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ABSTRACT

In sequence, family and school are the first fundamental settings in which the child’s affective, emotional, social and cognitive growth takes place. Two images of the child are formed, separately, in these two groups, the “filial” image and the “scholastic” image, which inevitably merge together, seeking a conformation, in the personality of the child (cf. Liverta Sempio, Marchetti, 1995).

This investigation aims to evaluate and compare the affective relationships experienced by the child in the family and in the class, as observable from the child’s drawings.

The study involved 105 primary school students (60 males, 45 females) in Piemonte, of whom 65 were in the first cycle (first and second grades) and 40 in the second cycle (fourth and fifth grades), analyzing a total of 210 drawings.

Drawings of the family and the class were produced and analyzed as suggested by Tambelli, Zavattini, Mossi (1995) and by Quaglia and Saglione (1990) respectively. It was found that there are graphic differences according to the subjects’ gender and age group. Comparison between the findings that emerged from the Family Drawing and those from the Class Drawing pointed to common aspects and specific features of the depicted settings.
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INTRODUCTION

The family is the first fundamental setting for the child’s affective, emotional, social and cognitive growth. When they are able to fulfill their duties “well enough” (Winnicott, 1965), parents are a resource for the child from a number of standpoints: they satisfy the child’s physical and emotional
needs by offering material and affective support, transmit social and moral rules, act as role models, and propose knowledge about the world and lifestyles that are necessary for independent life in the future (Whiting & Edwards, 1988).

Psychological literature long focused attention on family members in a precise sequence that assumed a decreasing order of importance, from mother to father to siblings. In reality, however, the majority of mothers and children live in a family setting in which there are other family members who modulate the relationship within the dyad in different ways, and thus cannot be relegated to a secondary role as onlookers. In particular, the dynamic perspective, in stressing the value of the father's presence in structuring the child's personality, conceptualizes the “co-starring role” that the paternal figure plays in promoting the child's psychological growth (Quaglia, 2001).

In certain cases, moreover, the presence of siblings modifies the family structure both in numerical terms and, above all, from the dynamic-relational standpoint. The “relational network” which is set up inside the family is extended, and the dynamics change: having a plurality of interlocutors encourages the process of decentralization, the development of social skills can be fine-tuned, and it is possible to use more material, cognitive and emotional resources, thus increasing the likelihood that successful solutions will be found. Accordingly, siblings put the ability to cope with alliances and rivalries to the test, making it necessary to develop new relational approaches.

Family relationships have an undoubted importance, not just because they are a source of security and satisfy affective and material needs, but chiefly because they are a solid foundation on which future relationships can be built: through affective, communicative, cognitive and social exchange with each family member, the child internalizes relational models that will tend to present themselves in the contexts he will encounter later (Howes, Matheson, & Hamilton). A number of studies have confirmed that the relational patterns found between the child and the first caregiver are extended to the relationships established with other figures to whom the child will turn to receive protection and comfort. In this sense, the parent-child relationship reoccurs in the interactions that the child-student establishes with the teacher (Howes & Hamilton, 1992) and with classmates (Erickson, Sroufe & Egeland, 1985).

The school, then, is the first stage on which the social and relational approaches acquired in the early affective contacts are rehearsed. Upon starting school, the process of partial separation from the parents is consolidated: for the first time, the child is put in a position where he must compare his own and others’ experience, and can learn to go beyond egocentric and subjective viewpoints (Programmi 1985). Drawing on the baggage of prior personal experience, the child learns to dialog in a new way with adults and peers having different roles and functions (the teacher in lieu of parents, classmates in lieu of siblings).

At school, moreover, others’ expectations and the rules for getting along multiply and become more complicated: the child knows he must adapt to the new context, “reconstructing” a new image of himself as pupil (Carugati & Selleri, 1996). This triggers a partial “dismantling” of the ways that the child has hitherto used and heard used in order to talk to people, to tell them about things, to ask, to explain, and to deal with others, gradually making room for those which are “institutionally appropriate”. At home and at school, two images of the child are formed, separately: the “filial” image and the “school” image, which inevitably merge together, seeking a conformation, in the personality of the child (cf. Liverta Sempio & Marchetti, 1995).

In all of this, a fundamental role falls to the teacher, who serves as a “hinge between the experience and the family culture of the individual and the experience and culture of a larger segment of society” (Bombi & Scittarelli, 1998, p.53): taking up where the parental relationship leaves off, the educator assumes the role of the third caregiver who is expected to recognize the child's feelings, process them and render them in a form which is more supportable for the child. A positive rela-
tionship with the teacher, marked by affection, closeness, and exchange of communication, becomes a factor that protects against the developmental risks associated with problematic family situations as well as with school experiences that are seen as negative, either in terms of academic success (Plinta & Steinberg, 1992) or of conduct and peer relationships (Hughes, Cavell & Jackson, 1999).

In view of the important role that school and family play in the child’s development through a continual exchange and construction of “images” of the child as “son” or “daughter” and as “student”, this study aims to evaluate and compare the affective relationships experienced by the child in the family and in the class. These dynamics are observed through drawing, an activity that is natural and enjoyable for the child, and a way of communicating the structure of the inner representational world and its affective implications.

In particular, identifying significant associations between graphic indexes of family experience and the ability to adapt to the school setting will enhance the value of using drawing (specifically, the Class Drawing) as a means of communication and of opening up to dialog between teacher and student.

**METHOD**

**Participants**

The study involved 105 students, including 60 males (57.1%) and 45 females (42.9%), with a mean age of 7.96 years (SD= 1.441). All of the children attended primary school in Piemonte; 65 (61.9%) were in the first cycle (first and second grades) and 40 (38.1%) were in the second cycle (fourth and fifth grades): participants were thus distributed fairly evenly between two age groups, a younger group of 6 to 7 year olds, and an older group of 9 to 10 year olds. As each student produced two graphic representations, a total of 210 drawings were analyzed.

**Instruments**

Part of the tradition of the projective methods that are widely used in dynamic models, use of the graphic method springs from the idea that drawing can be revealing of affective dynamics in childhood. Like a narrative, a drawing is a “construction”, shaped on the one hand by life cycle events, and on the other hand by internal working models that cannot be assimilated literally with real events. The drawing is thus a “communication” of the inner representational world and its affective implications (Tambelli, Zavattini & Mossi, 1995): in his graphic representation, the child does not copy reality faithfully, nor does he depart from reality in error. Rather, he cuts out a corner of the world all for himself, where he can dictate the rules of the game and twist and bend reality in order to recreate a relationship of trust with different self-images (Quaglia & Saglione, 1990).

In this sense, the two instruments used, the Family Drawing (FD) and the Class Drawing (CD) represent a personal conception of relatively stable, though by no means fixed, affective dynamics in the family and school settings respectively.

*The Family Drawing (FD)*

The Family drawing, devised by Corman in 1967 for children and adolescents, aims to investigate the relationships that the subject has established with other members of the family group, as well as the problems he has with the group as a whole and/or certain persons in particular. This study is based specifically on the interpretation of the FD provided by Tambelli, Zavattini and Mossi (1995), who see it as “a representation of a representation, or in other words the product of a construction, not in terms of a pure creation of unconscious fantasies that are indifferent to the experi-
ence of real relationships, nor of a mere distortion of them, but as an expression of more fluid mecha-
nism of cycles of projection and introjection in which representations of internal relationships of an
imaginary nature are constantly projected onto the outside world, and perceptions of real figure in
the outside world blend with internal images” (ibid., pp. 12-13).

The FD and CD were produced by the entire class during morning school hours, on different
occasions and in alternating order, without setting time limits. For each drawing, each child was
given a standard A4 sheet of paper, pencil, eraser and crayons. For the FD, the children were told
“Draw a family”, rather than “Draw a family, a family you’ve invented” as in the traditional Corman
method, since the intention was to maintain the same function of facilitating the projection of imag-
inary aspects, but without suggesting “prosaically” inventive aspects (Tambelli, Zavattini & Mossi,
1995).

After finishing the drawing, each child was interviewed individually to obtain information about
his or her preferences and identification with the people figuring in the drawing (for each person rep-
resented, the child was asked to indicate name, gender, age, role in the family, what they do and
where they are, and who is the most or least liked, happy and important person. In addition, the child
was asked “Suppose you are part of this family: who would you like to be?”. For each child, the atti-
itude assumed when receiving instructions and while drawing was observed (refusal, excessive
speed, anxiety, etc.). Finally, the teachers assisted in filling out an identification form indicating the
composition of each child’s family group in order to compare the drawn family with the actual fam-
ily.

Given that the data collected through the drawing can never represent everything that the child
could or would consciously or unconsciously like to communicate, but only those things that were
focused on through the selected parameters, a set of indexes was used to identify the subject’s prin-
cipal positive or negative tendencies. Specifically, the investigators proceeded to compare the real
family with the family in the drawing (analyzing omissions and additions), to determine the role of
identifications and, in accordance with Corman’s concept of “valorization/devalorization” (1967), to
rank the significance assigned to the various depicted characters on three nominal scales (priority,
size and importance).

The Class Drawing (CD)
The Class Drawing, a semi-projective graphic method developed Quaglia and Saglione in 1990,
was used to investigate the child’s perception of his “well-being” at school as regards the various
aspects of classroom life (the relationship with the teacher, the relationship with classmates, expe-
rience with learning and with the himself as student. After a preliminary dialog with the entire class
in which the children were brought to understand that the “class” is an entity consisting of four main
aspects (one’s self, classmates, teacher, classroom), the children were told “Draw your class, draw
it however you like”. Here again, the children were interviewed individually after finishing their draw-
ings in order to determine what each child had represented and the reasons for any omissions.

As Quaglia and Saglione (1990) suggest, the drawings were interpreted at the level of content.
Specifically, a comparison of what was represented in the drawing with the real elements (layout of
desks, position of each student, number of classmates and teachers, etc.), was followed by an analy-
sis of how each element of the class was depicted and whether it was omitted, the amount of care
taken in representing it, its dimensions, order of appearance, and closeness/distance. As Quaglia
and Saglione indicate, the forms of devaluation (moving away, reducing size, erasing, adding last,
suppressing) are to be interpreted, like silence in oral communication, as attempts at defense and
reassurance when faced with distressing and problematic situations to which the child is unable to
adapt. Conversely, the elements of the class that are represented accurately and valorized (subjects
present physically, depicted with care, close, proportionately dimensioned, and drawn first) are
interpreted as showing positive affective investment, and the child thus exhibits a relationship of trust in them.

**Procedure**

Data were analyzed using PASW 18 statistical analysis software.

**RESULTS**

**Family Drawing**

The majority of the children produced the required drawings calmly and happily, doing so in a drawing time that was neither too long nor too short (97.1%). The pressure and type of stroke used are for the most part appropriate (82.9% and 87.6%); lines that are too light or too heavy, discontinuous and uncertain or repeated are chiefly typical of males ($\chi^2=6.085; df=1; p<0.05$) and the younger children ($\chi^2=5.815; 1; p<0.05$).

A generally positive emotional tone (in 99% and 96.4% of cases respectively) is also found in the responses to the question “Where are the people?” and in the description of the activities they are engaged in, and especially in the responses of the younger children ($\chi^2=6.757; df=1; p<0.05$).

Frequency distributions of the indexes analyzed for the FD are summarized in Table 1.

As regards the actual composition of the families, in most cases the students belong to triadic families (36.2%) consisting of mother, father and child, or tetradic families (49.5%) made up of parents and two children. In the remaining 14.3% of cases, the family consists of three or more children. In 63.8% of cases, then, students have at least one brother or sister.

Comparing the actual numerical composition with the one depicted in the drawing, it was found that 68.5% of the students drew all of the members of their family without making changes. In the remaining 31.5% of cases, the changes consisted of omitting rather than adding people (Table 1, Omission). In particular, the omissions are of parental figures (mother: 11.4%; father: 10.5%) and, even more frequently, the image that should represent the child himself (21.9%). The older students are especially likely not to draw themselves ($\chi^2=16.620; df=2; p<0.001$). More often than their counterparts in the first cycle, the older students tend to assign characteristics – name, gender, age, profession – to the parental figures that differ in part from those of the real family members (father: $\chi^2=22.238; df=2; p<0.001$; mother: $\chi^2=24.166; df=2; p<0.001$).

The added figures, which like the omitted figures are here interpreted as different “identifications” of the subject, rather than as indicating unexpressed drives, are chiefly representative of children with whom there is a fraternal bond (11.4%), other unrelated children, grandparents, uncles, aunts and cousins.
The children’s choices as regards identification of desire are almost equally divided between themselves (25.7%), the maternal figure (24.8%) and the paternal figure (23.8%). It should be noted that the child’s response to the interview question “Who would you like to be?” refers to a desire or tendency at the conscious level: the child chooses the person who best expresses his “confessable” aspirations. In this case, then, the question is not so much one of accepting one’s gender, age or role in the family as of identifying with the figures who represent the power, value and models that the child would like to make his own (Abraham, 1976). Conforming this, it is chiefly the younger children who identify with the maternal figure ($x^2=6.977; \text{df}=1; p<0.01$), and who also see the mother as the most important person ($x^2=6.672; \text{df}=1; p<0.05$), underscoring her role as the primary relational partner.

In the responses, there are also important differences associated with gender identity: girls prefer to identify with the mother ($x^2=22.684; \text{df}=1; p<0.001$), and boys with the father ($x^2=14.717; \text{df}=1; p<0.001$). This highlights the sense of sexual belonging and the function it assumes in the organization of the Self.

Considering depicted closeness as an indicator of the dynamics of the affections, “where” the child draws himself with respect to the other family members was evaluated. The majority of the

---

### Table 1. Percentage frequency distribution for each FD index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FD INDEXES and FIGURES (reference %)</th>
<th>Father (100%)</th>
<th>Mother (100%)</th>
<th>Self (100%)</th>
<th>Sibling1 (63.8%)</th>
<th>Sibling2 (9.5%)</th>
<th>Other cohabitant (5.7%)</th>
<th>Added figure (21.9%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Omission</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>21.9°</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total distortion of reality</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial distortion of reality</td>
<td>11.4°</td>
<td>12.4°</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete match with reality</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>56.2°</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>23.8°</td>
<td>24.8°</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>9.5°</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of desire

| Order (drawn first)                  | 30.5         | 24.8         | 24.8°      | 7.6             | 1.9             | 5.7                 |
| Size                                 | 47.6         | 24.8         | 2.9        | -               | 4.8             | 2.9                 |
| Importance                           | 21.9°        | 23.8°        | 18.1*      | 8.6°            | 2.9             | -                   | 4.8               |
| Closeness                            | 41           | 46.7         | -          | 30.5            | 3.8             | -                   | 1.9               |
| Together                             | 84.8         | 83.8         | 76.2       | 57.1            | 9.5             | 5.7                 | 21                 |
| Happiest                             | 26.7°        | 33.3*°       | 39°        | 29.5            | 1.9             | -                   | 10.5               |
| Less happy                           | 16.2°        | 7.6          | 2.9        | 4.8             | 1.9             | -                   | 4.8               |
| More important                       | 41.9°        | 30.5*°       | 29.5°      | 17.1            | 1.9             | 1                   | 1.9               |
| Less important                       | 1.0          | 6.7          | 6.7        | 7.6             | 1.9             | 1                   | 4.8               |
| More liked                           | 34.3         | 21           | 16.2       | 22.9            | 3.8             | 1                   | 8.6               |
| Less liked                           | 11.4°        | 4.8          | 6.7        | 8.6             | 3.8             | -                   | 1.9               |

* with significant differences by gender; ° with significant differences by age.
subjects (78.7%) placed themselves near at least one parent (Table 1, Closeness), emphasizing the bond of mutual understanding and liking that joins the child to the parental figures. In addition, parents and child are usually depicted as belonging to a single graphic grouping. The other figures—siblings, added persons and other cohabitants in particular—occupy a common, shared space to a gradually decreasing extent (Table 1, Together).

As for the order in which the figures are drawn, the father is most often represented first, followed by the mother and by the child himself (Table 1, Order). However, the paternal figure is also the one that is most frequently drawn last, indicating an ambivalent attitude towards him. Here again, moreover, the younger children exhibit a strong egocentric sense, starting their drawings by representing themselves ($\chi^2=9.765; \text{df}=3; p<0.05$). This attitude is also found in the younger children’s tendency to identify themselves as the happiest ($\chi^2=5.549; \text{df}=1; p<0.05$) and most important person ($\chi^2=5.098; \text{df}=1; p<0.05$).

Assuming that there is a link between the emotional resonance of a family member and the size of that member’s depiction, the father is also the most highly valorized figure in terms of height (47.6%), followed by the mother (24.8%) (Table 1, Size).

On the basis of the number of attributes, on the other hand, the mother is the figure who receives most attention, though not to an overwhelming degree (Figure 1, Importance), followed by the figure of the father (21.9%) and that representing the child (18.1%). In general, the girls devote more attention and care to details (Maternal figure: $\chi^2=13.130; \text{df}=1; p<0.001$. Figure of self: $\chi^2=3.723; \text{df}=1; p<0.05$. Figure of siblings: $\chi^2=8.025; \text{df}=1; p<0.01$).

Class Drawing
The main findings that emerged from the analysis of the Class Drawings are summarized in Table 2.

As regards the physical presence of the individuals making up the class (the child, classmates and teacher), the figures who are most frequently represented are those of classmates (65%) (Table 2, Presence). However, classmates are not always drawn with particular care, especially by the males ($\chi^2=7.574; \text{df}=2; p<0.05$). Another figure that is generally present as a person is the teacher (62.5%) who, even if omitted, is nevertheless “remembered” through an element (blackboard or desk) associated with his or her educational role (35.6%). The teacher often appears among the most highly valorized figures in the drawing (43.8%), particularly in girls’ representations ($\chi^2=6.242; \text{df}=1; p<0.05$).

By contrast, the least present figure is that of the child himself (48.6%). Once again, the representation of Self, when present, is drawn with greater care by females ($\chi^2=6.522; \text{df}=2; p<0.05$) and, as in the FD, is more highly valorized by the younger children ($\chi^2=14.514; \text{df}=1, p<0.001$). With age, in fact, the attention towards the self is replaced with a greater care in drawing the classroom as a physical space ($\chi^2=8.555; \text{df}=3; p<0.05$) and in drawing the teacher ($\chi^2=5.006; \text{df}=1; p<0.05$).
As regards the internal correspondences between the total scores obtained in the different dimensions of the CD, there are significant correlations between the representation of subjects: between Self and Classmates (Pearson’s $r = .529; p<0.01$), between Self and Teacher (Pearson’s $r = .473; p<0.01$), and between Classmates and Teacher (Pearson’s $r = .499; p<0.01$).
Associations between FD and CD

Table 3. Chi-square test thresholds in the associations between FD Indexes and CD Elements as most highly valorized (+) or most devalorized (-).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FD Indexes</th>
<th>CD Elements</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents_Omission</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>- 0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father_Closeness</td>
<td>Classmates</td>
<td>+ 0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father_Distortion</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>- 0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father_Importance</td>
<td>+ 0.05</td>
<td>+ 0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father_LessHappy</td>
<td>- 0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father_MoreLiked</td>
<td>+ 0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother_Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother_Omission</td>
<td>- 0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother_Distortion</td>
<td>- 0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother_Importance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother_Happiest</td>
<td>+ 0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother_MostImportant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self_Omission</td>
<td>- 0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self_Happiest</td>
<td>+ 0.05</td>
<td>+ 0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siblings_Omission</td>
<td>- 0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 summarizes the significant relationships found between the indexes considered for the FD and the CD. As can be seen, there are important links between the two graphic representations, in particular between:

- Ways of representing the paternal figure and valorizing the Self-student: a greater importance assigned to the father (expressed in terms of the care taken in drawing and the attribution of characteristic of happiness and liking for the figure, typical of the younger children) corresponds to a higher regard for the Self in the school setting (likewise typical of six to seven year olds), emphasizing the value of the paternal figure as one that indicates the way ahead to the child, opening up the road to conquests in the world outside of the family.

- The omission of Self-child and the devalorization of Self-student: how the child represents himself in the FD is repeated in the CD.

- The characteristics of the graphic representation of the parental figures and those of the classmates: forms of affective disinvestment from the paternal and maternal figure and in part from siblings (omission, poor match between the depicted figures and reality) correspond to forms of devaluation of peers in the CD, confirming the role of primary relationships as the basis for future dealings.

- Value assigned to the maternal figure and the figure of the educator: the teacher is graphically valorized chiefly by students who identify with the maternal figure and consider the mother to be the happiest and most important person (consequently, this is especially true of girls).

CONCLUSIONS

Age and gender were found to be variables that influence children’s internal representations in two settings of undoubted importance, the family and the school (Morval, 1973). In particular, this study found significant differences between the two age groups considered (younger children from 6 to 7 years old, and older children from 9 to 10 years old), confirming the intermediate age of 8
years as a turning point. In the graphic representations considered, there is a clear transition from a period of egocentrism and dependence, rendered by a high valorization of the Self in drawings by children in the first primary school cycle, to a form of devaluation of the Self in the representations of students in the second cycle. Rather than a devalorization, however, this should be seen as an attempt on the part of the older students to differentiate themselves from the family setting, and to adapt and identify interests in the non-family world (the world of school and contemporaries). Graphically, this attempt translates into illustrations that are less firmly anchored to reality in the FD, and, in the CD, a higher valorization of the educational environment and figures (particular care in drawing classroom furnishings and the teacher). While the importance that children assign to themselves continues to decrease, the educational figures – the parents in the family and the teachers at school – remain constant points of affective reference.

The significant associations found between the FD and CD (the link between how parental figures are represented in the FD and classmates in the CD, between the maternal image and the teacher, between the figure of the father and of the child himself in the school setting) confirm the importance of relational exchanges with family figures, which contribute to the baggage of knowledge and experience that the child will bring to each new situation, including the school situation. At the same time, however, each setting affirms its own specific features; in the school environment, for example, the role of the educator is a resource for establishing positive relationships with peers.

These findings thus bear out the concurrent validity of the CD, which is confirmed as a useful means of interpreting and understanding for the teacher who, in view of his or her direct knowledge of the student, can employ this graphic method to dialog with the child and reconstruct – and improve – the child's affective reality.
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