe others have malevolent intentions, exhibit unusual thoughts and behaviors, have difficulties with attention, be either overly dependent or overly avoidant of other people, relate to people in a passive-aggressive manner, and attempt to control aspects of the environment.

The construct of the basic psychological need for relatedness is very similar to the construct of parental acceptance which has been shown to be essential to the healthy social and emotional development of all children and adults (Rohner, 1975/2000b). A laboratory experiment involving 41 mothers and their infants demonstrated that when infants experienced a general satisfaction of the relatedness need as implied by secure attachment, and their mothers were supportive of their autonomy, the infants were more likely to display intrinsically motivated exploratory behaviors of their surrounding environment (Frodi, Bridges, & Grolnick, 1985). In another laboratory experiment by Anderson, Manoogian, and Reznick (1976) involving 72 four- and five-year-old children, the experimental design consisted of each child being provided with a numbered T-shirt and 10 colored felt-tipped pens. The three reward conditions included money, symbolic reward, and positive verbal reinforcement. The control group children were told to draw whatever they wanted while the experimenter, a previously unknown adult, looked away for eight minutes. Each child in the control group was told that the experimenter had work to do if the child attempted to interact with the experimenter. The results of this experiment indicated that the children who were provided with positive verbal reinforcement spent the most time drawing, the children given money spent much less time drawing, and the children who were ignored by the experimenter spent the least amount of time drawing as compared to the other groups which suggested a lower level of intrinsic motivation.

When basic psychological needs are not met, substitutes are developed that serve as compensations (Deci, 1980; Ryan & Deci, 2002; Ryan, Sheldon et al., 1996). One reason for highly valuing extrinsic life goals may be related to low self-esteem and insecurity. Financial success aspirations in particular may represent a compensation for feelings of insecurity and low self-esteem engendered earlier in life, leading one to focus on external rewards, praise, and recognition as a means to gain approval, maintain a sense of worth, and feel better about oneself (Kasser et al., 1995; Ryan et al., 1996). When the family environment does an inadequate job of satisfying needs for security many children respond by adopting a value system that emphasizes materialism, such as possessions and wealth (Kasser, 2002). Extrinsic goals may be viewed as a means of becoming admired or esteemed, especially for someone who has felt contingently or conditionally loved (Rogers, 1961). Social contexts that hinder psychological need satisfaction: “can lead to goals that are compensatory and may involve serious risks to physical and psychological well-being” (Ryan & Deci, 2002, p. 26). Extrinsic aspirations can be highly motivating, but do not provide the direct satisfaction of basic psychological needs which are necessary for the promotion and experience of well-being and psychological health. Parental rejection is an example of the basic psychological need of relatedness *not* being met. Extrinsic aspirations, including wealth, fame, and image, can become visible indicators of worth and esteem that develop as substitutes for basic psychological needs, such as the need for relatedness, when psychological need satisfaction is not available.

As mentioned previously, materialism and parental styles have been studied in terms of materialistic life goals in teenagers and young adults, but to this author’s knowledge, have not been investigated in terms of remembered maternal and paternal acceptance-rejection or parental bonding in association with maladaptive money attitudes in adults. Extrinsic goals, such as

financial success, appear to originate from the family environment. Kasser (2002) asserts that “the family is of course the primary socializing environment for most of our early years, and the experiences we have there strongly determine how much we eventually feel safe and secure” (p. 30). Kasser, Ryan, Zax, & Sameroff (1995) studied 140 eighteen year-olds and their mothers and examined level of maternal nurturance, as measured by the Parental Style Survey (Sameroff, Thomas, & Barrett, 1989), self-reported by the mothers, and examined in relation to their teenager’s valuing of financial success. The results indicated that the teenagers who valued the extrinsic aspiration of financial success more highly, as compared to the intrinsic aspiration of self-acceptance, had mothers who were less nurturing. It was surmised that: “warm and democratic maternal environments may convey a sense that the child’s own inner desires are important and acceptable, and thus may be associated with valuing aspirations congruent with intrinsic needs” (Kasser et al., p. 911, 1995). Paternal nurturance was not examined by Kasser et al. (1995), but Cohen & Cohen (1996) found that adolescents highly oriented toward materialistic values had parents that were lax in the consistency with which they applied certain rules, very enmeshed with their child, and were also likely to use punitive measures.

In a similar study by Williams, Cox, Hedberg, & Deci (2000) that investigated extrinsic life goals in relation to health-risk behaviors in teenagers, it was found that there was a significant relationship between low autonomy-supportive parenting and adolescents’ relative extrinsic aspirations based on the self-reports of 141 suburban high school students ages 14-18. Perception of parental behaviors was assessed by a measure used from an unpublished doctoral dissertation called Perceptions of Parents (Robbins, 1994). More specifically, it was found that materialistic teenagers perceived their parents as unlikely to acknowledge their feelings, provide them with choices, or listen to them. Likewise, this study surmised that “it seems plausible that

the visible signs of worth represented by the extrinsic values are substitutes for basic needs that have gone unsatisfied” (p. 1761). A basic psychological need for all children is the generalized need to be accepted and loved by their parents or primary caretakers (Rohner, 2000). With regard to family structure, divorce has also been found to be related to materialistic values. Rindfleisch et al. (1997) surveyed 261 young adults, ages 20-32, and found that when 165 participants from intact families were compared with 96 from divorced families, the young adults from divorced families were more likely to endorse materialistic values. The authors concluded that “it is the diminution of interpersonal resources such as love and affection, rather than financial resources, that links family disruption and materialism” (p. 321). Higher levels of materialistic values among the young adults from divorced families were also thought to represent an attempt to use material objects as substitutes for an absent parent.

Perceived parental acceptance, particularly parental love, may reduce materialistic attitudes and values in adolescents as well as in adults. With regard to the dangers of materialism, Deci (1995) asserts that “When people say that money motivates, what they really mean is that money controls. And when it does, people become alienated – they give up some of their authenticity – and they push themselves to do what they think they must do” (p. 29). For these reasons, the psychological aspects of money need to be better understood in terms of its symbolic power and the meanings that are projected onto it.

### **Brief Overview of the Current Study**

The purpose of the present study is to investigate the extent to which parental rejection, maternal care, and maternal overprotection predict extrinsic life aspirations as well as maladaptive money attitudes in the college population. The research questions for this study will

examine relationships between measures specific to perceptions of parental acceptance-rejection, parental bonding, life aspirations and attitudes toward money. The perception of remembered parental rejection in childhood will be referred to as “parental rejection” for the sake of simplicity with the understanding that people make choices in the present that influence their memory of the past. Therefore, the memory of one’s childhood is influenced by the present context.

The overarching research question includes:

- Is maternal and paternal rejection related to extrinsic life aspirations as well as maladaptive money attitudes?

More specifically:

1) Is degree of maternal and paternal rejection associated with degree of extrinsic life aspirations?

- For example, based on the Adult Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire and the Aspirations Index, is greater maternal and paternal rejection associated with greater extrinsic life aspirations?
- Likewise, is less maternal care, as measured by the Parental Bonding Instrument, associated with greater extrinsic life aspirations? Is greater maternal overprotection associated with greater extrinsic life aspirations?

2) Is degree of maternal and paternal rejection associated with distinct money attitudes in adults?

- For example, based on the Money Attitude Scale, is greater maternal and paternal rejection associated with greater endorsement of the maladaptive money attitude

composite score involving the money factors power-prestige, anxiety, and distrust?

- Likewise, is less endorsement of maternal care, as measured by the Parental Bonding Instrument, associated with greater endorsement of the maladaptive money attitude composite score? Is greater endorsement of maternal overprotection associated with greater endorsement of the maladaptive money attitude composite score?

3) Does the Adult Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire correlate with the Parental Bonding Instrument?

4) Do extrinsic life aspirations mediate between maternal/paternal rejection and specific money attitudes?

- Do greater endorsement of extrinsic aspirations mediate between greater amounts of parental rejection (maternal and paternal) and greater endorsement of the maladaptive money attitude composite score?

5) Is maternal or paternal rejection a better predictor of greater extrinsic life aspirations and greater endorsement of the maladaptive money attitude composite score for females or males?

Hypotheses:

Extrinsic life aspirations and money attitudes such as power-prestige, anxiety, and distrust may be various forms of coping mechanisms used to try to bolster self-esteem as well as minimize some of the psychological pain and feelings of inadequacy produced by perceived parental rejection and overprotection. Money has been found to be more



important to those who place greater importance on the extrinsic aspects of life (Lau, 1998), which involve materially oriented goals such as fame, wealth, and image. A predominance of extrinsic values may be substitutes for basic needs that have gone unsatisfied (Williams et al., 2000). A basic psychological need is for all children to be accepted and loved by their parents (Rohner, 2000). Likewise, rejected children and adults are likely to feel insecure and anxious (Khaleque & Rohner, 2002). Higher degrees of extrinsic life aspirations and greater endorsement of the money attitudes power-prestige, anxiety, and distrust may all in various ways represent an attempt to turn toward material objects including money when it is believed that people can't be fully trusted or relied on. Endorsing more highly the maladaptive money attitude composite score and extrinsic life goals can be viewed as attempts to feel more secure, self-sooth, and defend against fears of inadequacy, emptiness and depletion as well as the wish to be recognized, loved, and validated from external sources that may function as substitutes for a general lack of parental acceptance.

Lower scores on the Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire indicate more acceptance and higher scores indicate more rejection. On the other hand, the Parental Bonding Instrument is scored in the opposite direction for the maternal care construct in which lower scores indicate less care and higher scores indicate more care. For the maternal overprotection construct of the Parental Bonding Instrument, lower scores indicate less overprotection and higher scores indicate more overprotection. For the Aspirations Index, intrinsic and extrinsic scores are part of one continuum. Lower scores on the intrinsic summary score indicate higher scores on the extrinsic summary score and

vice versa because intrinsic-extrinsic life goals are one continuous bipolar measure rather than two distinct constructs.

The hypotheses below correspond with the research questions reported above:

1. Greater maternal and paternal rejection will be significantly and positively associated with greater extrinsic life aspirations. Adults who perceive their parents to have been more rejecting than accepting toward them when they were children will endorse a higher degree of extrinsic life aspirations, such as materially oriented goals that include fame, wealth, and image, as compared to adults who felt more accepted than rejected.
  - Less maternal care will be significantly and negatively associated with greater extrinsic life aspirations. Lower scores on maternal care will be associated with a higher endorsement of extrinsic life goals.
  - Greater maternal overprotection will be significantly and positively associated with greater extrinsic life aspirations. Higher scores on overprotection will be associated with a higher endorsement of extrinsic life goals.
2. Greater amounts of maternal and paternal rejection are hypothesized to be significantly and positively associated with higher scores on the maladaptive money attitude composite score.
  - As measured by the Parental Bonding Instrument, less endorsement of maternal care will be significantly and negatively

associated with greater endorsement of the maladaptive money attitude composite score. Likewise, greater endorsement of maternal overprotection is hypothesized to be significantly and positively associated with greater endorsement on the maladaptive money attitude composite score.

3. It is predicted that greater maternal rejection as measured by the Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire will be significantly and negatively correlated with lower maternal care on the Parental Bonding Instrument. Likewise, it is predicted that greater maternal rejection on the Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire will be significantly and positively correlated with greater maternal overprotection as measured by the Parental Bonding Instrument.
4. It is predicted that extrinsic life aspirations will mediate between maternal/paternal rejection and maladaptive money attitudes. More specifically, greater endorsement of extrinsic aspirations will mediate between greater amounts of parental rejection and greater endorsement of the maladaptive money attitude composite score. Respondents who have perceived more parental rejection will gravitate toward a more extrinsic orientation toward life which in turn will be associated with a higher level of endorsement of maladaptive money attitudes that include power-prestige, anxiety and distrust.
5. Greater amounts of both maternal and paternal rejection are hypothesized to predict a greater endorsement of extrinsic life aspirations and a greater endorsement of the

maladaptive money attitude composite score, but *paternal rejection* is hypothesized to be a stronger predictor of extrinsic life aspirations and maladaptive money attitudes, when compared to maternal rejection for both males and females. The reason why paternal rejection is thought to be a stronger predictor is because fathers have been found to be more rejecting and less accepting when compared to mothers cross-culturally (Dwairy, 2010) and it has also been found that paternal acceptance makes a unique and independent contribution to offspring life satisfaction as well as happiness while being negatively correlated with psychological distress (Amato, 1994). Not much is known about why the influence of paternal acceptance-rejection is at times greater than the influence of maternal acceptance-rejection (Rohner & Veneziano, 2001), but it is hypothesized that higher degrees of extrinsic life aspirations and greater endorsement of maladaptive money attitudes in particular may represent an attempt to self-soothe and feel more secure as well as the wish to be recognized, loved, and validated from external sources that may function as a substitute for a dearth of paternal acceptance in particular and parental acceptance in general for both males and females. Little is known about the issue of possible gender-of-parent by gender-of-offspring interactions (Rohner & Britner, 2002). Even though male adolescents were found to be more rejected and less accepted than females, a significant interaction was not found between parents' sex and adolescents' sex (Dwairy, 2010). It has been postulated that especially for male adolescents "disruptions in the father-son relationship may be particularly disturbing for adolescents; efforts to affirm their masculinity may take the form of externalizing" behavior (Rothbaum & Weisz, 1994, p. 69). This sample will be targeting the adult college population.

## Methods

### Participants

Participants were recruited from the City University's Department of Psychology Research Subject Pool. The City University of New York Psychology Department offers undergraduate students the opportunity to participate in current research projects. Participants were required to be at least 18 years of age and proficient in English in order to take part in this study; there were no other exclusion criteria. Participants received research credit for their participation and three participants, out of the total number of participants who completed the study, were randomly selected by a lottery to receive one of three Amazon gift cards. The gift card prizes were valued respectively at \$250, \$100, and \$50. To collect data, the study used an Internet based survey questionnaire. Through an online consent form, informed consent was obtained from every participant. For all aspects of this study, IRB approval was granted.

The sample is composed of 366 adults, of which 141 (38.5%) are males and 225 (61.5%) are females. The sample is on average 21 years old ( $sd = 3.38$ ) and ranges from 18 to 47 years of age. It is a racially and ethnically diverse sample with 32% of the respondents of Hispanic background, 23% Asian, 13% African-American, and 12% Caucasian. The remainder of the sample (20%) is made up of "other" racial/ethnic backgrounds which include Native American, Alaskan Native, Pacific Islander, Mixed Races, and "Other." With respect to religion, 41% identify as Christian, 23% report no religious affiliation, 14% are Muslim, 4% are Hindu, 4% are Buddhist, and 14% report "Other" religious affiliations. With regard to relationship status, 78% of the sample report being single, 7% are not married but living with someone/consensual union, 3% married, 0.3% divorced, and 11% "Other". Slightly over half of the participants (55%) report

not currently working while the rest (45%) report being presently employed. The current socioeconomic status of the participants is made up of Working Class/Lower Class (40%), Lower Middle Class (24%), Middle Class (30%), Upper Middle Class (6%), and Upper Class (0.3%). The socioeconomic status of the participant's family when the respondent was a child is very similar to current socioeconomic status and consisted of Working Class/Lower Class (36%), Lower Middle Class (24%), Middle Class (33%), Upper Middle Class (6%), and Upper Class (0.3%). The personal income of the participants is made up of 48% reporting no personal income, 32% earning less than \$10,000, 15% earning between \$10,001 to \$25,000, 3% earning between \$25,001 to \$40,000, 1% earning between \$40,001 to \$60,000 and 0.8 % earning above \$60,001. The household income of the participants include 4% reporting no household income, 9% less than \$10,000, 28% between \$10,001 to \$25,000, 16% between \$25,001 to \$40,000, 13% between \$40,001 to \$60,000, 12% between 60,001 to 85,000, 12% between \$85,001 to \$125,000, and 6% above \$125,001.

## **Procedure**

The research survey, consisting of the informed consent form, background information, and a series of five measures was converted into an electronic file and uploaded to a web-based data system called PsychData which specializes in Internet-based research for the social sciences (see Appendix 1). The data was stored on a secure server to which only the principal investigator had access. The study used the title "*An Online Study of Attitudes toward Money*" which was uploaded to the CCNY Subject Pool. Participants who clicked on the link were presented with a detailed description of the study including the right to skip questions and to discontinue the survey at any time. Following the informed consent information, participants had the option to

click “yes, I consent to participate” and continue with the survey or to click “no, I do not consent to participate” to decline participation and exit the survey (see Appendix 2 to view the consent form). Of four-hundred and twenty six (n=426) participants who began the survey, sixty (n=60) failed to meet the criterion that they provide at least half of the information required for each measure. Every participant who consented received research credit irrespective of whether they completed the survey. Once data collection was complete, the information was converted into an SPSS data file for statistical analysis.

## **Measures**

*Quality of Parent-Child Relationships* - Participants were administered The Adult Parental Acceptance-Rejection/Control: Mother version (short form) and Father version (short form) (ADULT PARQ/Control; Rohner, 2005), which is a self-report instrument that contains 29 items for the mother version and 29 items for the father version and was used to rate perceptions of maternal and paternal acceptance-rejection as remembered in childhood between the ages of 7-12 years old. Adult perceptions of remembered parental acceptance-rejection are measured along a continuum, with rejection on one end and acceptance on the other end, for both parents. The words “mother” and “father” can be replaced with the term caregiver, which indicates any person who has had long-term care-giving responsibilities, without affecting the reliability and validity of the measure (Rohner & Khaleque, 2005). The majority of the items focus on parental behavior rather than parental attitudes. The PARQ consists of four scales: warmth/affection, hostility/aggression, indifference/neglect and undifferentiated rejection including an overall perceived rejection score. The total score ranges between 24 and 96 and is keyed in the direction of perceived rejection which means that higher scores translate into greater perception of rejection and lower scores indicate greater perception of acceptance; a total score at or above the

midpoint score of 60 indicates the experience of qualitatively more rejection than acceptance. Reliability coefficients for the mother version of the adult PARQ long-form range from .86 to .95, with a median reliability of .91; discriminant validity and convergent validity have also been found. Results of meta-analyses show that all alpha coefficients exceed the .70 level often recommended as the criterion for minimally acceptable reliability estimates. The standard 60-item long form has been used in approximately 400 studies internationally and within the United States and has been proven to be both reliable and valid. The short form presently has little information available about reliability because it is newly created, but since it is based on a subsample of items from the long form, it is expected to have excellent psychometric status (Rohner & Khaleque, 2005). Ratings are based on a likert-scale that ranges from almost never true to almost always true (1= almost never true - 4 = almost always true). Examples of statements include: “My mother/my father: let me know she/he loved me” and “Paid no attention when I asked for help”.

The Parental Bonding Inventory (PBI; Parker, Tupling & Brown, 1979) was also administered to adults to further assess the quality of parent-child relationships as remembered in childhood during the first 16 years; only the mother version was used in this study. It is a 25-item self-report checklist and the PBI yields two measures of parental behavior that have been validated through factor analytic research (Lopez & Gover, 1993; Mackinnon et al., 1989; Parker, 1983b) and consists of two subscales termed ‘care’ and ‘overprotection’ also known in the literature as ‘control’. The care subscale measures the level of perceived parental warmth, nurturance, intimacy, and empathy; lower scores indicate less care and higher scores indicate more care. The overprotection subscale measures the level of perceived parental obstruction of independence, perception of parental control, and intrusion. Lower scores on overprotection



indicate a perception of the parent as encouraging of autonomy, independence, and individuation and high scores indicate more overprotection and control. The two subscales may be intersected to yield four possible patterns of parenting: neglectful (low care, low protection), affectionless control (low care, high protection), affectionate constraint (high care, high protection), and optimal (high care, low protection) or they can be analyzed as continuous variables. The PBI has been found to have good reliability and validity as well as good internal consistency and re-test reliability both as a measure of perceived parental characteristics (Mackinnon et al., 1989; Parker, Tupling, & Brown, 1979; Wilhelm & Parker, 1990) and actual parental characteristics (Parker, 1981). Coefficient alphas have been reported to be .92 for the care subscale for mothers and .88 for the overprotection subscale for mothers (Rapport & Meleen, 1998). Ratings are based on a likert-scale that ranges from very unlike the parent's behavior to very like the parent's behavior (0 = very unlike - 3 = very like). Examples of statements include: "My mother: frequently smiled at me" and "Let me go out as often as I wanted".

*Intrinsic and Extrinsic Life Aspirations* - The Aspirations Index (AI; Aspirations Index Scale Description, 2012; Kasser & Ryan, 1996) is a 42-item self-report measure of intrinsic and extrinsic life goals rated on two dimensions: (a) personal importance and (b) the chances of attaining them in the future. Intrinsic-extrinsic life goals are part of one continuum therefore they form one continuous measure; lower scores on the intrinsic summary score indicate higher scores on the extrinsic summary score and higher scores on the extrinsic summary score indicate lower scores on the intrinsic summary score. Fourteen of the goals are classified as intrinsic, 14 are extrinsic, and 4 are neutral; some items were not retained for scoring as they did not cross-load in factor analyses or load as expected. The 14 intrinsic goals consist of four goals of personal growth (self-acceptance), five of relatedness with others (affiliation), and five of community

contribution (community feeling); the 14 extrinsic goals are composed of four goals of wealth (financial success), five of image (attractive appearance), and five of fame (social recognition). The neutral goals are related to the aspiration of physical fitness which is not clearly intrinsic or extrinsic. A total importance score is calculated taking the average of the seven subscale scores which consist of: self acceptance, affiliation, community feeling, physical fitness, financial success, attractive appearance, and social recognition. A summary intrinsic aspiration score is calculated by averaging the three intrinsic mean-corrected importance subscale scores and a summary extrinsic aspiration score is calculated by averaging the three extrinsic mean-corrected importance subscale scores; the summary intrinsic and extrinsic scores perfectly correlate with each other because they are relative to each other and therefore they are mirror images of each other. Since intrinsic and extrinsic are not two separate constructs, but are on a continuum that make up one bipolar measure, the summary extrinsic aspiration score will be the focus of this analysis. Research has shown the test-retest and internal reliability of intrinsic and extrinsic goals on the Aspirations Index. Alpha coefficients for the importance subscales range from .59 to .87; the mean is .76. Alphas for the likelihood/chance subscales range from .68 to .86; the mean is .76 (Kasser & Ryan, 1996). Ratings are based on a likert-scale that ranges from not at all to vary (1= not at all – 5= very) regarding the importance dimension and from very low to very high (1= very low - 5= very high) regarding the chances dimension. Examples of items include: “In the future...At the end of your life, you will look back on your life as meaningful and complete” and “In the future... You will be financially successful”.

*Money Attitudes* - The Money Attitude Scale (MAS; Yamauchi & Templer, 1982) is a 29-item self-report measure of money attitudes in adults. The MAS is considered to be a four-dimensional scale where scores on items within each dimension are summed to form indices of

each dimension. The coefficient alpha for the MAS is .77 and internal consistency estimates for the four factors composing the final scale is .80, .78, .73, and .69 for the power-prestige, retention-time, distrust, and anxiety subscale factors respectively. Test-retest reliability was determined and evidence for the nomological validity of the MAS was also found (Yamauchi & Templer, 1982). Three of the four subscales were replicated, but the distrust subscale may not be stable in all samples, especially smaller ones (Spinella, Lester, & Yang, 2005). The power-prestige factor is purported to describe the extent to which a person believes money is a symbol of success and uses money to influence and impress others. A High score on this factor indicates the importance of money as a status symbol. The retention-time factor describes people who carefully prepare and plan for the future including behaviors involving budgeting and saving money; a high retention-time score is characterized as placing great value on financial security. The distrust factor includes attitudes of suspicion and a high score on this factor indicates doubtful, hesitant, and suspicious attitudes when it comes to money. It also indicates the fear of being taken advantage of, fear of being depleted, and feeling like one never has enough money. The anxiety factor involves the attitude that money is a source of tension and anxiety for people; a high score on this factor indicates anxiety and nervousness in interactions surrounding money. (Yamauchi & Templer, 1982). A combined Maladaptive Money Attitude composite score was calculated by adding responses to the items measuring power-prestige, distrust, and anxiety. The Retention-Time factor is considered to be a separate index because it diverges from the emotional and psychological money-related connotations that make up the other three factors of the MAS. For example, the retention factor assesses monetary behavior that most would consider to be adaptive and rational (Engelberg & Sjoberg, 2006). Ratings are based on a likert-scale that

ranges from never to always (1= never – 7 = always). Examples of statements include: “I hesitate to spend money, even on necessities” and “I worry that I will not be financially secure”.

*Reducing Demand Characteristics* - The Couples Satisfaction Index (Funk & Rogge, 2007) was included in this study as an additional measure to reduce demand characteristics and was not analyzed. Respondents who indicate that they are presently in a committed relationship answered a 4-item self-report measure of couples' satisfaction. Ratings were based on a likert-scale that ranges from not at all to completely (1= not at all – 5 = completely). Examples of statements include: “How rewarding is your relationship with your partner?” and “In general, how satisfied are you in your relationship?”

*Background Variables* - Participants were asked to select the option that best describes their age, ethnicity/race, gender, religion, and relationship status. Participants were also asked to select the option that best describes their employment status, current socioeconomic status, the socioeconomic status of their family when they were a child, personal income, and household income.

## Results

As a broad overview of the data, Table 1 provides the means, standard deviations, minimum and maximum scores for all of the independent and dependent variables used in this study. A Multivariate Analysis of Variance was performed in order to look at the following demographic variables: age, gender, personal income, household income, current socioeconomic status, and childhood socioeconomic status. These demographic variables were analyzed along with the outcome variables: extrinsic life aspirations and maladaptive money attitudes. Results indicate that neither the univariate or multivariate significance tests for any of the demographic variables were significant; for this reason these demographic variables did not need to be controlled for.

Basic assumption checking was performed and it was discovered that the Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire total score for the mother was not linearly related to the maladaptive money attitude composite score of the Money Attitude Scale. Therefore, a logarithmic transformation was performed to linearize the relationship. After performing the logarithmic transformation there was still some residual non-linearity but it was fairly small therefore the logarithmic transformation was accepted because even though it did not completely reduce non-linearity it greatly reduced it. Likewise, on the Parental Bonding Instrument, maternal care was also discovered to not be linearly related to the maladaptive money attitude composite score. A logarithmic transformation was performed and the assumption of linearity was met therefore the logarithmic transformation eliminated the non-linearity. No other violations were found.

Table 1  
Means and Standard Deviations of the Independent and Dependent Variables

Variables	Means	Standard Deviations	Minimum	Maximum
PARQ: Total Score (Mother)	38.41	14.23	24	96
PARQ: Total Score (Father)	44.68	16.18	24	93
PBI: Care (Mother)	26.70	8.16	0	36
PBI: Overprotection (Mother)	17.32	7.90	0	39
AI: Extrinsic	3.21	.70	1.15	5
MAS: Maladaptive Money Attitudes	22.63	6.40	7.33	49.33

A Priori Hypothesis on Maternal/Paternal Rejection and Extrinsic Life Aspirations:

**Hypothesis 1a** predicted that greater maternal and paternal rejection would be significantly and positively correlated with greater extrinsic life aspirations. This hypothesis was not confirmed.

A simultaneous multiple regression analysis was conducted in order to estimate the relative predictive power associated with maternal/paternal rejection and extrinsic life aspirations. When taken together as a set, the two predictors, maternal and paternal rejection do not predict extrinsic life aspirations ( $R^2_{\text{change}} = .01$ ,  $F = 1.91$ ,  $df = (2, 361)$ ,  $p = .15$ ). Table 2 looks at each predictor individually using standardized coefficients:

Table 2  
Simultaneous Regression Analysis for PARQ Mother and PARQ Father Predicting Extrinsic Life Aspirations

Variable	Standardized Coefficients: Beta	t	Sig
PARQ: Total Score - Mother	-.05	-.94	.35
PARQ: Total Score - Father	-.08	-1.37	.17

a. Dependent Variable: Extrinsic Life Aspirations  
 \* $p < .05$  \*\* $p < .01$  \*\*\* $p < .001$

Both of the p-values for maternal and paternal rejection are above .05 therefore neither is significant.

A Priori Hypothesis on Maternal Care, Maternal Overprotection, and Extrinsic Life Aspirations:

**Hypothesis 1b** predicted that less maternal care would be significantly and negatively associated with greater extrinsic life aspirations. Likewise, greater maternal overprotection was predicted to be significantly and positively correlated with greater extrinsic life aspirations. This hypothesis was partially supported for maternal care, and it was fully supported for maternal overprotection.

Once again, a simultaneous multiple regression analysis was conducted in order to estimate the relative predictive power associated with maternal care, maternal overprotection and extrinsic life aspirations. When taken together as a set, the two predictors, maternal care and maternal overprotection do predict extrinsic life aspirations ( $R^2_{\text{change}} = .02$ ,  $F = 3.28$ ,  $df = (2, 362)$ ,  $p = .04$ ). Table 3 looks at each of the predictors separately using standardized coefficients:

Table 3

Simultaneous Regression Analysis for PBI Care Mother and PBI Overprotection Mother Predicting Extrinsic Life Aspirations

Variable	Standardized Coefficients: Beta	t	Sig
PBI: Care - Mother	.14	2.32	.02*
PBI: Overprotection - Mother	.13	2.15	.03*

a. Dependent Variable: Extrinsic Life Aspirations

\* $p < .05$  \*\* $p < .01$  \*\*\* $p < .001$

Both of the p-values for maternal care and maternal overprotection are below .05 therefore they are both significant, though the magnitude is not very large. Based on the positive association as represented by the beta weight .14, respondents who reported that their mother was more caring also reported more extrinsic life goals, which is not consistent with expectation. On the other hand, consistent with expectation, respondents who reported more maternal overprotection were found to report more extrinsic life goals.

A Priori Hypothesis on Maternal/Paternal rejection and Maladaptive Money Attitudes:

**Hypothesis 2a** predicted that greater amounts of maternal and paternal rejection would be significantly and positively correlated with higher scores on the maladaptive money attitude composite score. The results indicate that a more rejecting mother predicts to greater endorsement of maladaptive money attitudes in respondents, but a more rejecting father does not predict to maladaptive money attitudes therefore this hypothesis was partially confirmed.

A simultaneous multiple regression analysis was conducted in order to estimate the relative predictive power associated with maternal rejection, paternal rejection, and maladaptive money attitudes. These two predictors when taken together, maternal rejection and paternal rejection, do significantly relate to maladaptive money attitudes ( $R^2_{\text{change}} = .06$ ,  $F = 11.3$ ,  $df = (2, 362)$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Table 4 looks at each of the predictors separately using standardized coefficients:

Table 4

Simultaneous Regression Analysis for PARQ Mother and PARQ Father Predicting Maladaptive Money Attitudes

Variable	Standardized Coefficients: Beta	t	Sig
PARQ: Total Score - Mother	.20	3.80	.00***
PARQ: Total Score - Father	.09	1.62	.16

a. Dependent Variable: Maladaptive Money Attitudes

\* $p < .05$  \*\* $p < .01$  \*\*\* $p < .001$

The p-value for maternal rejection is below .05, but for paternal rejection it is above .05 therefore only maternal rejection is significant and has a modest effect size. Respondents who reported that their mother was more rejecting also reported more maladaptive money attitudes, which is consistent with expectation. On the other hand, respondents who reported more paternal rejection were not found to report more maladaptive money attitudes.



## A Priori Hypothesis on Maternal Care, Maternal Overprotection, and Maladaptive Money

### Attitudes:

**Hypothesis 2b** predicted that less endorsement of maternal care would be significantly and negatively associated with greater endorsement of the maladaptive money attitude composite score. Likewise, greater endorsement of maternal overprotection was hypothesized to be significantly and positively correlated with greater endorsement on the maladaptive money attitude composite score. The results indicate that less maternal care does not predict to greater endorsement of maladaptive money attitudes in respondents, but more maternal overprotection does predict to maladaptive money attitudes therefore this hypothesis was partially confirmed.

Once again, a simultaneous multiple regression analysis was conducted in order to estimate the relative predictive power associated with maternal care, maternal overprotection and maladaptive money attitudes. When taken together as a set, the two predictors, maternal care and maternal overprotection do predict maladaptive money attitudes ( $R^2_{\text{change}} = .06$ ,  $F = 11.05$ ,  $df = (2, 363)$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Table 5 looks at each of the predictors using standardized coefficients:

Table 5

*Simultaneous Regression Analysis for PBI Care Mother and PBI Overprotection Mother Predicting Maladaptive Money Attitudes*

Variable	Standardized Coefficients: Beta	F	Sig
PBI: Care - Mother	.06	1.11	.29
PBI: Overprotection - Mother	.26	21.07	.00***

a. Dependent Variable: Maladaptive Money Attitudes

\* $p < .05$  \*\* $p < .01$  \*\*\* $p < .001$

The p-value for maternal care is above .05 therefore it is not significant. The p-value for maternal overprotection is below .05 therefore it is significant, is of modest magnitude, and is in the direction of what was predicted. Respondents who reported that their mother was less caring

did not also report more maladaptive money attitudes, which is not consistent with expectation. On the other hand, respondents who reported more maternal overprotection were found to also report more maladaptive money attitudes.

A Priori Hypothesis on Correlations Between the Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire and the Parental Bonding Instrument:

**Hypothesis 3** predicted that greater maternal rejection as measured by the Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire would be significantly and negatively correlated with lower maternal care on the Parental Bonding Instrument. Likewise, it was predicted that greater maternal rejection on the Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire would be significantly and positively correlated with greater maternal overprotection as measured by the Parental Bonding Instrument. The results indicate that this hypothesis was completely confirmed because a very strong and significant negative correlation was found between maternal rejection as measured by the PARQ and maternal care as measured by the PBI. This means that greater maternal rejection is significantly and negatively correlated with lower maternal care. Likewise, there is a moderately strong and positive correlation between maternal rejection and maternal overprotection. Table 6 looks at the Pearson correlations used for this analysis:

Table 6  
Correlations of PARQ Mother, PBI Care Mother, and PBI Overprotection Mother

Variable	PBI: Care - Mother	PBI: Overprotection - Mother
PARQ: Total Score - Mother	-.89***	.42***

\*p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

The negative correlation of  $-.89$  between maternal rejection as measured by the PARQ and maternal care as measured by the PBI is significant, very strong, and in the predicted direction. The reason these measures are negatively correlated is due to the fact that high scores on PARQ: Total score indicate more maternal rejection and high scores on the PBI: Care construct indicates more maternal care. This implies that the same respondents who represented their mother as more rejecting also represented their mother as less caring and vice versa. Those students who represented their mother as less rejecting also represented their mother as more caring. The positive correlation of  $.42$  between maternal rejection and maternal overprotection is a moderately strong correlation and is consistent with expectation.

A Priori Hypothesis on Mediation between Maternal/Paternal rejection and Maladaptive Money Attitudes:

**Hypothesis 4** predicted that extrinsic life aspirations would mediate between maternal/paternal rejection and maladaptive money attitudes. Given the results of hypothesis 1a which found that maternal and paternal rejection do not predict to extrinsic life aspirations, this hypothesis was not tested since there is no association between maternal/paternal rejection and extrinsic life aspirations.

A Priori Hypothesis on Gender Differences in Relation to Maternal/Paternal rejection, Extrinsic Life Aspirations, and Maladaptive Money Attitudes:

**Hypothesis 5** predicted that greater amounts of both maternal and paternal rejection would predict greater endorsement of extrinsic life aspirations and greater endorsement of the maladaptive money attitude composite score, but *paternal rejection* was hypothesized to be a stronger predictor of extrinsic life aspirations and maladaptive money attitudes, when compared to maternal rejection for both males and females. Therefore, hypotheses 1a and 2a were run

again to see if effects differed by gender. No significant effects were found for males or females with regard to hypotheses 1a which tested the hypothesis that maternal/paternal rejection would be significantly and positively associated with greater extrinsic life aspirations. A significant effect was found when re-running hypothesis 2a, which predicted that greater amounts of maternal/paternal rejection would significantly and positively correlate with higher scores on the maladaptive money attitude composite score. For both males and females, a significant effect was found for maternal rejection, but a significant effect was not found for paternal rejection for either gender when predicting to greater endorsement of maladaptive money attitudes. Gender interaction was also analyzed and it was found that the effects of maternal or paternal rejection on maladaptive money attitudes do not differ for males or females, no interaction was found.

A simultaneous multiple regression analysis was performed for males in order to estimate the relative predictive power associated with maternal/paternal rejection and extrinsic life aspirations. These two predictors when taken together, maternal rejection and paternal rejection, do not significantly relate to extrinsic life aspirations for males ( $R^2_{\text{change}} = .02$ ,  $F = 1.43$ ,  $df = (2, 137)$ ,  $p = .24$ ). Table 7 looks at each of the predictors separately for males using standardized coefficients:

Table 7  
*Simultaneous Regression Analysis for PARQ Mother and PARQ Father Predicting Extrinsic Life Aspirations for Males*

Variable	Standardized Coefficients: Beta	t	Sig
PARQ: Total Score - Mother	-.02	-.23	.82
PARQ: Total Score - Father	-.13	-1.44	.15

a. Dependent Variable: Extrinsic Life Aspirations  
\* $p < .05$  \*\* $p < .01$  \*\*\* $p < .001$

The p-values for maternal and paternal rejection are both above .05, therefore there were no significant effects found for males.

The same analysis was run separately for females. Maternal rejection as well as paternal rejection, do not significantly relate to extrinsic life aspirations for females ( $R^2_{\text{change}} = .01$ ,  $F = .70$ ,  $df = (2, 221)$ ,  $p = .50$ ). Table 8 looks at each of the predictors separately for females using standardized coefficients:

Table 8

*Simultaneous Regression Analysis for PARQ Mother and PARQ Father Predicting Extrinsic Life Aspirations for Females*

Variable	Standardized Coefficients: Beta	t	Sig
PARQ: Total Score - Mother	-.05	-.76	.44
PARQ: Total Score - Father	-.05	-.68	.50

a. Dependent variable: Extrinsic Life Aspirations

\* $p < .05$  \*\* $p < .01$  \*\*\* $p < .001$

The p-values for maternal and paternal rejection are both above .05, therefore there were no significant effects found for females.

Next, a simultaneous multiple regression analysis was conducted in order to estimate the relative predictive power associated with maternal rejection, paternal rejection, and maladaptive money attitudes for males. These two predictors when taken together, maternal rejection and paternal rejection, significantly relate to maladaptive money attitudes for males ( $R^2_{\text{change}} = .11$ ,  $F = 8.79$ ,  $df = (2, 138)$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Table 9 looks at each of the predictors separately using standardized coefficients:

Table 9

*Simultaneous Regression Analysis for PARQ Mother and PARQ Father Predicting Maladaptive Money Attitudes for Males*

Model	Standardized Coefficients: Beta	t	Sig
PARQ: Total Score - Mother	.30	3.41	.00***
PARQ: Total Score - Father	.08	.87	.39

a. Dependent Variable: Maladaptive Money Attitudes

\*p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

The p-value for maternal rejection is below .05, but for paternal rejection it is above .05 therefore only maternal rejection is significant and has a moderate effect size for males.

The same analysis was run for females. A simultaneous multiple regression analysis was conducted in order to estimate the relative predictive power associated with maternal rejection, paternal rejection, and maladaptive money attitudes for females. These two predictors when taken together, maternal rejection and paternal rejection, do significantly relate to maladaptive money attitudes ( $R^2_{\text{change}} = .04$ ,  $F = 5.11$ ,  $df = (2, 221)$ ,  $p < .01$ ) for females. Table 10 looks at each of the predictors separately using standardized coefficients for females:

Table 10

*Simultaneous Regression Analysis for PARQ Mother and PARQ Father Predicting Maladaptive Money Attitudes for Females*

Variable	Standardized Coefficients: Beta	t	Sig
PARQ: Total Score - Mother	.17	2.55	.01**
PARQ: Total Score - Father	.09	1.25	.21

a. Dependent Variable: Maladaptive Money Attitudes

\*p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

The p-value for maternal rejection is below .05, but for paternal rejection it is above .05 therefore only maternal rejection is significant for females.

Lastly, a multiple regression analysis was performed between-subjects to examine gender interaction on the PARQ: Total Score for the mother ( $R^2_{\text{change}} = .08$ ,  $F = 3.21$ ,  $df = (1, 359)$ ,  $p = .07$ ) and on the PARQ: Total Score for the father ( $R^2_{\text{change}} = .08$ ,  $F = .02$ ,  $df = (1, 359)$ ,  $p = .89$ ). Since both of these p-values are not significant, the relationship between maternal rejection or paternal rejection and maladaptive money attitudes does not differ for males or females indicating that there is not a significant gender interaction.

## Discussion

The present study assessed the extent to which maternal rejection, paternal rejection, maternal care, and maternal overprotection predict extrinsic life aspirations as well as maladaptive money attitudes in the college population. This study has generated four clusters of findings: 1) Maternal and paternal rejection were found not to be significant when predicting to extrinsic life aspirations. On the other hand, maternal care was found to be significantly and positively associated with extrinsic life aspirations; this was a counter-intuitive finding that was not consistent with expectation. Maternal overprotection was also found to be significantly and positively associated with extrinsic life aspirations. 2) Maternal rejection was found to predict higher endorsement of maladaptive money attitudes in respondents, but paternal rejection was not significant. Maternal care was not significantly associated with maladaptive money attitudes, but maternal overprotection was significantly and positively associated with the maladaptive money attitude composite score. 3) There was a very strong and significant negative correlation between the Parental Acceptance-Rejection total score for the mother and the Parental Bonding Instrument maternal care score. A moderately strong positive correlation was found between the Parental Acceptance-Rejection total score for the mother and the Parental Bonding Instrument maternal overprotection score. 4) When examining gender differences in the prediction of greater endorsement of maladaptive money attitudes, a significant effect was found for maternal rejection, but not paternal rejection for both males and females. The significant effect size was slightly stronger for males than it was for females. When gender interaction was looked at, the relationship between maternal rejection and maladaptive money attitudes did not differ for males or females. These results will be discussed in detail below.



## Differentiating between Maternal Rejection and Maternal Care

It is important to take a closer look at the pattern of convergence and divergence among the constructs of maternal rejection and maternal care prior to a more in-depth discussion of the results pertaining to the core hypotheses of this project. Maternal rejection was measured using the total score from the Parental Acceptance-Rejection/Control: Mother version (PARQ) and Maternal care was measured using the care subscale of the Parental Bonding Instrument (PBI). The two measures have significant convergence in the form of the “warmth/affection”, “indifference/neglect”, and “undifferentiated rejection” subscales of the PARQ with the “care” subscale of the PBI. For example, with regard to the warmth/affection subscale of the PARQ, the item, *my mother*: “Said nice things about me” is most similar to the PBI item, *my mother*: “Spoke to me in a warm and friendly voice.” Likewise, the PARQ items, *my mother*: “Made it easy for me to tell her things that were important to me” as well as “Cared about what I thought, and liked me to talk about it,” are both similar to the PBI item, *my mother*: “Enjoyed talking things over with me.” With regard to the indifference/neglect subscale of the PARQ, the item, *my mother*: “Paid no attention when I asked for help,” is analogous to the PBI item, *my mother*: “Did not help me as much as I needed.” For the undifferentiated rejection subscale, the PARQ item, *my mother*: “Let me know I was not wanted” is akin to the PBI item, *my mother*: “Made me feel I wasn’t wanted.”

The two scales have significant divergence with regard to the hostility/aggression subscale of the PARQ which does not have an equivalent in an item by item analysis of the PBI. The PARQ items that make up the hostility/aggression subscale include, *my mother*: “Hit me, even when I did not deserve it,” “Punished me severely when she was angry,” “Said many unkind things to me,” “Went out of her way to hurt my feelings,” “Frightened or threatened me

when I did something wrong,” and “Felt other children were better than I was no matter what I did.” Therefore, the main difference between the constructs maternal rejection and maternal care involve the inclusion or exclusion of maternal hostility and aggression. The construct of maternal rejection, as measured by the PARQ, includes six items that collectively capture maternal physical, verbal, and emotional abuse while maternal care, as measured by the PBI, does not have an equivalent hostility/aggression dimension.

### **Relationships between the Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire and the Parental Bonding Instrument**

The results in this study found a very strong and significant negative correlation in the predicted direction between the Parental Acceptance-Rejection total score for the mother version and the Parental Bonding Instrument maternal care score ( $r = -.89, p < .001$ ). This implies that the respondents who represented their mother as more rejecting also represented their mother as less caring. The negative correlation can be understood in terms of high scores on the PBI indicating more maternal care and high scores on the PARQ indicating more maternal rejection. Given that the measures are similar in terms of the overlap of items that can be categorized as warmth/affection, indifference/neglect, and undifferentiated neglect this strong correlation makes sense when understood in this context.

The correlation between the Parental Acceptance-Rejection total score for the mother and the Parental Bonding Instrument maternal overprotection score ( $r = .42, p < .001$ ) is also consistent with expectation and is a moderately strong correlation. Maternal rejection can be defined as a significant withdrawal or absence of maternal warmth, affection and love as well as the presence of a range of psychologically and physically hurtful behaviors and affects toward

children (Rohner, 1975/2000b). Maternal overprotection, on the other hand, can be understood as the level of perceived parental control and intrusion. Higher scores on overprotection indicate the perception of the parent as discouraging autonomy, independence, and individuation (Parker, Tupling, & Brown, 1979). For these reasons, the constructs of maternal rejection and maternal overprotection are different yet related constructs.

### **Maternal Rejection, Paternal Rejection and Extrinsic Life Aspirations**

The results of this study indicate that maternal and paternal rejection do not predict to extrinsic life aspirations. Extrinsic goals have come to be described as materialistic goals in the literature and the distinction between extrinsic and intrinsic goals is considered to be synonymous with the distinction between materialism and the absence of materialism (Kasser, 2002). Extrinsic life aspirations include goals that are more related to external signs of worth and include aspirations of financial success, social recognition, and attractive appearance (Kasser & Ryan, 1995).

The findings from this study did not replicate previous findings in the literature in which parental styles have been associated with degree of extrinsic life aspirations. For example, Kasser et al. (1995) found that eighteen year-olds who valued the extrinsic aspiration of financial success more highly, as compared to the intrinsic aspirations of self-acceptance, had mothers who were less nurturing. Cohen & Cohn (1996) found that adolescents who were more highly oriented toward materialistic values had parents who were more likely to use punitive measures. A significant relationship was also found by Williams et al. (2000) between low autonomy-supportive parenting and adolescents' relative extrinsic life aspirations. When taken together, these studies suggest that adolescents and young adults who perceive their parents to be less

nurturing, less supportive, and more punitive are more likely to adopt extrinsic goals and endorse materialistic values.

In this study, the extrinsic attitude of financial success was not separated out from the other extrinsic attitudes of attractive appearance and social recognition because in this study, intrinsic-extrinsic attitudes were analyzed on a continuum, which is congruent with the literature. Also, the construct of parental rejection has not specifically been studied before in the literature in relation to extrinsic life aspirations. The constructs that have been studied, as cited above, include parental nurturance, punitive actions, and supportiveness, which are all constructs that are similar to parental rejection with probable significant overlap, but they are not the exact same construct, which perhaps partially accounts for why a significant relationship was not found in this study. More specifically, the broadness of the summary variable may have had a watering down effect that might partially account for the non-significant relationship. It should be noted that, the finding that maternal and paternal rejection do not predict extrinsic life aspirations was unexpected given the previous findings in the literature, and thus the finding is puzzling and requires further replication.

### **Maternal Care, Maternal Overprotection and Extrinsic Life Aspirations**

The study did find that both maternal care and maternal overprotection are significantly and positively associated with extrinsic life aspirations. Respondents who perceived their mother to be more caring were also found to endorse higher extrinsic life goals, which was not consistent with expectation and is a counter-intuitive finding that is not supported in the literature. As stated previously, the literature suggests that adolescents and young adults who perceive their parents to be more caring and supportive are less likely to adopt extrinsic goals

(Cohen & Cohn, 1996; Kasser et al., 1995; Williams et al., 2000). Greater maternal care predicting to extrinsic life aspirations ( $\beta = .14, p < .05$ ) can be contextualized partially in terms of the relatively weak effect size even though it is significant. It is also possible, given the number of measures the respondents were asked to fill out, and since the Parental Bonding Instrument was the last instrument they completed and was in some ways redundant to the Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire, that the respondents may have been fatigued and/or rushing through when answering the maternal care items of the Parental Bonding Instrument. At present, the finding is puzzling and requires further replication to determine if it was just an artifact.

On the other hand, consistent with expectation, respondents who reported more maternal overprotection were found to also report more extrinsic life goals, though once again, the magnitude was not very large ( $\beta = .13, p < .05$ ). In the literature, parental overprotection and parental control are often used interchangeably. Parental psychological control has been shown to be negatively related to peer support (Karavasillis, Doyle, & Markiewicz, 2003), positively related to general social anxiety (Loukas, Paulos, & Robinson, 2005), positively related to aggressive behaviors toward peers (Nelson & Circk, 2002), and negatively related to school grades (Aunola & Nurmi, 2004) in children. The bulk of the parental overprotection research is centered on perceptions of parental overprotection predicting to high anxiety levels in adult offspring (Bennet & Stirling, 1998; Manfredi et al., 2011; Smari, Martinsson, & Hjalti, 2010; Parker, 1981; Taylor & Alden, 2006; Tearnan & Telch, 1988).

This being said, what may appear to be overprotective in one population may actually be protective in another population. Endorsing high levels of maternal overprotection may have different meanings for white, suburban, middle/upper class students when compared to minority,

urban, lower/working class students. With regard to maternal overprotection in particular, what may appear as hovering and controlling in the context of economic surplus may in fact be protective in the context of relative economic deprivation. It is important to note that there is not a clear-cut line between psychological and behavioral control and therefore there is not a one-to-one relation between psychological and behavioral control with emotional and behavioral outcomes (Wang et al., 2007). In general, there is a lack of substantial research in the area of parental psychological and behavioral control/overprotection in relation to extrinsic life aspirations of offspring, especially with regard to low income minority populations. Therefore the results from this study contribute to the literature.

### **Maternal Rejection, Paternal Rejection, and Maladaptive Money Attitudes**

It was found in this study that greater maternal rejection does significantly and positively correlate with greater maladaptive money attitudes ( $\beta = .20, p < .001$ ), but that paternal rejection does not correlate with maladaptive money attitudes ( $\beta = .09, p = .16$ ). To date, and to this author's knowledge, this is the first study to empirically examine the relationships between maternal rejection, paternal rejection, and money attitudes. Based on the literature, Gellerman's (1963) theory of money motivation hypothesized that children who feel rejected by their parents grow up to symbolize money as security and love. He believed that in particular, maternal rejection would predict to maladaptive money attitudes. More specifically, he theorized that the symbolic meaning of money for the money-driven adult would relate to the childhood wish for an idealized mother who "loves, shelters, and above all is constant" (p. 168). Gellerman focused on maternal rejection and did not write about paternal rejection. The results of this study support and expand on Gellerman's theory of money motivation with regard to maternal rejection predicting to maladaptive money attitudes.

Maladaptive money attitudes involve the belief that money is a symbol of success, combined with attitudes of suspicion and doubt, as well as money being a source of anxiety and tension (Engelberg & Sjoberg, 2006; Yamauchi & Templer, 1982). The maladaptive money attitude composite score is made up of the three subscales: power-prestige, anxiety, and distrust. The power-prestige factor describes the extent to which a person views money as a symbol of success, the anxiety factor includes the attitude that money is a source of tension and indicates nervousness in interactions surrounding money, and the distrust factor includes fears of being depleted, taken advantage of, and feeling like one never has enough money (Yamauchi & Templer, 1982). It has been written that money is one of the most emotionally meaningful objects in contemporary life (Krueger, 1986) and that success is defined materialistically for many Americans (Wachtel, 2003). Money can represent a sense of support and security that can take the place of a social network for money-oriented adults (Engelberg & Sjoberg, 2006). Likewise, maladaptive money attitudes in particular may represent an attempt to feel more secure or self-sooth, as well as the wish to be validated, loved, and recognized from external sources that function as a substitute for a lack of maternal acceptance.

It is important to reflect on the meaning of maladaptive money attitudes in the context of this particular sample, which includes predominantly lower income minority college students. This sample, made up predominantly of Hispanic, Asian, and African-Americans students from lower SES, examines a population that is relatively under-represented in the majority of research studies. Adaptive and maladaptive money attitudes exist on a continuum . Within the context of this sample, which has experienced significant relative economic deprivation, highly endorsing money as a symbol of success in particular can be understood to be adaptive even though the study was designed to address this attitude as a maladaptive one. Many of the students in this

sample are in school in order to obtain degrees with the hope of escaping high levels of poverty. Thus, endorsing money as a symbol of success and viewing money as a status symbol have very different meanings for them than for white, suburban, middle/upper class students. As stated previously, what appears maladaptive in one context may in fact be adaptive in another context.

It is interesting that in this study, maternal rejection was found to significantly and positively correlate with greater maladaptive money attitudes, but paternal rejection was not. One reason for this finding may be due to the role of the mother, who is more likely to be the primary caregiver when compared to the father. In all western societies, women continue undertake the bulk of caring for children and housework (Treas & Drobnic, 2010). Although the depiction of fatherhood seems to be moving toward a social ideal consisting of a more emotionally involved, nurturing, coparent (Craig, 2006) with an increasing role for childcare and housework tasks, the main role of fathers continues to be the provision of economic support (Wall & Arnold, 2007). Conversely, notwithstanding the many ways in which the role of women in society has changed, it continues to be mothers who bear the majority of responsibility for young children even though the conduct of fathers has changed to some degree (Craig, 2006; Ranson, 2001). Therefore the impact of maternal rejection may have been experienced more negatively by respondents than paternal rejection, suggesting an explanation for why maternal rejection predicts to maladaptive money attitudes and paternal rejection does not.

### **Maternal Care, Maternal Overprotection and Maladaptive Money Attitudes**

To date, and to this author's knowledge, this is the first study to empirically examine the relationships between maternal care, maternal overprotection, and money attitudes. As stated previously, maternal care measures the level of perceived maternal nurturance, warmth, and



empathy while maternal overprotection measures the level of perceived maternal psychological and behavioral control and intrusion. In this study, low scores on maternal care were not found to be significantly associated with maladaptive money attitudes ( $\beta = .06, P = .29$ ), but maternal overprotection was significantly and positively associated with the maladaptive money attitude composite score ( $\beta = .26, p < .001$ ). It is interesting that maternal rejection was found to predict maladaptive money attitudes, but maternal care did not. One reason for this finding may be related to the way in which the two scales are different. As stated previously, maternal rejection, as measured by the PARQ, includes a hostility/aggression subscale that taps into maternal physical, verbal, and emotional abuse. In contrast, the PBI, which was the measure employed for maternal care, does not. For this reason, greater amounts of maternal hostility and aggression seem to best explain the significant association between maternal rejection and maladaptive money attitudes. The fact that low scores for maternal care were not found to predict maladaptive money attitudes is noteworthy, because without the component of maternal hostility/aggression, the degree of maternal care does not relate to maladaptive money attitudes in offspring.

In contrast to the measure of maternal care, maternal overprotection was found to be significantly and positively associated with maladaptive money attitudes, with a modest effect size. There is a lack of research in the area of maternal overprotection in relation to maladaptive money attitudes of offspring, and consequently the results from this study contribute usefully to the literature. As stated previously, maternal control/overprotection is considered to be a form of maternal insensitivity that is not based on the needs of the child, but is based on the needs and motivations of the mother (Hughes et al., 2005). Higher scores on maternal overprotection indicate the perception of the mother as discouraging of individuation, autonomy, and

independence (Parker, Tupling, & Brown, 1979). This indicates that those respondents who perceived their mother to be more psychologically and behaviorally controlling also perceived money more maladaptively by rating more highly the power-prestige, anxiety, and distrust money attitudes subscale scores. This makes sense, given that in the literature, parental control and overprotection have been associated with a host of negative outcomes in offspring, including anxiety (Bennet & Stirling, 1998; Manfredi et al., 2011) and depression (Parker, 1981; Parker, 1983a).

### **Parental Rejection, Extrinsic Life Aspirations, Maladaptive Money Attitudes, and Gender Differences**

When maternal and paternal rejection were analyzed in relation to maladaptive money attitudes, a significant effect was found for maternal rejection both for males ( $\beta = .30, p < .01$ ) and for females ( $\beta = .17, p < .01$ ), but a significant effect was not found for either gender for paternal rejection. With regard to maternal rejection, the significant effect size was slightly stronger for males than for females when predicting to maladaptive money attitudes. There were no significant effects for the gender of subjects when maternal and paternal rejection were analyzed in relation to extrinsic life aspirations. A between-subjects test was performed to examine gender interaction in this study and gender interaction was not found. Given that a gender interaction was not found, the results of this study indicate that the main effects can be interpreted.

### **Cross-Cultural Issues and Attitudes toward Money**

In this study, the sample is racially and ethnically diverse, with 32% of the respondents of Hispanic background, 23% Asian, 13% African-American, and 12% Caucasian. The remainder

of the sample (20%) is made up of “other” racial/ethnic backgrounds which include Native American, Alaskan Native, Pacific Islander, and Mixed Races, with the vast majority reporting mixed race. The diversity of the sample is a strength of this study, but it is important to contextualize the diversity given that attitudes toward money are shaped by cultural factors that are reinforced by society and differ by country of origin (Bailey & Lown, 2007; Furnham, Kirkcaldy, & Lynn, 1994; Masuo & Reddy, 1998; Tang, Furnham, & Davis, 2003; Tang, Arocas, & Sutarso, 2004). Culture determines what money is, how money is used, and what is used as money. At the macrolevel, this includes large meaning and belief systems such as the civil and religious values of society. At the microlevel, this involves the beliefs, attitudes, and values of individuals that influence their behavior with regard to money (Baker & Jimerson, 1992).

National attitudes toward money have been studied by Furnham, Kirkcaldy, & Lynn (1994) using a sample of 12,000 college students from 41 countries on all five continents. Along with variables such as competitiveness and work ethic, their study examined money beliefs specifically the importance attached to money. Attitudes to money, savings, and competitiveness were found to be fairly strongly and positively associated with economic growth, but were negatively related to gross domestic product. Therefore, the importance attached to money, as well as competitiveness and savings, were found to be predictors of growth but not wealth. Cross-national differences were examined in work-related and monetary beliefs. The European countries included: Belgium, Bulgaria, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, and Yugoslavia. As a whole, Europeans scored lower on the importance attached to money, competitiveness, and saving attitudes compared to non-Europeans. A second analysis compared subjects from Europe, the Americas, the Middle East, and Far East. Students from the Americas included: Argentina,

Brazil, Chile, Columbia, Mexico, USA, and Venezuela and as a whole scored highest on savings and work ethic. On the other hand, Asian/Eastern countries: Bangladesh, China, Hong King, India, Iraq, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Korea, Singapore, Syria, Taiwan, Turkey, and the United Arab Emirates scores highest on the importance attached to money and on competitiveness.

Another study conducted by Ang (2000) compared the “wonders” of money, also known as belief in money, (which is comparable to the importance of money) among two Western economies – Canada and Hawaii and two Asian economies – Hong Kong and Singapore. Subjects consisted of a total of 393 young adults studying business at universities. The results indicate that Canadians believed money can do wonders more so than Singaporeans and Hong Kongers, while Hawaiians’ attitudes toward money hovered between those of Canadians and Asians. These findings were understood to suggest a negative relationship between cost of living and belief in money. In essence, belief in the power of money was found to be highest among the Canadians. It may be noted that Canada has a developed social welfare system and therefore has a lower cost of living than the other three economies that were studied.

Falicov (2001) examined Latinos’ (immigrants from Latin America) and Anglo-Americans’ different conceptualizations of how money is symbolized and used. In exploring meanings of money, some variables were confounded in their study: Roman Catholic, working class Latinos were compared to middle-class, Protestant Anglo-Americans. The most salient difference between Latinos’ and Anglo-Americans’ uses of money related to a collectivist vs. individualistic perspective. The collectivist view primarily held by Latinos tended to stress family unity, in which money was often pooled to be used by family members in various ways, in contrast to Anglo-Americans, who tended to consider money as an individual reward for one’s hard work.

Racial differences have been found in relation to perceptions of money when comparing African-American males and females with Caucasian males and females. For example, a study consisting of 210 full-time employees in the United States examined a model of pay satisfaction and argued that the income-pay satisfaction relationship depends on one's love of money and also to whom one compares oneself. When Caucasian males and females were compared to African-American males and females, it was found that income significantly increased the importance of the love of money attitude for African-American females, but not for Caucasian males. This was explained in terms of income enhancing the love of money for African-American females due to pay inequality. In general, African-American females are more likely to experience financial hardship, have less income, and therefore place a greater importance on money when compared to Caucasian male counterparts. The love of money was defined as the extent to which an individual is motivated by money, the desire to have more money and how much money represents success (Tang, Tang, & Homaifar, 2006).

In a study by Tang et al. (2003) money attitudes and several work related beliefs were compared between professional employees in Taiwan, the United States, and the United Kingdom. Once educational levels, age, and sex were controlled for, it was found that American employees had the strongest feeling that money was good and had the highest organization-based self-esteem, while the Chinese employees in Taiwan had the highest respect for money, the lowest intrinsic job satisfaction, and the strongest endorsement of the Protestant work ethic. The British had the strongest belief that money represented power. The factors good, evil, achievement, respect, budget, and freedom were derived from the Money Ethic Scale (Tang, 1992, 1995). The factor that money is "good" differs from the factor "respect" for money in that respect involves self-esteem and the perception that money is honorable, can bring one many

friends, and earns respect from the community. The perception that money is “good” includes viewing money as valuable, attractive, valued highly, and important.

The literature on national and cross-cultural attitudes toward money is scarce and is in need of more attention. Even though this study is not comparing and contrasting different cultures, it contributes to the literature with regard to the diversity of the sample and by examining maladaptive money attitudes in particular, which had not been studied to date within the cross-cultural literature.

### **Clinical Implications**

The results of this study indicate that maternal rejection predicts to maladaptive money attitudes for both males and females, but especially for males. Likewise, maternal overprotection also predicts to maladaptive money attitudes and extrinsic life aspirations. The clinical implications of these findings include the importance of gathering a detailed family history when working therapeutically with a patient who is struggling with maladaptive money attitudes and extrinsic life aspirations. More specially, it is important that clinicians be aware of, ask about, and listen for themes relating to perceived maternal rejection and overprotection in particular.

To date, clinical psychology has not adequately focused on problematic money attitudes and behaviors aside from pathological gambling as an area of concern or offered interventions for disordered money attitudes (Klontz et al., 2008). The DSM-V (American Psychiatric Association, 2013) lists Gambling Disorder under the heading: Non-Substance-Related Disorders. The only other clinical area in which the DSM-V addresses money is the section labeled: Other Conditions That May Be A Focus of Clinical Attention, such as: economic problems consisting of a lack of adequate food or safe drinking water, extreme poverty, low

income, insufficient social insurance or welfare support, and unspecified housing or economic problems. Gallen (2002) proposed that a “money disorder” has underlying emotional causes and functions as a way to avoid feeling a range of intense and unresolved emotions and conflicts. Disordered money behaviors are defined in the literature as maladaptive financial behaviors, attitudes, and beliefs that impair social and/or occupational functioning, lead to clinically significant distress, undue financial strain, and/or the inability to enjoy one’s financial resources. Destructive financial attitudes, behaviors, and beliefs are related to money scripts, which are rooted in painful emotions associated with past relationships and events that don’t necessarily reflect reality and are often passed down through generations, can be unconscious, and are internalized in childhood (Klontz et al., 2008).

In a *New York Times* op-ed article (2014, January 18), Sam Polk wrote about working on Wall Street and how he became a self-proclaimed “wealth addict”. His therapist reportedly made him aware that he had been using money the same way he had previously used alcohol and drugs – as a means to make himself feel more powerful. Feeling powerful was important because as a child he had felt very powerless. According to Polk (personal communication, February 17, 2014) he described his mother as rejecting, but not overprotective, when he was growing up. He depicted both of his parents as having “rage issues” and reported that “in a thousand different ways they communicated that I was unimportant, and I was often afraid either of violence or of being forgotten about”. More specifically, his mother was portrayed as being “out of it a lot” and he was typically the last one to be picked up from baseball practice when he was younger. His father, on the other hand, was described as having been a “full-blown narcissist”. Polk stated in the op-ed article that no matter how much money he made as an adult, he never felt like he was making enough, even despite his bonus of \$3.6 million. His anxiety about money is an example

of distorted thinking in the form of a maladaptive money attitude. After leaving Wall Street and a hedge fund, he discussed struggling with withdrawal symptoms and found himself waking up at night panicked and fearful about the idea of running out of money. He went on to assert that he believes that the huge disparity between the poor and the rich, as well as the annihilation of the middle class, is created by wealth addicts and that addiction researchers have not paid the concept enough attention.

Philip Slater (1980), the late sociologist and playwright coined the term “wealth addiction” and defined it as an attitude toward money that is experienced as a need that is not only intense and chronic, but also feels as if it were essential to one’s sense of wholeness; the pursuit of wealth is used to fill what is perceived to be a lack in one’s sense of self and money is believed to be needed to complete the personality. With wealth addiction, Slater reported that “the harm lies less in wanting money or security than with the fact that our concern with these things deprives us of more nourishing human satisfactions – love, friendship, adventure, physical well-being, and so on” (pp. 37-38). In the literature, wealth addiction and greed are very similar constructs. He concluded that addiction to wealth is a social and psychological issue that is curable through a reflective process of simultaneously letting go and allowing the parts of oneself that have been silenced to emerge, which is analogous to a therapeutic process.

In this study, maladaptive money attitudes included high responses on subscales measuring anxiety, power-prestige, and distrust. This encompasses nervousness and anxiety in interactions surrounding money, the extent to which a person believes money is a symbol of success, and fears of being taken advantage of, being depleted, and feeling like one never has enough money (Yamauchi & Templer, 1982). The clinical and societal implications of maladaptive money attitudes include the recognition that money continues to be the last



emotional taboo (Krueger, 1986) because it remains difficult to talk about not only within the therapeutic encounter, but within the context of the broader consumer American culture.

Contemporary American society advertises shopping as a solution to a myriad of psychological difficulties and success tends to be defined materialistically for many Americans (Wachtel, 2003). This perhaps helps to explain why Gambling Disorder is the only money-related disorder in the DSM-V to date; many potentially problematic attitudes toward money are societally normative.

### **Limitations of the Study**

There are several limitations to the current study. First, the study is limited by the use of an undergraduate college sample from a predominantly urban working class/lower class background which may have limited applicability to a broader population. As a result, it is possible that the sample is made up of participants who have little work experience, which may shape their attitudes toward money. At the same time, the strength of this particular sample includes the size (366 adults), as well as the racial and ethnic diversity and the age range which spans from 18 to 47 years. Future work would benefit from testing the relationships among the main variables with working professionals, as well as a more affluent sample.

Another limitation is the use of self-report measures due to the potential biases that are inherent with this type of measurement. Self-reports are known to have validity issues with regard to participants over-reporting or under-reporting. For example, participants might be embarrassed to reveal the extent of maternal or paternal rejection due to social desirability bias which is a systematic error in self-report measures due to the basic human tendency to present oneself in the best possible light. The result is data that are biased toward participants'

perceptions of what is socially acceptable (Fisher, 1993; Maccoby & Maccoby, 1954).

Dependence on self-report data with respect to the perception of parental rejection, extrinsic life aspirations, and maladaptive money attitudes may be problematic with regard to the likelihood of respondents' under-reporting on these particular self-report measures due to social desirability bias.

Correlational studies are used to look for relationships between variables, but they cannot prove that one variable causes a change in another variable. For this reason, even though maternal rejection and maternal overprotection predict to maladaptive money attitudes, this does not imply that maternal rejection and maternal overprotection cause the maladaptive money attitudes. Other variables and factors that were not tested might play a role.

Lastly, the quality of parent-child relationships was measured using the Adult Parental Acceptance-Rejection-Control: Mother version and Father version (PARQ; Rohner, 2005) and the Parental Bonding Inventory (PBI; Parker, Tupling & Brown, 1979) which both require that participants rate perceptions of their parents as remembered from childhood. The PARQ involved perceptions of maternal and paternal acceptance-rejection as remembered and having occurred in childhood between the ages of 7-12 years old and the PBI assessed adult memories of mother-child relationships during the first 16 years of life. Memory of one's childhood is malleable and is influenced by a myriad of variables, including current circumstances and choices that people make in the present. For these reasons, the potential to revise or distort the facts of one's childhood, known as recall bias, can be viewed as another limitation of the present study.

## Conclusion and Future Directions

In a broad sense, this study supports Gellerman's (1963) hypothesis that money attitudes vary from person to person as a function of their life history. Based on the results of this study, maternal rejection was found to predict greater endorsement of maladaptive money attitudes, but paternal rejection did not predict to maladaptive money attitudes. Lower endorsement of maternal care was not found to predict to greater endorsement of maladaptive money attitudes, but more maternal overprotection was found to predict to maladaptive money attitudes.

On the other hand, greater maternal and paternal rejection were not found to correlate with greater extrinsic life aspirations. For this reason, the mediation of extrinsic life aspirations between maternal/paternal rejection and maladaptive money attitudes was not tested since an association was not found. A higher endorsement of maternal overprotection, as well as higher maternal care, were both found to predict to a greater endorsement of extrinsic life aspirations. A moderately strong and positive correlation was found between maternal rejection and maternal overprotection. Likewise, a very strong and significant negative correlation was found between maternal rejection and maternal care.

This study also examined gender differences and interactions in association with maladaptive money attitudes. When examining gender differences in the prediction of greater endorsement of maladaptive money attitudes, a significant effect was found for maternal rejection, but not paternal rejection, for both males and females. The significant effect size was slightly stronger for males, but there was no gender interaction.

Future work would benefit from testing the relationship among maladaptive money attitudes, parental rejection, and extrinsic life aspirations with more affluent samples that are

composed of older adults and working professionals. Due to time constraints in this study, the Parental Bonding Instrument only examined maternal care and maternal overprotection; future studies would benefit from administering the PBI measure that specifically examines paternal care and overprotection. Likewise, using more objective types of measures in order to reduce social desirability bias are also future directions to be considered.

## Appendices

### Appendix 1: Survey Items

#### Demographics

1. What is your age?
2. What is your race/ethnicity?
3. Are you male or female?
4. What is your religious affiliation?
5. What is your current relationship status?
6. What is your current employment status?
7. What is your current socioeconomic status?
8. What was the socioeconomic status of your family when you were growing up? (If family circumstances changed, indicate the socioeconomic status which best describes your family growing up).
9. What is your personal income?
10. What is your household income? (Household income is defined as the combined income of all household members and is from all sources including wages, social security, bonuses, commissions, investments, unemployment insurance, disability payments, child support payments received, etc.).

**The Couples Satisfaction Index** (Funk & Rogge, 2007). *Ratings are based on a likert-scale that ranges from not at all to completely (1 = not at all – 5 = completely).*

1. If you are in a relationship, then please indicate the degree of happiness, all things considered, of your relationship.
2. I have a warm and comfortable relationship with my partner.
3. How rewarding is your relationship with your partner?
4. In general, how satisfied are you with your relationship?

**The Aspirations Index** (Kasser & Ryan, 1996). Ratings are based on a likert-scale that ranges from not at all to vary (1 = not at all – 5 = very) regarding the importance dimension and from very low to very high (1 = very low – 5 = very high) regarding the chances dimension.

This first set of questions asks you about the future. Rate each item by circling how important it is to you that it happen in the future. Then circle the chances that it will happen in the future.

#### IN THE FUTURE...

1. You will be physically healthy.
2. Your name will be known by many people.
3. You will have people comment often about how attractive you look.
4. You will have a lot of expensive possessions.

5. You will be famous.
6. You will donate time or money to charity.
7. You will feel good about your level of physical fitness.
8. You will be the one in charge of your life.
9. You will have good friends that you can count on.
10. You will keep up with fashions in hair and clothing.
11. You will teach others the things that you know.
12. You will have a job that pays well.
13. You will exercise regularly.
14. You will share your life with someone you love.
15. You will be admired by many people.
16. At the end of your life, you will look back on your life as meaningful and complete.
17. You will avoid things bad for your health (such as smoking, excessive alcohol, etc.)
18. You will have people who care about you and are supportive.
19. You will work for the betterment of society.
20. You will be married to one person for life.
21. You will be your own boss.
22. You will achieve the "look" you've been after.
23. You will deal effectively with problems that come up in your life.
24. You will feel energetic and full of life.
25. You will have a job with high social status.
26. You will have good, open relationships with your children.
27. You will work to make the world a better place.
28. You will successfully hide the signs of aging.
29. Your name will appear frequently in the media.
30. You will know people that you can have fun with.
31. You will be relatively free from sickness.
32. You will help others improve their lives.
33. Your body shape and type will be fairly close to ideal.
34. You will buy things just because you want them.
35. You will know and accept who you really are.
36. You will eat healthfully and moderately.
37. You will be financially successful.
38. You will do something that brings you much recognition.
39. You will help people in need.
40. You will have a couple of good friends that you can talk to about personal things.
41. You will be talked about years after your death.
42. Your image will be one others find appealing.

**Money Attitude Scale** (Ymauchi & Templer, 1982). Ratings are based on a likert-scale that ranged from never to always (1 = never – 7 = always).

The statements in this questionnaire represent common behaviors associated with money. Read each statement and then circle the category underneath each statement to indicate the extent you engage in the behavior. There are no right or wrong answers. You are encouraged to be free and candid in responding. Please respond to every statement.

1. I put money aside on a regular basis for the future
2. I keep track of my money
3. Although I should judge success of people by their deeds, I am more influenced by the amount of money they have
4. It bothers me when I discover I could have gotten something for less elsewhere
5. I hesitate to spend money, even on necessities
6. I have money available in the event of another economic depression
7. I use money to influence other people to do things for me
8. When I make a major purchase, I have the suspicion that I've been taken advantage of
9. It's hard for me to pass up a bargain
10. In all honesty, I own nice things in order to impress others
11. After buying something, I wonder if I could have gotten the same for less elsewhere
12. I do financial planning for the future
13. I seem to find that I show more respect to people with more money than I have
14. I follow a careful financial budget
15. I show worrisome behavior when it comes to money
16. I behave as if money were the ultimate symbol of success
17. When I buy something, I complain about the price I paid
18. People I know tell me that I place too much emphasis on the amount of money a person has as a sign of success
19. I spend money to make myself feel better
20. I am very prudent with money
21. I must admit that I sometimes boast about how much money I make
22. I show signs of nervousness when I don't have enough money
23. I save now to prepare for my old age
24. I must admit that I purchase things because I know they will impress others
25. I worry that I will not be financially secure
26. I try to find out if other people make more money than I do
27. I automatically say, "I can't afford it," whether I can or not
28. I argue or complain about the cost of things I buy
29. I am bothered when I have to pass up a sale

**Adult Parental Acceptance-Rejection/Control** (Rohner, 2005). Ratings are based on a likert-scale that from almost never true to almost always true (1 = almost never true – 4 = almost always true) for both father and mother versions.

The following pages contain a number of statements describing the way fathers sometimes act toward their children. Read each statement carefully and think how well it describes the way your father treated you when you were about 7-12 years old. Work quickly. Give your first impression and move on to the next item. Do not dwell on any item.

Four boxes are drawn after each sentence. If the statement is *basically* true about the way your father treated you, then ask yourself “Was it almost *always* true?” or “Was it only *sometimes* true?” If you think your father almost always treated you that way, put an X in the box ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE; if the statement was sometimes true about the way your father treated you

then mark **SOMETIMES TRUE**. If you feel the statement is basically *untrue* about the way your father treated you then ask yourself, “Was it *rarely* true?” or “Was it almost *never* true?” If it is rarely true about the way your father treated you put an **X** in the box **RARELY TRUE**; if you feel the statement is almost never true mark **ALMOST NEVER TRUE**.

Remember, there is no right or wrong answer to any statement, so be as honest as you can. Respond to each statement the way you feel your father really was rather than the way you might have liked him to be.

Respondent's significant male caregiver (father, stepfather, etc.): \_\_\_\_\_

My Father:

1. Said nice things about me
2. Paid no attention to me
3. Saw to it that I knew exactly what I may or may not do
4. Made it easy for me to tell him things that were important to me
5. Hit me, even when I did not deserve it
6. Saw me as a big nuisance
7. Was always telling me how I should behave
8. Punished me severely when he was angry
9. Was too busy to answer my questions
10. Seemed to dislike me
11. Was really interested in what I did
12. Said many unkind things to me
13. Paid no attention when I asked for help
14. Insisted that I must do exactly as I was told
15. Made me feel wanted and needed
16. Paid a lot of attention to me
17. Went out of his way to hurt my feelings
18. Forgot important things I thought he should remember
19. Made me feel not loved any more if I misbehaved
20. Let me do anything I wanted to do
21. Made me feel what I did was important
22. Frightened or threatened me when I did something wrong
23. Cared about what I thought, and liked me to talk about it
24. Felt other children were better than I was no matter what I did
25. Let me know I was not wanted
26. Wanted to control whatever I did
27. Let me know he loved me
28. Paid no attention to me as long as I did nothing to bother him
29. Treated me gently and with kindness

The following pages contain a number of statements describing the way mothers sometimes act toward their children. Read each statement carefully and think how well it describes the way



your mother treated you when you were about 7-12 years old. Work quickly. Give your first impression and move on to the next item. Do not dwell on any item.

Four boxes are drawn after each sentence. If the statement is *basically* true about the way your mother treated you, then ask yourself “Was it almost *always* true?” or “Was it only *sometimes* true?” If you think your mother almost always treated you that way, put an X in the box ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE; if the statement was sometimes true about the way your mother treated you then mark SOMETIMES TRUE. If you feel the statement is basically *untrue* about the way your mother treated you then ask yourself, “Was it *rarely* true?” or “Was it almost *never* true?” If it is rarely true about the way your mother treated you put an X in the box RARELY TRUE; if you feel the statement is almost never true mark ALMOST NEVER TRUE.

Remember, there is no right or wrong answer to any statement, so be as honest as you can. Respond to each statement the way you feel your mother really was rather than the way you might have liked her to be.

Respondent's significant female caregiver (mother, stepmother, etc.) \_\_\_\_\_

My Mother:

1. Said nice things about me
2. Paid no attention to me
3. Saw to it that I knew exactly what I may or may not do
4. Made it easy for me to tell her things that were important to me
5. Hit me, even when I did not deserve it
6. Saw me as a big nuisance
7. Was always telling me how I should behave
8. Punished me severely when she was angry
9. Was too busy to answer my questions
10. Seemed to dislike me
11. Was really interested in what I did
12. Said many unkind things to me
13. Paid no attention when I asked for help
14. Insisted that I must do exactly as I was told
15. Made me feel wanted and needed
16. Paid a lot of attention to me
17. Went out of her way to hurt my feelings
18. Forgot important things I thought she should remember
19. Made me feel not loved any more if I misbehaved
20. Let me do anything I wanted to do
21. Made me feel what I did was important
22. Frightened or threatened me when I did something wrong
23. Cared about what I thought, and liked me to talk about it
24. Felt other children were better than I was no matter what I did
25. Let me know I was not wanted
26. Wanted to control whatever I did

27. Let me know she loved me
28. Paid no attention to me as long as I did nothing to bother her
29. Treated me gently and with kindness

**Parental Bonding Inventory** (Parker, Tupling & Brown, 1979) ratings are based on a likert-scale that ranges from very unlike the parent's behavior to very like the parent's behavior (0 = very unlike - 3 = very like).

This questionnaire lists various attitudes and behaviors of parents. As you remember your MOTHER in your first 16 years would you place a tick in the most appropriate box next to each question.

My Mother:

1. Spoke to me in a warm and friendly voice
2. Did not help me as much as I needed
3. Let me do those things I liked doing
4. Seemed emotionally cold to me
5. Appeared to understand my problems and worries
6. Was affectionate to me
7. Liked me to make my own decisions
8. Did not want me to grow up
9. Tried to control everything I did
10. Invaded my privacy
11. Enjoyed talking things over with me
12. Frequently smiled at me
13. Tended to baby me
14. Did not seem to understand what I needed or wanted
15. Let me decide things for myself
16. Made me feel I wasn't wanted
17. Could make me feel better when I was upset
18. Did not talk with me very much
19. Tried to make me feel dependent on her
20. Felt I could not look after myself unless she was around
21. Gave me as much freedom as I wanted
22. Let me go out as often as I wanted
23. Was overprotective of me
24. Did not praise me
25. Let me dress in any way I pleased

## Appendix 2: Consent Form

### CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH PROJECT

**Project Title:** Perceptions of Money: Relationships between Remembered Parental Rejection, Extrinsic Life Aspirations and Maladaptive Attitudes toward Money

Principal Investigator:

Rebecca Smith, M.A., Graduate Student  
Doctoral Program in Clinical Psychology  
The City College of New York  
N.A.C. Building 8/101  
Convent Avenue at 138<sup>th</sup> Street  
New York, NY 10031  
Tel.: (212) 650-5674

Faculty Advisor:

Paul L. Wachtel, Ph.D.  
CUNY Distinguished Professor  
Doctoral Program in Clinical Psychology  
The City College of New York  
N.A.C. Building 8/129  
Convent Avenue at 138<sup>th</sup> Street  
New York, NY 10031  
Tel.: (212) 650-5660

Site where study is to be conducted: This study is an Internet-based study therefore the site where the study is to be conducted includes the URL: <http://www.MoneyAttitudeStudy.com> and <https://www.psychdata.com/s.asp?SID=153223>. The site will include The City College of the City University of New York.

**Introduction/Purpose:** You are invited to participate in a research study. You have been invited because you are 18 years or older. The study is conducted under the direction of Rebecca Smith, M.A., Graduate Student, Doctoral Program in Clinical Psychology. The purpose of this research study is to examine a variety of factors that may shape adult attitudes toward money and may influence life goals.

**Procedures:** You can complete the online survey all at once, or you can go over parts of it, save your answers, and come back to it later to finish it. The entire survey should take 20-35 minutes to complete. Some of the questions in the survey will ask about your attitudes, feelings, or behaviors, including some you might find sensitive or personal. You can skip questions you do

not want to answer. This survey will not ask you for any identifiable information, so all of your answers will remain completely anonymous.

Possible Discomforts and Risks: It is possible that some of the survey questions might make you uncomfortable. In the event that a question makes you experience psychological discomfort or distress, and you want to speak to someone about it, you can contact the free and confidential helpline 1-800-LIFENET where trained mental health professionals can help you find mental health services.

Benefits: There are no direct benefits to participating in this study. Your participation, however, may be helpful in advancing the field of psychology and it may also provide you with an opportunity to think about the role money might play in your own life.

Alternatives to Participation: At any time you can choose to not participate in this study. If you are an undergraduate student then alternatives to participation in this study can be offered by your instructor.

Voluntary Participation: Your participation in this study is voluntary, and you may decide not to participate without prejudice, penalty, or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

Financial Considerations: Participation in this study will involve no cost to the participant.

Compensation: Three participants, out of the total number of participants, will be randomly selected by a lottery to receive one of three Amazon gift cards. The three gift card prizes will be valued respectively at \$250, \$100, and \$50. To participate in this lottery, you will need to fill out a second and completely separate survey (“email survey”) which will ask you to provide an email address that does not contain your name. The “email survey” is NOT linked in any way to the research survey. At the completion of the study, once the three Amazon gift card winners have been randomly selected and notified then your email will be deleted without a recovery option. City University students who are in the subject pool will receive one credit for their research participation in line with the policy of the Department of Psychology at City College. To receive this credit, you will need to fill out a third and completely separate survey (“name survey”) which only asks your name. The “name survey” is NOT linked in any way to the research survey. Once your name has been sent to the City College Psychology Department for credit allocation, it will be deleted without a recovery option.

Confidentiality: Participants are encouraged to protect their own confidentiality by completing this survey in a private setting. The survey is hosted by PsychData which is encrypted using 256-bit SSL Technology that is equivalent to the industry standard for securely transmitting credit card information over the Internet. Once the study has been completed, the anonymous data collected will be securely stored for possible future research.

Contact Questions/Persons: If you have any questions about the research now or in the future, you should contact the Principal Investigator, Rebecca Smith, at [Rsmith2@gc.cuny.edu](mailto:Rsmith2@gc.cuny.edu). If you have any questions concerning your rights as a participant in this study, you may contact the IRB Administrator, Tricia Mayhew-Noel, at [tmayhewnoel@ccny.cuny.edu](mailto:tmayhewnoel@ccny.cuny.edu), (212) 650-7902.

Statement of Consent:

I have read the above description of this research and I understand it. I have been informed of the risks and benefits involved, and all of my questions have been answered to my satisfaction.

Furthermore, I have been assured that any future questions that I may have will be answered by the Principal Investigator of the research study. I voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

- YES, I consent to participate. I have read this consent form and I understand the above information. I agree to take part in this study and I am 18 years of age or older.
- NO, I do not consent to participate.

## References

- Abraham, K. (1976). The spending of money in anxiety states. In E. Borneman (Ed.) & M. Shaw (Trans.), *The Psychoanalysis of Money* (pp. 99-102). New York, NY: Urizen Books.  
(Original work published 1917)
- Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1967). *Infancy in Uganda: Infant care and the growth of love*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Ainsworth, M. D. S. (2010). Security and attachment. In R. Volpe (Ed.), *The secure child: Timeless lessons in parenting and childhood education* (pp. 43-53). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Ainsworth, M. D. S., & Bowlby, J. (1991). An ethological approach to personality development. *American Psychologist*, *46*(4), 333-341.
- American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5th ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Publishing.
- American Psychological Association. (2014). *Impact of stress*. Retrieved from <http://www.apa.org/news/press/releases/stress/2012/full-report.pdf>
- Amato, P. R. (1994). Father-child relations, mother-child relations and offspring psychological well-being in adulthood. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *56*, 1031-1042.
- Amato & Rivera (1999). Parental involvement and children's behavior problems. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *61*(2), 375-384.
- Anderson, R., Manoogian, S. T., & Reznick, J. S. (1976). The undermining and enhancing of

- intrinsic motivation in preschool children. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 34, 915-922.
- Andry, R. G. (1962). Paternal and maternal roles and delinquency. In M. Ainsworth (Ed.), *Deprivation of maternal care* (WHO Public Papers, Vol. 14, pp. 31-41). Geneva: World Health Organization.
- Ang, S. H. (2000). The power of money: A cross-cultural analysis of business related beliefs. *Journal of World Business*, 35(1), 43-60.
- Aunola, K., & Nurmi, J. E. (2005). The role of parenting styles in children's problem behavior. *Child Development*, 76, 1144-1159.
- Bailey, W., & Gustafson, W. (1986). Gender and gender-role orientation differences in attitudes and behaviors toward money. *Proceedings of the 4<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference of the Association of Financial Counseling and Planning Educators*, 11-20.
- Bailey, W., & Gustafson, W. (1991). An examination of the relationship between personality factors and attitudes to money. In R. Frantz, H. Singh and J. Gerber (Eds.), *Handbook of Behavioral Economics*, (pp. 271-285). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Bailey, W., & Lown, J. (1993). A cross-cultural examination of the aetiology of attitudes toward money. *Journal of Consumer Studies and Home Economics*, 17, 391-402.
- Bailey, W., Johnson, P., Adams, C., Lawson, R., Williams, P., & Lown, J. (1994). An exploratory study of money beliefs and behaviors scale using data from 3 nations. *Consumer Interests Annual*, (pp. 178-185). Columbia, MO: ACCZ.
- Baker, W. E., & Jimerson, J. B. (1992). The sociology of money. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 35(6), 678-693.
- Barber, B. K. (1996). Parental psychological control: Revisiting a neglected construct. *Child*

- Development*, 67, 3296-3319.
- Barber, B. K., & Harmon, E. L. (2002). Violating the self: Parental psychological control of children and adolescents. In B. K. Barber (Ed.), *Intrusive parenting: How psychological control affects children and adolescents* (pp. 15-52). Washington, DC: APA.
- Baron, R. & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 1173-1182.
- Barrera, M., Jr., & Garrison-Jones, C. (1992). Family and peer social support and as specific correlates of adolescent depressive symptoms. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 20, 1-16.
- Bartle, S., Anderson, S., & Sabatelli, R. (1989). A model of parenting style, adolescent individuation and adolescent self-esteem: Preliminary findings. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 4, 283-298.
- Baumeister, R. F. (1991). *Escaping the self*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Bennet, A. (1998). Vulnerability factors in the anxiety disorders. *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, 71(3), 311-321.
- Blatz, W. E. (1940). *Hostages to peace: Parents and the children of democracy*. New York, NY: Morrow.
- Blatz, W. E. (1966). *Human security: Some reflections*. Toronto, Ontario: University of Toronto Press.
- Bowlby, J. (1952). Maternal care and mental health. *World Health Organization Monograph* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Geneva, Switzerland: Palais Des Nations.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss, Vol. 1: Attachment*. New York, NY: Basic Books.



- Bowlby, J. (1988). *A secure base: Parent-child attachment and healthy human development*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Bretherton, I. (1992). The origins of attachment theory: John Bowlby and Mary Ainsworth, *Developmental Psychology*, *28*(5), 759-775.
- Brook, J. E., & Brook, J. S. (1988). A developmental approach examining social and personal correlates in relation to alcohol use over time. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, *149*, 93-110.
- Brook, J. S., Whiteman, M., & Gordon, A. S. (1981). The role of the father in his son's marijuana use. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, *138*, 81-86.
- Campo, A. T., & Rohner, R. P. (1992). Relationships between perceived parental acceptance-rejection, psychological adjustment, and substance abuse among young adults. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, *16*, 429-440.
- Congressional Budget Office. (2010, June). *Average Federal Tax Rates in 2007*. Retrieved from <http://www.cbo.gov/publication/21521>
- Carver, C. S., & Baird, E. (1998). The American dream revisited: Is it what you want of why you want it that matters? *Psychological Science*, *9*, 289-292.
- Chen, X., Liu, M., & Li, D. (2000). Parental warmth, control, and indulgence and their relations to adjustment in Chinese children: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *14*, 401-419.
- Coggan, P. (2012). *Paper promises: Debt, money, and the new world order*. New York, NY: Public Affairs.
- Cohen, P., & Cohen, J. (1996). *Life values and adolescent mental health*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Collins, N., & Read, S. (1990). Adult attachment, working models, and relationship quality in

- dating couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 644-663.
- Conte, H. R., Plutchik, R., Picard, S., Buck, L., & Karasu, T. B. (1996). Gender differences in recalled parental childrearing behaviors and adult self-esteem. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, 37(3), 157-166.
- Craig, L. (2006). Does father care mean fathers share? A comparison of how mothers and fathers in intact families spend time with their children. *Gender & Society*, 20, 259-81.
- Deci, E. L. (1980). *The psychology of self-determination*. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.
- Deci, E. L., & Flaste, R. (1995). *Why we do what we do: Understanding self-motivation*. New York, NY: Penguin Books.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*, New York, NY: Plenum.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The 'what' and 'why' of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227-268.
- Diamond, D. & Doane, J. (1994). Disturbed attachment and negative affective style: An intergenerational spiral. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 164, 770-781.
- Dickie, J., Eshleman, A., Merasco, D., Shepard, A., Vander Wilt, M., & Johnson, M. (1997). Parent-child relationships and children's images of God. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 36, 25-43.
- Dimen, M. (2012). Money, love, and hate: Contradiction and paradox in psychoanalysis. In B. Berger & S. (Eds.), *Money talks in therapy, society, and life* (pp. 99-124). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Dominy, N. L., Johnson, W. B., & Koch, C. (2000). Perception of parental acceptance in women with binge eating disorder. *Journal of Psychology*, 134, 23-36.

- DuBos, D., Eitel, S., & Felner, R. (1994). Effects of family environment and parent-child relationships on school adjustment during the transition to early adolescence. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 56, 405-414.
- Dwairy, M. (2010). Parental acceptance-rejection: A fourth cross-cultural research on parenting and psychological adjustment of children. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 19, 30-35.
- Emmelkamp, P. M., & Heeres, H. (1988). Drug addiction and parental rearing style: A controlled study. *International Journal of the Addictions*, 23(2), 207-216.
- Engelberg, E., & Sjoberg, L. (2006). Money attitudes and emotional intelligence. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 36(8), 2027-2047.
- Enns, M. W., Cox, B. J., & Clara, J. (2002). Parental bonding and adult psychopathology: Results from the US national comorbidity survey. *Psychological Medicine*, 32(6), 997-1008.
- Eron, L. D., Banta, T. J., Walder, L. O., & Laulicht, J. H. (1961). Comparison of data obtained from mothers and fathers on child-rearing practices and their relation to child aggression. *Child Development*, 32, 457-472.
- Falicov, C. J. (2001). The cultural meanings of money. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 45(2), 313-328.
- Fenichel, O. (1938). The drive to amass wealth. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 7, 69-95.
- Fisher, R. J. (1993). Social desirability bias and the validity of indirect questioning. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 20, 303-315.
- Fitz-Simmons, M. J. (1935). *Some parent-child relationships as shown in clinical case studies*

- (Contributions to Education No. 643). New York, NY: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Frenczi, S. (1976). The ontogenesis of the interest in money. In E. Borneman (Ed.) & M. Shaw (Trans.), *The Psychoanalysis of Money* (pp. 81-90). New York, NY: Urizen Books. (Original work published 1914)
- Freud, S. (1976). Character and anal erotism. In E. Borneman (Ed.) & M. Shaw (Trans.), *The Psychoanalysis of Money* (pp. 73-80). New York, NY: Urizen Books. (Original work published 1908)
- Freud, S. (1913). On beginning the treatment. In J. Strachey (Ed. & Trans.), *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, (Vol. 9, pp. 123-144). London: Hogarth Press, 1958.
- Frodi, A., Bridges, L., & Grolnick, W.S. (1985). Correlates of mastery-related behavior: A short term longitudinal study of infants in their second year. *Child Development*, 56, 1291-1298.
- Furnham, A. (1984). Many sides of the coin: the psychology of money usage. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 5, 95-103.
- Furnham, A., & Argyle, M. (1998). *The psychology of money*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Furnham, A., Kirkcaldy, B. D., & Lynn, R. (1994). National attitudes to competitiveness, money, and work among young people: First, second, and third world differences. *Human Relations*, 47(1), 119-132.
- Gallen, R. (2002). *The money trap: A practical program to stop self-defeating financial habits so you can reclaim your grip on life*. New York, NY: Harper Resource.
- Gellerman, S. W. (1963). *Motivation and productivity*. New York, NY: American Management

Association.

- Gresham, A., & Fontenot, G. (1989). The different attitudes of the sexes toward money: An application of the money attitude scale. *Advances in Marketing*, 8, 380-384.
- Grimm, L. G. (1993). *Statistical suplications for the behavioral sciences*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Goldberg, H., & Lewis, R. (1978). *Money madness: The psychology of saving, spending, loving and hating money*. London: Springwood.
- Hanley, A., & Wihelm, M. (1992). Compulsive buying: An exploration into self-esteem and money attitudes. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 13, 5-18.
- Harlow, H. F. (1953). Motivation as a factor in the acquisition of new responses. In J. S. Brown, et al. (Eds.), *Current theory and research on motivation* (pp. 24-49). Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska Press.
- Harwood, R. (1992). The influence of culturally derived values on Anglo and Puerto Rican mothers' perceptions of attachment behavior. *Child Psychology*, 63, 822-839.
- Hazden, C. & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 511-524.
- Hughes, M. M., Blom, M., Rohner, R. P., & Britner, P. A. (2005). Bridging parental acceptance-rejection theory and attachment theory in the preschool strange situation. *Ethos*, 33(3), 378-401.
- Jiloha, R. C. (1986). Psycho-social factors in adolescent heroin addicts. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 27, 442-450.
- Jindal, S. K. (1990). Money usage: A psychological analysis. *Indian Journal of Applied Psychology*, 27(1), 29-32.

- Jones, E. (1918). Anal-erotic character traits. *The Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 13*(5), 261-284.
- Karavasillis, L., Doyle, A. B., & Markiewicz, D. (2003). Associations between parenting style and attachment to mother in middle childhood and adolescence. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 27*, 153-164.
- Kasser, T. (2002). *The high price of materialism*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kasser, T., & Ryan, R. M. (1993). A dark side of the American dream: Correlates of financial success as a central life aspiration. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65*, 410-422.
- Kasser, T., & Ryan, R. M. (1996). Further examining the American dream: Differential correlates of intrinsic and extrinsic goals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22*, 80-87.
- Kasser, T., & Ryan, R. M. (2001). Be careful what you wish for: Optimal functioning and the relative attainment of intrinsic and extrinsic goals. In P. Schmuck & K. Sheldon (Eds.), *Life goals and well-being* (pp. 116-131). Seattle, WA: Hogrefe & Huber Publishers.
- Kasser, T., Ryan, R. M., Zax, M., & Sameroff, A. J. (1995). The relations of maternal and social environments to late adolescents' materialistic and prosocial values. *Developmental Psychology, 31*(6), 907-914.
- Khaleque, A., & Rohner, R. P. (2002a). Perceived parental acceptance-rejection and psychological adjustment: A meta-analysis of cross-cultural and intracultural studies. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 64*, 54-64.
- Khaleque, A., & Rohner, R. P. (2002b). Reliability of measures assessing the pancultural association between perceived parental acceptance-rejection and psychological

- adjustment: A meta-analysis of cross-cultural and intracultural studies. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 33(1), 87-99.
- Khaleque, A., & Rohner, R. P. (2012). Pancultural associations between perceived parental acceptance and psychological adjustment of children and adults: A meta-analytic review of worldwide research. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 43(5), 784-800.
- Khaleque, A., Rohner, R. P., Riaz, M., Laukkala, H., & Sadeque, S. (2007). Perceived parental acceptance-rejection and psychological adjustment of children: A cross-cultural study in Finland, Pakistan, and the United States. *National Academy of Psychology, India*, 52(2), 114-119.
- Kinstler, D. B. (1961). Covert and overt maternal rejection in stuttering. *Journal of Speech & Hearing Disorders*, 26, 145-155.
- Klontz, B. T., Bivens, A., Klontz, P. T., Wada, J., & Kahler, R. (2008). The treatment of disordered money behaviors: Results of an open clinical trial. *Psychological Services*, 5(3), 295-308.
- Klontz, T., Kahler, R., & Klontz, B. (2008) *The financial wisdom of Ebenezer Scrooge: 5 principles to transform your relationship with money*. Deerfield Beach, Florida: Health Communications, Inc.
- Komarovsky, M. (1976). *Dilemma of masculinity: A study of college youth*. New York, NY: Norton.
- Kroupa, S. (1988). Perceived parental acceptance and female juvenile delinquency. *Adolescence*, 23, 171-185.
- Krueger, D. W. (1986). *The Last Taboo: Money as Symbol and Reality in Psychotherapy and Psychoanalysis*. New York, NY: Brunner/Mazel Publishers.

- Lau, S. (1998). *Money: What it means to children and adults*. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 26(3), 297-306.
- Lefkowitz, M., & Tesiny, E. (1984). Rejection and depression: Prospective and contemporaneous analyses. *Developmental Psychology*, 20, 776-785.
- Lopez, F. G., & Gover, M. R. (1993). Self-report measures of parent-adolescent attachment and separation-individuation: A selective review. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 71, 560-569.
- Loukas, A., Paulos, S. K., & Robinson, S. (2005). Early adolescent social and overt aggression: Examining the roles of social anxiety and maternal psychological control. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 34, 335-345.
- Maccoby, E. E., & Maccoby, N. (1954). The interview: A tool of social science. In G. Lindzey (Ed.), *Handbook of social psychology* (pp. 449-487). Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Mackinnon, A. J., Henderson, A. S., & Andrews, G. (1993). Parental 'affectionless control' as an antecedent to adult depression: A risk factor refined. *Psychological Medicine*, 23(1), 135-141.
- Mackinnon, A. J., Henderson, A. S., Scott, R., & Duncan-Jones, P. (1989). The parental bonding instrument (PBI): An epidemiological study in a general population sample. *Psychological Medicine*, 19(4), 1023-1034.
- Manfredi, C., Caselli, G., Rovetto, F., Rebecchi, D., Ruggiero, G., Sassaroli, S., & Spada, M. M. (2011). Temperament and parental styles as predictors of ruminative brooding and worry. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 50, 186-191.
- McHoskey, J. W. (1999). Machiavellianism, intrinsic versus extrinsic goals, and social interest: A self-determination theory analysis. *Motivation and Emotion*, 23, 267-283.



- Nelson, D. A., & Crick, N. R. (2002). Parental psychological control: Implications for childhood physical and relational aggression. In B. K. Barber (Ed.), *Intrusive parenting: How psychological control affects children and adolescents* (pp. 168-189). Washington, DC: APA.
- Oleson, M. (2004). Exploring the relationship between money attitudes and Maslow's hierarchy of needs. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 28(1), 83-92.
- Parker, G. (1981). Parental reports of depressives: An investigation of several explanations. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 3, 131-140.
- Parker, G. (1981). Parental representations of patients with anxiety neurosis. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, 63(1), 33-36.
- Parker, G. (1983a). Parental 'affectionless control' as an antecedent to adult depression: A risk delineated. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 40, 956-960.
- Parker, G. (1983b). *Parental over-protection: A risk factor in psychosocial development*. New York, NY : Grune & Stratton.
- Parker, G., Fairley, M., Greenwood, J., Jurd, S., & Silove, D. (1982). Parental representations of schizophrenics and their association with onset and course of Schizophrenia. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 141, 573-581.
- Parker, G. & Lipscombe, P. (1981). Influences on maternal overprotection. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 138, 303-311.
- Parker, G., Johnston, P., & Hayward, L. (1988). Parental expressed emotion as a predictor of schizophrenic relapse. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 45, 806-813.
- Parker, G., Tupling, H., & Brown, L. B. (1979). A parental bonding instrument. *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, 52, 1-10.

- Pervin, L. A. (Ed.). (1989). *Goal concepts in personality and social psychology*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Peterson, D. R., Becker, W. C., Hellmer, L. A., Shoemaker, D. J., & Quay, H. C. (1959). Parental attitudes and child adjustment. *Child Development, 30*, 119-130.
- Phares, V., & Compas, B. E. (1992). The role of fathers in child and adolescent psychopathology: Make room for daddy. *Psychology Bulletin, 111*(3), 387-412.
- Polk, S. (2014, January 18). For the love of money. *The New York Times*, p. A27.
- Ranson, G. (2001). Men at work: Change or no change in the era of the “new father.” *Men and Masculinities, 4*(1), 3-26.
- Rapport, L. J., & Meleen, M. (1998). Childhood celebrity, parental attachment, and adult adjustment: The young performers study. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 70*(3), 484-505.
- Rindfleisch, A., Burroughs, J. E., & Denton, F. (1997). Family structure, materialism, and compulsive consumption. *Journal of Consumer Research, 23*, 312-315.
- Robbins, R. (1994). *Parental autonomy support versus control: Child and parent correlates and assessment*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Rochester, NY.
- Roberts, B. W., & Robins, R. W. (2000). Broad dispositions, broad aspirations: The intersection of personality traits and major life goals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 26*, 1284-1296.
- Rogers, C. R. (1995). *On becoming a person: A Therapist's View of Psychotherapy*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company. (Original work published 1961)
- Rohner, R. P. (1980). Worldwide tests of parental acceptance-rejection theory: An overview. *Behavior Science Research, 15*, 1-21.

- Rohner, R. P. (1999). Acceptance and rejection. In D. Levinson, J. Ponzetti & P. Jorgensen (Eds.). *Encyclopedia of human emotions* (Vol. 1, p. 6-14). New York: Macmillan.
- Rohner, R. P. (2000a). *The warmth dimension: Foundations of parental acceptance-rejection theory*. Storrs, CT: Rohner Research Publications. (Originally published in 1986)
- Rohner, R. P. (2000b). *They love me, they love me not: A worldwide study of the effects of parental acceptance and rejection*. Storrs, CT: Rohner Research Publications. (Originally published in 1975)
- Rohner, R. P. (2004). The parental “acceptance-rejection syndrome”: Universal correlates of perceived rejection. *American Psychologist*, *59*(8), 830-840.
- Rohner, R. P., & Britner, P. A. (2002). Worldwide mental health correlates of parental acceptance-rejection: Review of cross-cultural and intracultural evidence. *Cross Cultural Research*, *36*(1), 16-47.
- Rohner, R. P., & Cournoyer, D. E. (1994). Universals in youths’ perceptions of parental acceptance and rejection: Evidence from factor analyses within eight sociocultural groups worldwide. *Cross-Cultural Research*, *28*, 371-383.
- Rohner, R. P., & Khaleque, A. (Eds.). (2005). *Handbook for the study of parental acceptance and rejection* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Storrs, CT: Rohner Research Publications.
- Rohner, R. P., Khaleque, A., & Cournoyer, D. E. (2005). Parental acceptance-rejection: Theory, methods, cross-cultural evidence, and implications. *Ethos*, *33*(3), 299-334.
- Rohner, R. P., & Veneziano, R. A. (2001). The importance of father love: History and contemporary evidence. *Review of General Psychology*, *5*, 382-405.
- Rothbaum, F., & Weisz, J. R. (1994). Parental caregiving and child externalizing behavior in nonclinical samples: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *116*, 55-74.

- Ryan, R. M. & Deci, E. L. (2002). Overview of self-determination theory: an organismic dialectical perspective. In Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R. M. (Eds.), *Handbook of self-determination research* (pp. 3-33). Rochester, NY: The University of Rochester Press.
- Ryan, R. M., Sheldon, K. M., Kasser, T., & Deci, E. L. (1996). All goals are not created equal: An organismic perspective on the nature of goals and their regulation. In P. M. Gollwitzer & J. A. Bargh (Eds.), *The psychology of action: Linking cognition and motivation to behavior* (pp. 7-26). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Sameroff, A. J., Thomas, S. L., & Barrett, L. (1989). *Parental style survey*. Providence, RI: Bradley Hospital.
- Schaefer, E. S. (1965). A configurational analysis of children's reports of parent behavior. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 29*, 552-557.
- Sennett, R. (1998). *The corrosion of character: The personal consequences of work in the new capitalism*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Sennett, R. (2006). *The culture of the new capitalism*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Sheldon, K. M., & Kasser, T. (1995). Coherence and congruence: two aspects of personality integration. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*, 531-543.
- Silove, D., Parker, G., Hadzi-Pavlovic, D., Manicavasagr, V., & Blaszczyński, A. (1991). Parental representations of patients with panic disorder and generalized anxiety disorder. *British Journal of Psychiatry, 159*, 835-841.
- Slater, Philip (1980). *Wealth addiction*. New York, NY: E. P. Dutton, INC.
- Smari, J. (2010). Rearing practices and impulsivity hyperactivity symptoms in relation to inflated responsibility and obsessive-compulsive symptoms. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 51*(5), 392-397.

- Sobel, M. E. (1982). Asymptotic confidence intervals for indirect effects in structural equation models. In S. Leinhardt (Ed.), *Sociological Methodology 1982* (pp. 290-312). Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.
- Spinella, M., Lester, D., & Yang, B. (2005). Consistency of the Yamauchi/Templer money attitude scale. *Psychological Reports, 97*, 962.
- Srivastava, A., Locke, E. A., & Bortol, K. M. (2001). Money and subjective well-being: It's not the money, it's the motives. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 80*, 959-971.
- Stiglitz, J. E. (2012). *The price of inequality: How today's divided society endangers our future*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Tacon, A., & Caldera, Y. (2001). Attachment and parental correlates in late adolescent Mexican American women. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 23*, 71-88.
- Tang, T. L. P. (1992). The meaning of money revisited. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 13*, 197-202.
- Tang, T. (1993). The meaning of money: Extension and exploration of the money ethic scale in a sample of University students in Taiwan. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 13*, 197-202.
- Tang, T. L. P. (1995). The development of a short money ethic scale: Attitudes toward money and pay satisfaction revisited. *Personality and Individual Differences, 19*(6), 809-816.
- Taylor, C. T. (2006). Parental overprotection, interpersonal behavior, generalized social phobia, social development. *Behavior Therapy, 37*(1), 14-24.
- Tearnan, B. H., & Telch, M. J. (1988). Etiology of agoraphobia: An investigation of perceived childhood and parental factors. *Phobia Practice & Research Journal, 1*, 13-24.
- Treas, J., & Drobnic. (Eds). (2010). *Dividing the domestic: Men, women & household work in*

- cross-national perspective. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Tuber, S. (2008). *Attachment, play, and authenticity: A Winnicott Primer*. Lanham, Maryland: Jason Aronson.
- van Ijzendoorn, M. (1995). Adult attachment representations, parental responsiveness, and infant attachment: A meta-analysis on the predictive validity of the AAI. *Psychological Bulletin, 117*, 387-403.
- van Ijzendoorn, M. & Koonenberg, P. (1988). Cross-cultural patterns of attachment: A meta-analysis of the Strange Situation. *Child Development, 59*, 423-330.
- Wachtel, P. L. (1989). *The poverty of affluence: A psychological portrait of the american way of life*. Philadelphia, PA: New Society Publishers.
- Wachtel, P. L. (2003). Full pockets, empty lives: A psychoanalytic exploration of the contemporary culture of greed. *The American Journal of Psychoanalysis, 63*(2), 103-122.
- Wachtel, P. L., & Blatt, S. J. (1990). Perceptions of economic needs and of anticipated future income. *Journal of Economic Psychology, 11*, 403-415.
- Wagner, B., & Phillips, D. (1992). Beyond beliefs: Parent and child behaviors and children's perceived academic competence. *Child Development, 63*, 1380-1391.
- Wall, G., & S. Arnold. (2007). How involved is involved fathering?: An exploration of the contemporary culture of fatherhood. *Gender & Society, 21*, 508-527.
- Wernimont, P. & Fitzpatrick, S. (1972). The Meaning of money. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 56*, 218-221.
- Williams, G.C., Cox, E. M., Hedberg V. A., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Extrinsic life goals and health-risk behaviors in adolescents. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 30*(8), 1756-1771.

- Wilhelm, K., & Parker, G. (1990). Reliability of the parental bonding instrument and intimate bond measure scales. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 24(2), 199-202.
- Winnicott, D. W. (1965). *The maturational processes and the facilitating environment: Studies in the theory of emotional development*. New York, NY: International Universities Press.
- Younge, S. L., Oetting, E. R., Deffenbacher, J. L. (1996). Correlations among maternal rejection, dropping out of school, and drug use in adolescents. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 52(1), 96-102.
- Zelizer, V. A. (1989). The social meaning of money: "Special Monies." *American Journal of Sociology*, 95, 342-377.