The Role of Inanimate Transitional Objects in Helping Children Cope with Daily Hassles

by

Sandra Leigh Lookabaugh

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Family and Child Development

APPROVED:

V. R. Fu, Chairman

C. S. Rogers

J. K. Sawyers

October, 1986

Blacksburg, Virginia

The Role of Inanimate Transitional Objects in Helping Children Cope with Daily Hassles

by

Sandra L. Lookabaugh

Committee Chairman: Victoria R. Fu
Family and Child Development

(ABSTRACT)

Children's use of inanimate transitional objects when coping with daily hassles was examined in this study. Mothers of 50 chilldren, aged 2- to 3-years, rated their children on frequency of hassles, intensity of reaction to daily hassles, coping effectiveness, and frequency of object use. No significant differences were found between those children with an inanimate transitional object and those without such an object ($p > .05$). Among those children with objects, a significant object effect on frequency of hassles ($p < .05$) and a significant object effect on coping effectiveness ($p < .05$) were found. Post hoc analyses indicated that children using soft objects ($\bar{X}=31.87$) were rated as having more hassles than children using their thumb ($\bar{X}=18.88$), and children using soft objects ($\bar{X}=1.34$) were rated as coping less effectively than children using their thumb ($\bar{X}=.75$). Among those children with inanimate transitional objects, significant positive relationships were found between: frequency of hassle,

intensity of reaction to hassles, coping effectiveness, and frequency of object use. The results indicated that children who use their thumb as an inanimate transitional object had fewer hassles and cope more effectively than children who use a soft object. The results also suggest that increased object use was related to an increased number of hassles, as well as more intense reactions to hassles and less effective coping. Based on these findings, future research suggestions were made.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people deserve recognition for their contributions to this study. I would especially like to thank:

--Dr. Victoria Fu, my committee chair, because she not only giuded me, but was right beside me every step of the way.

--Dr. Janet Sawyers and Dr. Cosby Rogers, my committee members, for their support and encouragement throughout the entire process.

--Marilyn Cavell, for her endless hours of patience in front of the computer.

--The subjects of my study, without your cooperation this study would not have been possible.

--Mandy and Chris, you both deserve honorary degress! Thank you for everything, but most of all thank you for being such special friends. I love you both.

--My parents, for their love and continual support, and for teaching me at a very young age that there was not any goal I could not achieve--now I truly believe that.

--Jeb, you are always there for me--although not always in person, always in spirit. Thank you for being my very best friend. I love you.

Table of Contents

The Role of Inanimate Transitional Objects
in Helping Children Cope with Daily Hassles. 1
Method. 3
Subjects 3
Procedure. 4
Results 7
Discussion. 9
References. 14
Appendix A - Review of Literature 15
Appendix B - References 22
Appendix C - Informational Form 25
Appendix D - Hassles Scale for Preschool Children . . .27
Appendix E - Toddler Temperament Scale. 31
Appendix F - Hassles Survey 34
Appendix G - Survey Letter. 39
Appendix H - Consent Letter 41
Appendix I - Supplementary Tables 43
VITA. 46

Much of modern stress research is preoccupied with major life events while relatively limited attention has been focused on the minor stresses that characterize everday life. Kanner, Coyne, Schaefer, and Lazarus (1981) call these irritating, frustrating, distressing everyday events "hassles". McLean (1976, p.298) has suggested that "these kinds of stressors have been taken for granted and considered to be less important than more dramatic stressors". According to Lazarus and Folkman (1984), hassles arise independently of life events and usually result from the routine tasks of living. When comparing two modes of stress management, daily hassles and uplifts versus major life events, Kanner, et al. (1981) found that, among adults, daily hassles provide a "more direct and broader estimate of stress in life than major life events" (p.21).

This study examined preschool children's use of inanimate transitional objects as a means of coping with daily hassles. A transitional object may be a corner of a blanket, a teddy, a word, a mannerism or the like (Winnicott, 1953). Van Ijendoorn, Goossons, Tavvecchio, Verger & Hubbard (1983) state that children especially appreciate the presence of a favorite object during daily stressors such as going to sleep, being tired or ill, and during periods of inactivity. Busch, Nagera, McKnight & Pezzarossi (1973) state that the transitional object often

functions as a soother and aids the child in coping with anxiety and stress. Winnicott (1953) views the transitional object as often being absolutely necessary during such daily stressful situations as bedtine, times of loneliness, or as a defense against anxiety or stress.

There have been several approaches to the measurement of these minor events (Carson, 1930; Lewisohn & Talkington, 1970; Kanner et al., 1981) in adults but similar scales adapted for children are nonexistent in current literature. Stress research in relation to children primarily focuses on hospitalized and handicapped children and major stressful events in their lives. The idea of daily hassles in the lives of preschool children needs further investigation. The findings may have practical implications for childrearing and educational use in training daycare workers and early childhood educators.

The purpose of this study was to examine young children's use of inanimate transitional objects such as thumbs, pacifiers, blankets, teddy bears, soft and hard objects as well as clothing in dealing with daily hassles. More specifically, this study examined: (a) the differences between frequency of daily hassles, defined as the number of hassles encountered; intensity of reaction to daily hassles, defined as the severity of the child's reaction; and coping effectiveness, defined as the child's level of difficulty in dealing with specific hassles, in young

children who have an inanimate transitional object and those who do not have such an object; (b) the differences between frequency of hassles, intensity of reaction, and coping effectivess among those children who do not have an inanimate transitional object, those who use their thumb as a transitional object, and those who use a soft object as a transitional object; and (c) the relationships between frequency of hassles, intensity of reaction, coping effectiveness, and frequency of object use, defined as how often the child uses the inanimate object when feeling hassled, among those children who have been identified as having an inanimate transitional object.

Method

Subjects

The sample consisted of 50 mothers of children (29 males and 21 females) aged 2-01 to 3-11 (mean age 3-00, S.D. 1.76) enrolled at a university child development laboratory or on the waiting list at that faciliity. Based on information provided by the mothers, children were divided into two groups according to whether or not they had an inanimate transitional object. Seventeen children were classified as not having an inanimate transitional object and 33 were identified as having such an object. Among the latter group, 9 used their thumbs and 24 used a soft object.

Procedures

Each subject was interviewed individually and was asked to provide the following information about her child: age, sex, ordinal position, childcare arrangements, whether or not the child had an inanimimate transitional object, and the type of object (see Appendix C). Next each subject was asked to complete the Hassles Scale for Preschool Children (HSPC) (see Appendix D). For this scale, the mother was asked to recall all the hassles her child had encountered over the last two weeks. She was then asked, using a structured interview format, to rate her child on each of the hassles indicated according to intensity of reaction, coping effectiveness, and frequency of object use.

After the structured interview, each subject rated her child according to two subscales of the Fullard, McDevitt and Carey (1978) Toddler Temperament Scale (TTS): intensity and adaptibility (see Appendix E). These ratings were obtained to test the validity of the Hassles Scale for Preschool Children.

Hassles Scale for Preschool Children (HSPC)

The procedures for the development of this instrument were based on those used by Kanner et al., (1981). A list of common daily hassles of preschool children was generated by surveying 37 mothers of preschool children, aged 4 to 5 years, enrolled at a university child development

laboratory. Each mother was given an informational form describing what a hassle is and asking her to record the daily hassles her preschool child experienced in a four day period (two week days and two weekend days) (see Appendix F). They were asked to briefly describe the child's behavior reaction to each of the hassles experienced. They were then asked to identify any other hassles that are experienced on a frequent basis but were not recorded over the four day period. The 50 most commonly reported hassles comprise the (Hassles Scale for Preschool Children) HSPC (see Appendix D).

The description and scoring method for each subscale of the HSPC is described below:

Freguency_of_Hassles. This subscale indicates the number of hassles the child encountered over the last two weeks. If a hassle had been experienced in the last two weeks it was circled. If a hassle was not experienced it was left unmarked. A total frequency of hassles score was derived by summing all the hassles circled.

Intensity_of_Reaction. This subscale indicates how intensely the child reacts to the hassles specified. The reaction was rated on a 5 point scale with scores ranging from (1) meaning "slightly intense" to (5) meaning "extremely intense". A total intensity of reaction score was derived by summing the scores of this subscale and dividing by 50 (the total number of hassles possible).

Coping Effectiveness. This subscale indicates the child's level of difficulty in dealing with the hassles specified. The subscale was rated on a 5 point scale with scores ranging from (1) meaning "with slight difficulty": to (5) meaning "with extreme difficulty". A total coping effectiveness score was derived by summing the scores of this subscale and dividing by 50.

Object Availability. This information was gathered from only those subjects who identified their child as having an inanimate transitional object. They were asked whether or not the object was available to the child when the hassles specified were experienced. This information was gathered to ascertain during which hassles the child's object was available.

Freguency of Object Use. This subscale was used only by those subjects who identified their child as having an inanimate transitional object. This subscale indicates how often the child used the object when experiencing the hassles specified. The subscale was rated on a 5 point scale with scores ranging from (1) meaning "seldom" to (5) meaning "almost always". A total frequency of object use score was derived by summing the scores of the subscale and dividing by 50.

Results

Hassle Scale for Preschool Children (HSPC)

Cronbach's alpha was calculated to determine the internal consistency of the HSPC. The alpha coefficientsfor the intensity of reaction, coping effectiveness, andfrequency of object use were .92, .93, .95 respectively. [1]

Hassles, Intensity of Reaction and Coping: Multivariate and Univariate Tests

Multivariate analyses of variance were conducted using the General Linear Models procedures (SAS, 1982). Test statistics for the MANOVAs reported are Rao's approximate *F*, which was used to convert Wilk's Lambda to *F* statistics. Tukey's Multiple Comparison Tests were performed to determine which differences between the various classification of means were statistically significant.

A MANOVA was computed to evaluate mothers' perceptions of the differences between those children who were identified as having an inanimate transitional object and those children who do not have such an object in frequency of hassles, intensity of reaction, and coping effectiveness. No significant differences were found, $F(3,46) = 1.85$, $p = .1508$. A second MANOVA was computed to evaluate mothers' perceptions of the differences between those children who use their thumb as an inanimate

transitional object, those children who use a soft object, and those children who did not have an inanimate transitional object in frequency of hassles, intensity of reaction, and coping effectiveness. A significant object effect was found, F (6,90)=2.22, p=.0481.

Corresponding univariate analyses showed a significantobject effect on frequency of hassles, F (2,47)=3.48, p=.0388, and a significant object effect on coping effectiveness F (2,47)=3.80, p=.0296. Post hoc analyses indicated that children who used soft objects as inanimate transitional objects scored higher on frequency of hassles ($\bar{X}$=31.87) than children who used their thumbs ($\bar{X}$=18.88). Children who used soft objects ($\bar{X}$=1.34) were rated as less effective in coping with hassles than those children who used their thumbs ($\bar{X}$=.75).

Relationships between Object Use, Frequency of Hassles, Intensity of Reaction, and Coping Effectiveness

Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were calculated to determine the relationships between frequency of hassles, intensity of reaction, coping effectiveness and frequency of object use among those children who have an inanimate transitional object. Significant correlations were found between: frequency of hassles and intensity of reaction (r=.91, p=.0001); frequency of hassles and coping effectiveness (r=.83, p=.0001); frequency of hassles and frequency of object use (r=.87, p=.0001); intensity of

reaction and coping effectiveness (r=.92, p=0001); intensity of reaction and frequency of object use (r=.87, p=.0001); coping effectivness and frequency of object use (r=.71, p=.0001).

Discussion

This study investigated the effectiveness of coping with daily hassles among two groups of preschool children,those who have been identified as having an inanimate transitional object and those who did not have such an object. More specifically, the differences between these two groups of chidren were examined in terms of frequency of hassles, intensity of reaction, and coping effectiveness.

The Hassles Scale for Preschool Children (HSPC) was developed to measure mothers' assessment of frequency of hassles, intensity of reaction, and coping effectiveness. The results indicated that this scale has high internal consistency.

The results indicated that, according to mothers, children who used their thumb as an inanimate transitional object had significantly fewer hassles than children who used soft objects. This difference may be partially explained in terms of the nature of the object as a coping mechanism. Mothers of children who suck their thumb may either take this action for granted or are less likely to

associate this behavior as a coping mechanism, used by the child, when feeling hassled. The coping function of the thumb may be less obvious to mothers since many children suck their thumbs as a habit, although thumb sucking may increase in times of stress. For mothers of children using soft objects, it may be more obvious when their child is feeling hassled because the desired external object, functioning as a coping mechanism, must be actively soughtout and handled. Consequently, mothers of children using soft objects may perceive their children as having more hassles than mothers of children using their thumbs.

The results also indicated that mothers reported more effective coping among those children who used their thumb than children who used soft objects. This difference may partially be explained in terms of the accessibility of the object to the child. Since the thumb is part of the body, children who use their thumb as a coping mechanism always have access to it. Children who use soft objects may find the desired object less accessible or inaccessible in certain situations to serve as a coping mechanism. Consequently, mothers of children using soft objects may perceive their children as coping less effectively than mothers of children who use their thumb.

Among those children with inanimate transitional objects, significant correlations were found between frequency of hassles, intensity of reaction, coping

effectiveness, and frequency of object use. Specifically, within this group of children, an increase in the number of hassles encountered was related to more intense reactions to the hassles, less effective coping and an increase in object use. These findings seem to suggest that when children with inanimate transitional objects experience more hassles, they tend to react more intensely, have more difficulty in coping, and use the inanimate transitional object more frequently.

No significant differences were found between those children with inanimate transitional objects and those without such objects in frequency of hassles, intensity of reaction, and coping effectiveness. Nonsignificant differences in frequency of hassles could possibly were attributed to the fact that in general, all children are exposed to a range of possible hassle situations. Each group was composed of children with a range of tolerance for hassles. Thus, differences in intensity of reaction to hassles might not be significant as a function of object use. Nonsignificant differences between the two groups in coping effectiveness may be partially explained by the fact that children with inanimate transitional objects may actively use the objects as coping mechanisms, while the group without objects may use other forms of environmental support to serve the same functions. Frequently among those children without objects, the mother or other

significant persons may serve as a coping mechanism in ways comparable to an inanimate transitional object.

The findings of this study, based on a small sample, suggest that children who use their thumbs as inanimate transitional objects experience fewer hassles and cope more effectively than children who use soft objects. These findings warrant further investigation with a larger and more diverse population across a wider age span. In doing so, we may explore and better understand: The choice of object as a function of age, sex, or temperamental differences; the differences in coping between children who use their thumb, a soft object, and those who use their thumb in conjunction with a soft object; and the use and choice of object as related to parental acceptance of these objects as coping mechanisms.

Footnote

[1]In an ideal design, the (Hassles Scale for Preschool Children) HSPC would have been validated by correlating it with another similar measure. Since there are no comparable scales, two subscales of the Toddler Temperament Scale (TTS) (intensity and adaptability) were correlated with two dimensions of the HSPC (intensity of reaction and coping effectiveness). Pearson's product-moment correlation coeffecients were calculated to assess the validity of the HSPC. The correlation between intensity (TTS) and intensity of reaction (HSPC) was .13, (p=.3573), and the correlation between adaptability (TTS) and coping effectiveness (HSPC) was .44 (p=.0013).

One possible explanation for the low correlation between the TTS and HSPC may be reflected by the fact that the TTS focuses on personality traits as well as specific behaviors and behavioral tendencies, while the HSPC focuses on a broad range of situations without preconceived ideas of behaviors. Thus, the HSPC may be a better indicator of mothers' perceptions of how their children cope with daily stressors.

References

Busch, F., Nagera, H., McKnight, J. & Pezzarossi, G. (1973). Primary transitional objects. Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry, 12, 193-214.

Carson, H. (1930). Common annoyances: A psychological study of everyday aversions and irritations. Psychological Monographs, 40, 182-185.

Fullard, W., McDevitt, S.C. & Carey, W.B. (1978). Toddler temperament scale. (Available from authors).

Kanner, A.D., Coyne, J.C., Schaefer, C. & Lazarus, R.S. (1981). Comparison of two modes of stress management: Daily hassles and uplifts versus major life events. Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 4 (1), 1-39.

Lazarus, R.S. & Folkman, S. (1984). Stress, appraisal, and coping. New York: Springer Publishing Co., Inc..

Lewisohn, P.M. & Talkington, J. (1979). Studies of the measurement of unpleasant events and relations with depression. Applied Psychology, 3, 83-101.

McLean, P. (1976). Depression as a specific response to stress. In I.G. Sarason and C.D. Spielberget (Eds.), Stress and anxiety, Vol. 3. Washington: Hemisphere.

SAS Institute, Inc. (1982). SAS user's guide. Cary, N.C.: SAS Institute Inc..

Van Ijzendoorn, M.H., Goossens, F.A., Tavecchio, L.W.C., Vergeer, M.M. & Hubbard, F.O.A. (1983). Attachment to soft objects: Its relationship with attachments to the mother and with thumbsucking. Child Psychiatry and Human Development, 14 (2), 97-105.

Winnicott, D.W. (1953). Transitional objects and transitional phenomena. International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 34, 89-97.

APPENDIX A

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Within the psychoanalytic theory, object relations theory has expanded and become a broadly inclusive idea. Freud (1905, p.43) first used the term "object" when he referred to the agent either upon which (whom) the instinctual drives were discharged and/or the agent which (whom) facilitated the discharge, the target of drives. In Freud's system, all of the most important psychic processes are produced by excesses or deficiencies of gratification, while the object is merely the vehicle through which gratification is either obtained or denied. Within Freud's system the most salient and constant characteristic is the pleasure principle where the ultimate goal of all impulses is the satisfaction accompanying the reduction of bodily tension, experienced as pleasure (Freud, 1924). Impulses are directed towards objects only when the objects prove useful in reducing tension. Interestingly, the particular objects towards which these impulses are directed are the least intrinsic, most accidental features within Freud's framework concerning the nature of the drives (Mitchell, 1981).

Within contemporary psychoanalytic literature, theorists such as Klein and Fairbairn have departed somewhat from the classical tradition concerning object relations theory. Klein argued that objects are built into

impulses from the start and are not accidental and added through experience as proposed by Freud (Mitchell, 1981). Klein is in agreement with Freud on the belief that the fundamental aim of the impulse is satisfaction, and the object is a means toward that end (Mitchell, 1981). Klein emphasizes the idea of internal objects which are established corresponding to real external objects. The child's internal world consists not only of people, but all experiences and situations as well (Mitchell, 1981). For Klein, the internal world is a "natural, inevitable and continual accomplishment of all experiences" (Mitchell, 1981, p.392).

Fairbairn further disagress with the drive theory, which is based on the idea that libido is pleasure-seeking, by proposing that libido is object-seeking. He argues that "the object is not only built into the impulses from the start, but the main characterisitc of libidinal energy is its object seeking quality " (Mitchell, 1981, p.386). For Fairbairn internal objects are neither "primary nor inevitable but are compensatory substitutes for unsatisfactory relations with real, external objects, the 'natural' primary objects of libido" (Mitchell, 1981, p.392). For Fairbairn, the content of internal objects is derived from real, external objects which may be fragmented and recombined but nonetheless result from the child's experience (Mitchell, 1981).

The object relations theory within Klein's framework is almost entirely based on the internal object world,while Fairbairn's conception is one which is based upon experiences in the external object world. It was Winnicott, a member of the British object Relations School, who attempted to bridge the gap between the theories of Klein and Fairbairn.

Winnicott (1953) states that every individual, as a unit, is composed not only of an internal and external reality but a third part as well. He calls this third part an intermediate area of experiencing, to which inner and external reality contribute. Winnicott (1953) describes this area as one which is "not challlenged because no claim is made on its behalf except that it shall exist as a resting place...of keeping inner and outer reality separate yet interrelated (p.90). This intermediate area of experiencing is a significant part of the infant's experience and is made possible by the mother's special "capacity for adapting to the infant's needs, thus allowing the infant the illusion that what he creates really exists" (Roiphe, 1979, p.119).

Winnicott introduced the term transitional phenomena to designate this intermediate area of experiencing. The transitional phenomena can be illustrated by the babbling of an infant or the way an older child goes over a repetory of songs when going to sleep, or by the use of objects that

are not part of the infant's body yet are not fully recognized as belonging to external reality (Winnicott, 1953). Winnicott(1953) goes on to say that very early in life infants display a sequence of events that involve a "not-me" possession such as a fist-in-mouth activity which may eventually lead to an attachment to a teddy, doll, soft or hard object (p.90). Winnicott (1953) points out that these sequences exist other than for oral excitement and stimulation, and sooner or later in an infant's development he begins to "weave other-than-me objects into his personal pattern" (p.90). Out of this transitional phenomena emerges the idea of transitional object (Winnicott, 1953).

The transitional object relates to the intermediate area of experiencing in which a bond between and infant and mother is preserved in the mother's absence "by the intervention of an inanimate transitional object which can be, on the one hand, a fusion of aspects of the mother and on the other hand, be a separate inanimate object in its own right" (Grotstein, 1982, p.52) According to Winnicott (1953) the transitional object is not an internal object but a possession. Yet, for the infant, it is not an external object either for it is invested with special qualities through the use of projective mechanisms (Roiphe, 1979). A transitional object may be a corner of a blanket, a teddy, a word, a mannerism or the like and becomes very important when going to sleep, or as defense against

anxiety or stress (Winnicott, 1953). The object continues to be important and parents soon begin to know its value; they take it when traveling and may let it get dirty, even smelly, knowing that by washing it a break in thecontinuity of the child's experience may result and possibly destroy its meaning (Winnicott, 1953). Winnicott (1953) goes on to say that the use of the transitional object helps the child in the process of becoming able to accept difference and similarity, to distinguish between fantasy and fact, between inner objects and external objects. The transitional object comes to stand for the live, real, good-enough object (Roiphe, 1979). The object may in many ways represent the ideal caregiver; one that is omnipresent and always accessible. "The transitional object is what we see of the journey of progress towards experiencing" (Winnicott, 1953, p.92).

Other theorists, such as Ainsworth and Bowlby, have emphasized the significance of inanimate transitional objects however this has not been the primary focus of their theories of attachment. According to Ainsworth, attachment refers to an affectional tie that one person forms to another specific individual. She goes on to say that this first tie is likely to be formed to the mother but soon may expand to other individuals. Ainsworth discusses three criteria for attachment:

(1) the person wants to be with the attchment figure, especially when under stress;
(2) the person derives comfort and security from the attachment figure; and
(3) the person protests when the attachment figure becomes or threatens to become inaccessible.
She emphasizes that attachment to a person is a precondition for attachment to an inanimate object (Ainsworth, 1978).

Bowlby's (1969) theory of attachment is congruent with Ainsworth's concept of attachment, and he states that there is one principal attachment figure and others one is attached to are secondary figures. Bowlby (1982) points out that certain components of attachment behavior are sometimes directed towards inanimate objects, and again emphasizes that these inanimate objects play a secondary role to the natural object, namely the mother. Bowlby (1982) describes this attachment to cuddly objects as being consistent with satisfactory relations with people and prolongation well into the school years is quite common. Passman and Halonen (1979) suggest that although "some parents evidence great concern over their young children's attachment to inanimate objects, such phenomena are common in normal development" (p.166).

APPENDIX B

REFERENCES

References

Ainsworth, M.D.S. (1969). Object realtions, dependency, and attachment: A theoritical review of the infant-mother relationship. Child Development, 40, 969-1025.

Ainsworth, M.D.S. (1982). Attachment: retrospect and prospect. In C.M. Parkes and J Stevenson-Hinde (Eds.), The place of attachment in human behavior. New York: Basic Books, Inc..

Ainsworth, M.D.S., Blehar, M.C., Waters,E. & Wall, S. (1978). Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bowlby, J. (1969). Attachment and loss--Separation: Anxiety and anger. Basic Books, Inc..

Bowlby, J. (1982). Attachment and loss--Attachment. London: Hogarth Press.

Busch, F., Nagera, H., McKnight, J. & Pezzarossi, G. (1973). Primary transitional objects. Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry, 12, 193-214.

Carson, H. (1930). Common annoyances: A psychological study of everyday aversions and irritations. Psychological Monographs, 40, 182-185.

Freud, S. (1905). Three essays on the theory of sexuality. Standard Edition, 7. London: Hogarth Press.

Freud, S. (1924). The economic problem of masochism. Standard Edition, 19. London: Hogarth Press.

Grotstein, J.S. (1982). Newer perspectives in object relations theory. Contemporary Psychoanalysis, 18, 43-91.

Kanner, A.D., Coyne, J.C., Schaefer, C. & Lazarus, R.S. (1981). Comparison of two modes of stress management: Daily hassles and uplifts versus major life events. Journal of Behavioral Medicine.

Lazarus, R.S. & Folkman, S. (1984). Stress, appraisal, and coping. New York: Springer Publishing Co., Inc..

Lewisohn, P.M. & Talkington, J. (1979). Studies of the measurement of unpleasant events and relations with depression. Applied Psychology, 3, 83-101.

McLean, P. (1976). Depression as a specific response to stress. In I.G. Sarason and C.D. Speilberget (Eds.), Stress and anxiety, Vol. 3. Washington: Hemisphere.

Mitchell, S.A. (1981). The origin and nature of the object in the theories of Klein and Fairbairn. Contemporary Psychoanalysis, 17, 374-398.

Passman R.H. & Halonen, J.S. (1979). A developmental survey of young children's attachments to inanimate objects. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 134, 165-178.

Roiphe, H. (1979). A theoretical overview of preoedipal development during the first four years of life. In J.D. Cull (Ed.), Basic handbook of child psychiatry: Normal development, Vol. 1. New York: Basic Books, Inc..

Van Ijzendoorn, M.H., Goossens, F.A., Tavecchio, L.W.C., Vergeer, M.M. & Hubbard, F.O.A. (1983). Attachment to soft objects: Its relationship with attachments to the mother and with thumbsucking. Child Psychiatry and Human Development, 14 (2), 97-105.

Winnicott, D.W. (1953). Transitional objects and transitional phenomena. International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 34, 89-97.

APPENDIX C

INFORMATIONAL FORM

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: SUBJECT NO. _____

AGE: YRS. _____ MOS. _____

SEX: MALE _____ FEMALE _____

NO. OF SIBLINGS: _____

ORDINAL POSITION: _____

CHILDCARE OUTSIDE THE HOME: YES _____ NO _____

TYPE OF CHILDCARE OUTSIDE THE HOME: _____

DOES THE CHILD HAVE SOMETHING THAT IS VERY SPECIAL TO HIM/HER, such as a toy, stuffed animal, book, etc.?

YES _____ NO _____

IF YES, WHAT IS IT? _____

APPENDIX D

HASSLES SCALE FOR PRESCHOOL CHILDREN

THE HASSLES SCALE FOR PRESCHOOL CHILDREN

Subject No. ____

Age _____

Sex _____

DIRECTIONS: Hassles are situations, incidents, and things that seem to upset, frustrate, and/or irritate your child. Hassles occur when your child is alone, interacting with peers, family members, pets, etc. throughout the day. Hassles can occur few or many times.

Listed on the following pages are a number of ways in which a child can feel hassled. First, circle the hassles your child has experienced during the last two weeks. Then look at the numbers on the right of the items you circled. Indicate by circling a 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, how INTENSELY your child reacted to each of the circled hassles in the last two weeks. If a hassle did not occur in the last two weeks do NOT circle it.

HASSLES	INTENSITY 1 slightly	2	3	4	5 extremely	CE	AV	FRQ
(1) conflict or teasing among siblings or friends	1	2	3	4	5			
(2) sharing	1	2	3	4	5			
(3) another child does not want to be his/her friend	1	2	3	4	5			
(4) not wanting to do as parent(s) says or demands	1	2	3	4	5			
(5) separation from parent(s)	1	2	3	4	5			
(6) staying with a babysitter	1	2	3	4	5			
(7) parental redirection or discipline	1	2	3	4	5			
(8) parent(s) not paying attention to child	1	2	3	4	5			
(9) going to bed	1	2	3	4	5			
(10) taking a nap	1	2	3	4	5			
(11) not being able to sleep	1	2	3	4	5			
(12) waking up alone or being in room alone	1	2	3	4	5			
(13) wetting the bed	1	2	3	4	5			
(14) having to wake up (get up)	1	2	3	4	5			
(15) nightmares	1	2	3	4	5			
(16) a toy breaking	1	2	3	4	5			
(17) competition	1	2	3	4	5			

HASSLES	INTENSITY 1 slightly	2	3	4	5 extremely	CE	AV	FRQ
(18) someone not playing as the child wants	1	2	3	4	5			
(19) cleaning up (putting toys, games, etc. away)	1	2	3	4	5			
(20) putting together or manipulating small toys	1	2	3	4	5			
(21) having to stop playing to do something else (changing activities)	1	2	3	4	5			
(22) not being able to find something	1	2	3	4	5			
(23) not getting something he/she wants or not getting his/her way	1	2	3	4	5			
(24) deciding what to play	1	2	3	4	5			
(25) wanting to do things that are too difficult	1	2	3	4	5			
(26) not liking clothing selected	1	2	3	4	5			
(27) changing clothes	1	2	3	4	5			
(28) trouble managing shoes, clothing, hair barrettes, etc.	1	2	3	4	5			
(29) spills and messes	1	2	3	4	5			
(30) taking a bath	1	2	3	4	5			
(31) having hair washed	1	2	3	4	5			
(32) brushing teeth	1	2	3	4	5			
(33) getting dressed	1	2	3	4	5			
(34) toileting	1	2	3	4	5			
(35) not getting gum, candy, sweets	1	2	3	4	5			
(36) not getting to use specific dishes, utensils, etc.	1	2	3	4	5			
(37) not wanting to eat at mealtime	1	2	3	4	5			
(38) wanting something different, than was prepared, to eat	1	2	3	4	5			
(39) something "not quite right" with food (being picky about food)	1	2	3	4	5			
(40) not wanting to eat o try particular foods	1	2	3	4	5			

HASSLES	INTENSITY 1 slightly	2	3	4	5 extremely	CE	AV	FRQ
(41) going to the doctor or dentist	1	2	3	4	5			
(42) being sick	1	2	3	4	5			
(43) having to wait	1	2	3	4	5			
(44) being rushed	1	2	3	4	5			
(45) being bored	1	2	3	4	5			
(46) minor bumps, bruises, scratches	1	2	3	4	5			
(47) the weather (thunderstorms)	1	2	3	4	5			
(48) having the TV interrupted or turned off	1	2	3	4	5			
(49) wanting to watch something different on TV	1	2	3	4	5			
(50) new situations and new people	1	2	3	4	5			

Are there any other hassles we missed? If so, please list them below.

APPENDIX E

TODDLER TEMPERAMENT SCALE

USING THE SCALE SHOWN BELOW, PLEASE MARK AN "X" IN THE SPACE THAT TELLS HOW OFTEN THE CHILD'S RECENT AND CURRENT BEHAVIOR HAS BEEN LIKE THE BEHAVIOR DESCRIBED BY EACH ITEM.

ALMOST NEVER	RARELY	USUALLY DOES NOT	USUALLY DOES	FREQUENTLY	ALMOST ALWAYS
1	2	3	4	5	6

1. The child takes feedings quietly with mild expression of likes and dislikes.	almost___:___:___:___:___:___almost never 1 2 3 4 5 6 always
2. The child accepts delays (for several minutes) for desired objects or activities (snacks, treats, gifts).	almost___:___:___:___:___:___almost never 1 2 3 4 5 6 always
3. The child shows strong reactions (cries, stamps feet) to failure.	almost___:___:___:___:___:___almost never 1 2 3 4 5 6 always
4. The child is easily excited by praise (laughs, yells, jumps).	almost___:___:___:___:___:___almost never 1 2 3 4 5 6 always
5. The child responds intensely (screams, yells) to frustration.	almost___:___:___:___:___:___almost never 1 2 3 4 5 6 always
6. The child allows face washing without protest (squirming, turning away).	almost___:___:___:___:___:___almost never 1 2 3 4 5 6 always
7. The child vigorously resists additional food or milk when full (spits out, clamps mouth closed, bats at spoon).	almost___:___:___:___:___:___almost never 1 2 3 4 5 6 always
8. The child takes several days to get used to (show usual behavior in) new situations away from parent (play group, day care center, sitter).	almost___:___:___:___:___:___almost never 1 2 3 4 5 6 always
9. The child reacts strongly (cries, screams) when unable to complete a play activity.	almost___:___:___:___:___:___almost never 1 2 3 4 5 6 always
10. The child reacts mildly (frown or smile) when his/her play is interrupted.	almost___:___:___:___:___:___almost never 1 2 3 4 5 6 always
11. The child accepts being dressed and undressed without protest.	almost___:___:___:___:___:___almost never 1 2 3 4 5 6 always
12. The child can be coaxed out of a forbidden activity.	almost___:___:___:___:___:___almost never 1 2 3 4 5 6 always
13. The child will avoid repetition of misbehavior if punished firmly once or twice.	almost___:___:___:___:___:___almost never 1 2 3 4 5 6 always

ALMOST NEVER	RARELY	USUALLY DOES NOT	USUALLY DOES	FREQUENTLY	ALMOST ALWAYS
1	2	3	4	5	6

14. The child reacts mildly (frown or smile) when another child takes his/her toy.
almost ___:___:___:___:___:___ almost
never 1 2 3 4 5 6 always

15. The child shows bodily movement (stomps, writhes, swings arms) when upset or crying.
almost ___:___:___:___:___:___ almost
never 1 2 3 4 5 6 always

16. The child continues to get into forbidden areas or objects in spite of parents' repeated warnings.
almost ___:___:___:___:___:___ almost
never 1 2 3 4 5 6 always

17. The child greets babysitter loudly with much expression of feeling whether positive or negative.
almost ___:___:___:___:___:___ almost
never 1 2 3 4 5 6 always

18. The child is still wary of strangers after 15 minutes.
almost ___:___:___:___:___:___ almost
never 1 2 3 4 5 6 always

19. The child sleeps poorly (restless, wakeful) in new places for first 2 or 3 times.
almost ___:___:___:___:___:___ almost
never 1 2 3 4 5 6 always

APPENDIX F

HASSLES SURVEY

PRESCHOOL HASSLES RECORD No._____

Instructions:

For four days between May 17 and May 20 please keep a record of hassles, i.e. situations, incidents, and things that seem to upset, frustrate, and/or irritate your child. You will want to keep in mind that hassles occur when your child is alone, interacting with peers, family members, pets, etc. throughout the day. Please record beside each hassle your child's behavior/reaction. Some hassles may occur several times day and may be repeated throughout the week, therefore you will want to record these hassles each time they are experienced. Please return this form to Mrs. Jean Vogler on Wednesday, May 21.

Thanking you again for your participation and cooperation.

Saturday, May 17

		Hassle	Child's behavior/reaction
Morning	1.		1.
	2.		2.
	3.		3.
	4.		4.
	5.		5.
	6.		6.
	7.		7.
	8.		8.
	9.		9.
	10.		10.

Total time spent with child during this part of the day:

Afternoon	1.		1.
	2.		2.
	3.		3.
	4.		4.
	5.		5.
	6.		6.
	7.		7.
	8.		8.
	9.		9.
	10.		10.

Total time spent with child during this part of the day:

		Hassle	Child's behavior/reaction
Evening	1.		1.
	2.		2.
	3.		3.
	4.		4.
	5.		5.
	6.		6.
	7.		7.
	8.		8.
	9.		9.
	10.		10.

Total time spent with child during this part of the day:

Night	1.		1.
	2.		2.
	3.		3.
	4.		4.
	5.		5.
	6.		6.
	7.		7.
	8.		8.
	9.		9.
	10.		10.

Total time spent with child during this part of the day:

Note. This from was completed for four days (May 17 - May 20)

Now that you have completed the Preschool Hassles Record, try to remember past hassles that your child has experienced but have not been recorded during the past four days. You might want to consider hassles your child has experienced throughout his/her preschool years.

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

APPENDIX G

SURVEY LETTER

VIRGINIA TECH

Department of Family
and Child Development

Wallace Annex
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061-8299
(703) 961-6794 or 6795

May 14, 1986

Dear Mothers:

I am a graduate student in child development conducting a study on the way preschool children deal with minor stressors, known as "hassles", that occur in their daily lives. This study is in response to a need to better understand preschool children's coping strategies and effectiveness. The findings of this study will be valuable in helping children develop effective coping strategies which may have a long-term effect on the development of competence.

In order to conduct this study, a "hassles" scale must be developed. To generate such a scale, a list of daily hassles experienced by preschool children must be identified. I am seeking your cooperation in this phase of the study to help to identify the hassles preschool children encounter. Your involvement entails keeping a daily record of the situations, incidents, and things that seem to upset, frustrate, and/or irritate your child. A daily record will be kept for four days between May 17 and May 20 on the enclosed forms and will be returned to Mrs. Jean Vogler, Child Development Laboratory, on May 28.

Your identities and responses will be kept strictly confidential in all instances. Participation in this study is entirely voluntary but I sincerely hope that you will participate in this initial phase of my study. The success of this study depends on your cooperation.

If you have any questions or need further information, please contact me ( ) or ( ), or Dr. Victoria Fu ( ).

Sincerely,

Sandra L. Lookabaugh
Graduate Student

Victoria R. Fu, Ph.D.
Professor

APPENDIX H

CONSENT LETTER

VIRGINIA TECH

Department of Family
and Child Development

Wallace Annex
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061 8299
(703) 961-4794 or 4795

July 7, 1986

Dear Mothers:

I am a graduate student in child development conducting a study on the way preschool children deal with minor stressors, known as "hassles", that occur in their daily lives. This study is in response to a need to better understand preschool children's coping strategies and effectiveness. The findings of this study will be valuable in helping children develop effective coping strategies which may have a long-term effect on the development of competence.

Your involvement in this study entails a brief interview and the completion of a short questionnaire. I will be contacting you in a few days to talk about the study and your decision to participate. Your identities and responses will be kept strictly confidential. Participation in this study is entirely voluntary but I sincerely hope that you will participate. The success of this study depends on your cooperation.

If you have any questions or need further information, please contact me (or), or Dr. Victoria Fu ( ).

Sincerely,

Sandra L. Lookabaugh
Graduate Student

Victoria R. Fu, Ph.D.
Professor

APPENDIX I

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

Pearson Correlation Coeffecients / Prob > R
Under HO : RHO = 0 / N = 50

	ADAPT	INTENSE	INTOT	OBTOT	FREQHASS	CETOT
ADAPT	-	.19291	.40604	.17397	.26477	.44102
	-	.1795	.0034	.2269	.0631	.0013
INTENSE	-	-	.13296	-.00975	-.01291	.14100
	-	-	.3573	.9464	.9291	.3287
INTOT	-	-	-	.50412	.91267	.91348
	-	-	-	.0002	.0001	.0001
OBTOT	-	-	-	-	.50534	.51702
	-	-	-	-	.0002	.0001
FREQHASS	-	-	-	-	-	.84184
	-	-	-	-	-	.0001
CETOT	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-

Note. ADAPT = adaptability (TTS)

INTENSE = intensity (TTS)

INTOT = total intensity of reaction (HSPC)

OBTOT = total frequency of object use (HSPC)

FREQHASS = total frequency of hassles (HSPC)

CETOT = total coping effectiveness (HSPC)

MEANS, SDs, AND RANGE OF SCORES FOR HSPC VARIABLES

SOURCE	FREQHASS			INTOT			CETOT			OBTOT		
	$\bar{X}$	SD	Range	$\bar{X}$	SD	Range	$\bar{X}$	SD	Range	$\bar{X}$	SD	Range
Children without objects (N=17)	28.00	13.40	10.00-50.00	1.39	0.60	0.52-2.22	1.04	0.49	0.46-2.16	-	-	-
Children with objects (N=33)	28.33	13.32	8.00-50.00	1.36	0.68	0.18-2.90	1.18	0.65	0.20-2.72	1.10	0.63	0.24-2.82
soft objects (N=24)	31.87	13.49	8.00-50.00	1.52	0.70	0.38-2.90	1.34	0.68	0.26-2.72	1.21	0.67	0.24-2.82
thumb (N=9)	18.88	7.00	8.00-27.00	0.93	0.40	0.18-1.50	0.75	0.28	0.20-1.18	0.82	0.39	0.28-1.26
TOTAL GROUP (N=50)	28.22	13.21	8.00-50.00	1.37	0.65	0.18-2.90	1.13	0.60	0.20-2.72	0.73	0.73	0.00-2.82

Note. FREQHASS= total frequency of hassles

INTOT= total intensity of reaction

CETOT= total coping effectiveness

OBTOT= total frequency of object use

The vita has been removed
from the scanned document