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The major purpose of the study was to describe parents' perceptions of their discipline of their children in relation to specific demographic factors in the $1960^{\prime}$ s, 1970 's, and 1980's. The specific demographic factors were age, sex and birth order of the child, the parents' ages and education, and the amount of time the child spent each day with each parent.

The basic research design was one in which information from a questionnaire was used to describe parents' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in relation to the above-named demographic factors in the 1960's, 1970's, and 1980's. Subjects were 180 children, ages 15 months to 59 months, and their parents, studied in three separate groups across 15 years.

Based on the information available on the questionnaire and literature findings, the following hypotheses were formulated:
(1) there is no relationship between the ages of the children and the parents' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the $1960^{\prime} \mathrm{s}, 1970$ 's, and $1980^{\prime} \mathrm{s} ;(2)$ there is no relationship between the sex of the children and the parents' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1960's, 1970's, and 1980's; (3) there is no relationship between the fathers' ages and the fathers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1960's, 1970's, and $1980^{\prime} \mathrm{s} ;(4)$ there is no relationship between the mothers' ages and the mothers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1960's, 1970's, and 1980's; (5) there is no relationship between the fathers' education and the fathers' perceptions of their discipline
of their preschool children in the $1960^{\prime} \mathrm{s}, 1970^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$, and 1980's; (6) there is no relationship between the mothers' education and the mothers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1960's, 1970's, and 1980's; (7) there is no relationship between the birth order of the children and the parents' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1960's, 1970's, and 1980; (8) there is no relationship between the amount of time the fathers spend with their children and the fathers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1960's, 1970's, and 1980's; and (9) there is no relationship between the amount of time the mothers spend with their children and the mothers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1960's, 1970's, and 1980's.

The results of the data revealed that a majority of the parents perceived their discipline of their preschool children to be "reasonably firm" in all three decades, even in consideration of specific demographic factors. The largest number of children were the first-born in their family, their parents were 30 years of age or older, and the greatest number of parents had a baccalaureate or higher level of education. A majority of the mothers spent eight hours or more a day with their children and the majority of fathers spent three hours or less a day with their children.
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## CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Today's parents are challenged by the problems of rearing children in a period of rapid social change. The changing society accompanied by changing life styles has suggested a need to examine the child-rearing practices exhibited by parents in recent years.

It has long been recognized that the discipline of children by their parents is an important aspect of parent-child relationships. Recently, investigators have attempted to explore the many factors relating to the discipline of children. What is written about the disciplining of children is massive, yet the relationship of the discipline of children, and parents' perceptions of their discipline, to specific demographic factors is unclear.

Zahn-Waxler and Chapman (1982) studied the interactions of children's behaviors and caretakers' disciplinary practices. Mulhern and Passman (1981) explored children's roles in influencing caretakers' behaviors toward them. Steinmetz (1979) and Kagan and Moss (1962) stressed that a particular disciplinary strategy could have varying effects at different points in the child's development. Shaffer (1979) and Baumrind (1971) studied parental disciplinary techniques and their relationship to prosocial behavior in children. Yankelovich, Skelly, and White (1977) were interested in parent-child interactions and attempted to explore and analyze patterns of parental discipline. In 1976, Saltzstein suggested collecting data from parents and children at
different points over the course of the child's development in order to guage the contribution of child-rearing practices such as discipline. Hoffman (1970) also explored and analyzed patterns of parental discipline. The majority of studies focusing on the discipline of children utilize psychoanalytical, developmental, or social learning theory.

## Purpose of the Study

The present study was designed to describe how specific demographic factors related to the degree of discipline parents perceived themselves to exercise towards their preschool children in three succeeding decades--the $1960^{\prime} \mathrm{s}, 1970^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$, and $1980^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$. Taken into account were the specific factors of the child's age and sex, the parents' respective ages and education, the birth order of the child, and the amount of time the child spends each day with each parent.

Three groups of children and their mothers and fathers were studied, all of whom participated in the Preschool Laboratory Centers in the Department of Child Development and Family Relations within the School of Home Economics at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro (UNC-G). The Preschool Laboratory Centers serve as a training ground for students who major in child development at UNC-G. The first group studied attended either the Toddler, or the foddler-Two, or the Nursery School Preschool Laboratory Centers from January, 1968 to December, 1969. The second group investigated attended the Toddler, Toddler-Two, or Nursery School Preschool Laboratory Centers from

January, 1975 to December, 1976. The third group participated in the same Centers from January, 1982 to December, 1983.

The parents of all children who were admitted to the three Preschool Laboratory Centers completed a questionnaire prepared by the staff of the Preschool Laboratory Centers within the Department of Child Development and Family Relations at UNC-G. Entitled FForm 19: Your Child and His Development" (see Appendix A), this questionnaire asked, among other things, that parents select the degree of discipline they perceived themselves to exercise toward their children. Their responses to this question formed the basis for the research question of this study.

## Research Question

For the present study, the following research question was investigated: Was there a relationship between specific demographic factors and the parents' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children during the three decades (1960's, 1970's, 1980's)? The specific demographic factors are the age of the child, sex of the child, father's age, mother's age, father's education, mother's education, birth order of the child, amount of time child spends each day with the father, and the amount of time the child spends each day with the mother.

## Assumptions

The basic assumption in this study was that parents' perceptions of how they discipline their preschool children could be reliably measured
by their responses to the questionnaire, "Form 19: Your Child and His Development" (UNC-G, n.d.), and specifically to the questions "Mother's discipline of child" and "Father's discipline of child." Possible answers were rigid, stern, reasonably firm, easygoing, very lax, and sometimes stern--sometimes lax.

## Significance of the Study

This research study was prompted by the investigator's observation of parents' discipline of their children in general, and her knowledge that families in general are undergoing changing life styles. Recognizing the dearth of research related to trends in parents' discipline, and needs expressed by parents who seek information and assistance with discipline, the investigator attempted to explore the present question of the relationship between specific demographic factors and parents' perceptions of their discipline. The knowledge of how certain factors relate to parents' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1960's, 1970's, and 1980's may be significant. Results of the study should provide parents, teachers, caregivers, and researchers with a better understanding of the trends in parental discipline over the 15-year period from 1968 to 1983.

## Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined as they are used in the present study:

Parents' perceptions of discipline: the mothers' and fathers' judgement of their own disciplinary behavior towards their preschool
child, seen as rigid, stern, reasonably firm, easy-going, very lax, or sometimes stern--sometimes lax.

Preschool children: those children at least 15 months and no more than 59 months of age who attended the Toddler, Toddler-Two, or Nursery School Preschool Laboratory Centers within the Department of Child Development and Family Relations within the School of Home Economics at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro during the years of 1968, 1969, 1975, 1976, 1982, and 1983.

Discipline: the responsibility assumed by parents requiring that their "children behave within certain limits, teaching them right from wrong, and teaching them to control themselves according to what is considered right and wrong by their society" (Smart \& Smart, 1977, p. 287).

Intact family groups: groups composed of first-marriage parents and their biological children.

Summary

Because discipline has always been considered an important aspect of parent-child relationships, the investigator proposed to analyze the relationship between specific demographic factors and parents' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children. It was hoped that the results of the study would provide parents, teachers, caregivers, and researchers with a better understanding of the trends in parental discipline since 1968.

## CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The review of the literature is presented in two distinct areas, related by the scope of inquiry of the present study. Research supporting the theoretical framework will be reviewed first, and the research relating to the discipline of children in the $1960^{\prime} \mathrm{s}, 1970^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$, and 1980's will follow.

## Theoretical Framework

## Biological Theory

Three of the most widely researched theories focusing on discipline of children are biological, drive, and social learning theories of aggression. Early psychological theories endeavored to explain human behavior in terms of instinctual forces. Biological theorists view man as aggressive by nature or by instinct. The instinctual theories range from McDougall's (1931) view that all social behavior is under instinctual control, to Freud's $(1922,1933)$ view that aggression represents overt expressions of the death instinct, to Lorenz's (1966) view that aggression involves an instinctual pattern that generates its own source of aggressive energy independently of extreme stimulation. The biological theories purport that aggressive behavior is determined by biological, psychological, and sociological factors. The general propositions equally apply to almost anything people do; however, they do not advance the understanding of aggression. The biological
theorists are unable to determine to what extent biological, psychological, and social influences contribute to variations in aggression between different people. They question whether aggressive behavior is determined by multiple causes.

The present study does not attempt to find the determinants of aggressive behavior, but does look at specific demographic factors that may be related to parents' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children. The biological theory forms the basis of the theoretical framework.

## Drive Theory

Eventually the instinct doctrine fell into disrepute and psychoanalysts made the aggressive drive theory popular. The aggressive drive theorists viewed man as motivated to aggressive behavior by a frustration-produced drive rather than by an innate aggressive force. The drive theory of aggression became popular with the investigations of Dollard, Dobb, Miller, Mowrer, and Sears (1939) who hypothesized that aggression is a natural and inevitable consequence of frustration. Frustration was assumed to be a necessary and sufficient condition for the occurrence of aggressive behavior. Dollard et al. (1939) evaluated the theory by studying a group of nursery school children and their parents. Miller (1941) modified their hypotheses to regard aggression as a natural, inevitable, consequence of frustration as well as a learned response to frustration.

Feshback (1970) in the more recent version of the drive theory gave greater recognition to learning variables than did his theoretical
forerunners. In his view, the aggressive drive relationship is innate, but the frustration aggressive behavior can be increased by reinforcement and modeling. Feshback (1970) retained the notion that frustrating events elicit an aggressive drive in people.

A major limitation of the aggressive-drive theory is that it assumes that aggression serves only a single purpose, namely to inflict injury. However, this view serves as an important link between the psychoanalytical and the social learning theories of aggression in the present study.

## Social Learning Theory

The social learning theorists view man as neither driven by inner forces nor buffeted helplessly by environmental influences. Instead, human behavior is explained in terms of continuous reciprocal interaction between behavior and its controlling conditions.

In an investigation of social interactions, Rausch (1965) found that the immediately preceding act of one person was the major determinant of the other person's response. Rausch (1965) examined the social interaction of children and found that in approximately $75 \%$ of the instances, hostile behavior elicited unfriendly response, whereas cordial acts seldom elicited unfriendly behavior.

In 1973, Bandura formulated a social learning theory of aggression sufficiently broad in scope to integrate evidence explaining all facets of aggression. The aim of Bandura's (1973) investigation was to offer a better basis for explaining, predicting, and modifying aggression, and to provide impetus for a new line of research which would augment the
explanation of social learning theory. Bandura (1973) concluded that the determinants of human aggression could be best sought in man's social practices.

Knowledge of the view held by the social learning theorists that interactions between parents and children are reciprocal in nature is important when attempting to study and interpret the importance of the parent-child interactions involved in discipline. Parents play an active role in shaping the responses of their children to discipline. Likewise, parental responses are influenced by their children.

Within the theoretical framework of discipline of children, two major areas particularly pertinent to the present study are aggression and perception. The recent research by Burgess (1979) and Mulhern and Passman (1979) supported the belief that parents' discipline of their children is a form of aggression. Many other researchers (Lesser, 1967; Baumrind, 1971) believe also that parents' discipline of their children is a natural response to aggression. Perception theories were addressed because the data utilized in the present study were based on perceptions of parents' discipline of their children rather than actual observations of their discipline.

## Perception Theories

A central premise undergirding the psychology of perception is that individual perceptions are selectively organized (Krech, Crutchfield, \& Bellachey, 1962). The individual first perceives organized objects with form, boundaries, and colors. All of this occurs immediately and without conscious effort. Second, among all the objects in the
individual's physical environment, only certain ones enter into his perceptions of the external world. Third, after considering all possible characteristics of an object, only certain ones are perceived. The cognitive map then is not only a visual representation of one's physical world, but also a personal formulation in which objects selected by the individual have meaning and are perceived in an individual manner (Krech, Crutchfield, \& Bellachey, 1962).

Perceptions have been explored by many theorists throughout the centuries. For many years, sensation was recognized as the only valid basis for the explanation of perceptual meaning. Chaplin and Krawiec (1974) challenged this idea because it failed to consider motivational and intrinsic dynamic factors. In recent years perceptual determinants such as attitudes, personality traits, physiological conditions, and cultural factors have been examined. In fact, Chaplin and Krawiec (1974) acknowledged that virtually every conceivable mental process has been studied in relation to its possible role as a central determinant of perception.

Allport (1955) defined perception as the result of processing information that consists of stimulation of receptors which are partially due to the subject's own activity. He concluded that values represented in the personality of the perceiver tended to influence perceptions and that personality features of the perceiver predispose him to perceive consistently with social value connotations.

Auger (1976) contended that perception is an internal process primarily controlled by the sensory receptors but influenced by many other factors such as attention, past experience, and emotional effect.

The selective process must occur prior to conscious awareness of the perception; therefore, it is assumed to occur outside the control of a person. Once conscious awareness of the incoming sensory information has occurred, it is necessary that the information be evaluated and interpreted as to its meaning or importance to the individual. The evaluation is based on past experience, the cultural frame of reference, and the emotional and cognitive appraisal of the individual.

The values placed by sociocultural regulators upon objects, relationships, and events also assist in the interpretation or the perception. "The way a person perceives his surroundings is a major determinant of the way he will respond or behave toward a situation. The observed response will be congruent to and determined by the individual's perception of the reality, not the reality itself" (Auger, 1976, p. 102).

Auger's (1976) theory of perception, as well as the perception theories of Krech, Crutchfield, and Bellachey (1962), Allport (1955), and Chaplin and Krawiec (1974) provide an important framework for understanding the significance of parents' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children. The knowledge that parents' perceptions are based on internal and external factors assists the investigator in the present study in the selection of variables and in the interpretation of the results.

Discipline in the $\frac{\text { Research on }}{1960^{\prime} \mathrm{s}, 1970^{\prime} \mathrm{s} \text {, and } 1980^{\prime} \mathrm{s}}$

Discipline in the 1960's
Over the years, an increasing amount of research effort has been devoted to the various problems associated with the discipline of children. In the late 1950's and 1960's, studies pertaining to the discipline of children focused primarily on the types of disciplinary practices of parents, the moral development of children (Hoffman, 1963a; Hoffman, 1963b; Hoffman \& Saltzstein, 1967), and aggressiveness in children (Walter, Pearce, \& Dahms, 1957; Lesser, 1967).

However, Jackson (1956) proposed that parents' actions used to correct "undesirable" behaviors in children needed to be examined empirically, and that an investigation, although difficult, would yield valuable information about the parent-child relationship.

Clifford (1959) suggested that the need for discipline was centered around problems involving interpersonal relationships such as sibling relationships and adult-child interactions as well as inappropriate behavior of the child. To study discipline in the home, he used a technique introduced by Goodenough (1931), whereby parents reported observations of their children's behavior objectively. Clifford recruited 120 mothers of children, 60 boys and 60 girls, equally divided among three age levels, three, six, and nine years of age. The primary purposes of the study were to describe the disciplinary process as it takes place in the home, to examine relationships between extrinsic factors and discipline, and to determine the effect of discipline on the child. The findings revealed that the age of the child was the primary
factor associated with discipline. While occassional differences were found between the sex of the child and the socioeconomic status of the family, a significant decrease in the frequency of discipline occurred as the child grew older. Clifford concluded that the age of the child is the greatest single predictor of discipline. While fathers were found to participate minimally in discipline, mothers were found to be most frequently responsible for disciplining the child. Regardless of the age of the child, Clifford (1959) found a great degree of similarity in the disciplinary controls that all mothers and fathers used. However, as the child grew older, the method of disciplinary control shifted from physical to verbal. The use of reasoning was then preferred as a disciplinary technique (Clifford, 1959). Children's reaction to the application of discipline ranged from pleasant behavior to crying to aggressive behavior (Clifford, 1959).

Sear, Maccoby, and Levin (1957) found that the degree of warmth and affection that characterized parent-child interactions was an important determinant of the effectiveness of a particular disciplinary strategy. Sear et al. (1957) found that power-assertive techniques (i.e., spankings) were an effective form of discipline when administered by warm, affectionate mothers. However, cold hostile mothers who were comparable to the affectionate mothers in their use of physical punishment were likely to report that spanking was ineffective.

In 1966, Baumrind described and contrasted three models of parental control--permissive, authoritarian, and authoritative. His findings suggested that authoritative control can achieve responsible conformity
to group standards without loss of individual autonomy or self-assertiveness.

Rothbart and Maccoby (1966) studied parents' reactions to a child's voice. With respect to the sex of the parent and sex of the child, a pattern emerged with fathers showing generally greater permissiveness toward girls than boys for both dependency and aggression. Mothers showed greater permissiveness toward boys than girls.

A year later in a study which investigated socialization practices associated with dimensions of competence in preschool boys and girls, Baumrind and Black (1967) visited in the homes of 95 families and rated the behavior of 103 preschool children. Their findings revealed that parental practices which are intellectually stimulating and to some extent tension producing (e.g., socialization, maturity demands, punitiveness, firmness in disciplinary matters, etc.) are associated with competence in the young child. Firm discipline in the home does produce conforming or dependent behavior in the nursery school situation. Independent, assertive behavior in girls was associated positively with parental demands and negatively with high acceptance. For boys, the opposite was true. The effects of disciplinary practices concluded in this study were consistent with those in the Baumrind (1966) study.

In the 1960's several studies on parental discipline and the child's moral development (Hoffman, 1963a, 1963b; Hoffman \& Saltzstein, 1967) were conducted. Hoffman (1963a) investigated parental discipline and the child's consideration for others among 12 middle-class and 10 working-class families who had a child in attendance at a half-day
nursery school in Detroit. The parent data were obtained from interviews in which the mother gave a detailed account of her interaction with her child the day before the interview. The interviews were coded for (a) the amount of pleasurable nondisciplinary interaction between mother and child, (b) the use of discipline oriented toward the direct consequences of the child's behavior, and (c) the use of discipline oriented toward the implications of the child's behavior for others. The child data were obtained from three half-hour time observations in the nursery school. The observations were coded for the child's consideration of others and the general affective orientation. It was concluded that love-withholding discipline could contribute to socially acceptable behavior in children by intensifying the child's need for approval.

Brim (1957) reported that early Iiterature on parent-child relationship analyzed the roles of the parents in the discipline of their children without specifying the sex of the parent. However, Miller and Swanson (1958) reported that fathers exhibit primarily instrumental functions while mothers provide expressive functions in child-rearing.

In a study by Kagan and Lemkin (1962) where the child's differential perceptions of parental attributes were investigated, the results indicated that children from preschool to preadolescence labeled the mother as more nurturant than the father. The subjects were 32 boys and 35 girls ranging in age from 3 years to 8 years with a median age of 5 years for the group. Each child was asked four sets of questions. The results of this study are in strong agreement with the studies by

Emmerich (1962) and Radke (1946) which described the mother as providing most of the routine nurturant care, emotional support, and discipline. Traditionally, the father has been seen as the authority figure whose discipline was more arbitrary and severe (Kagan, 1956; Radke, 1946). Clausen's study (1966) indicated that when the father rather than the mother was the disciplinarian, the child was more likely to be angry, assertive, and directly aggressive. Maternal discipline was more closely related to inhibition of anger, hostility, and psychosomatic ailments. In 1966 Mischel found that the father serves as a model of masculinity for the male child. His study included acceptable forms of male aggression.

The literature suggests that the effectiveness of any disciplinary technique may depend upon the age and the sex of the child to whom it is administered as well as the sex and social class of the person administering the discipline (Hoffman \& Saltzstein, 1967). The sex of the disciplinarian does make a difference: maternal disciplinary practices are more closely associated with measures of children's moral maturity than paternal practices. However, Hoffman and Saltzstein (1967) found that, particularly in the lower class, boys reported that their mothers had the fathers do the disciplining.

Aggression in children and the relationship of aggression to discipline were explored in the late $1950^{\prime}$ s and $1960^{\prime}$ s. Levine and Sears (1956) obtained measures of the punitiveness of parents and of the degree of identification preschool children showed with the same-sex parent. Boys who identified strongly with their fathers showed more aggression, especially when their fathers were the agents of punishment.

In an interview with parents, Sears, Maccoby, and Levin (1957) found that four methods of punishment most of ten used are isolation, ridicule, physical punishment, and deprivation of privileges. Mothers and fathers of girls punished aggression more similarly than did mothers and fathers of boys.

A study by Eron, Walder, Toigo, and Lefkowitz (1963) also revealed that mothers' and fathers' punishments for aggression are similar, regardless of which parent was chiefly responsible for the child's discipline. Eron et al. (1963) found no class difference in the differential use of psychological and physical punishment, contrary to traditional notions about punishment patterns and social class.

In summary, the research literature of the 1960 's focused primarily on the types of discipline parents practiced on their children, on the relationship between discipline and moral development in children, and the relationship between discipline and children's aggressiveness. Mothers were the chief source of information on discipline practices, and more father participation in all areas of child-rearing research was needed. The variables most often identified as significant were the sex of the child, sex of the parent, age of the child, and the socioeconomic status of the family.

Discipline in the 1970's
The research on the discipline of children in the 1970's continued with the relationship of discipline and moral development. Disciplinary techniques of parents and their effectiveness were also investigated.

In the area of discipline and moral development, Hoffman (1970) continued to argue that paternal discipline bears little relation to children's moral development. He stated the father, who is away from home more than the mother, is not the child's primary disciplinarian, although it is possible that the father may influence the mother's choice of disciplinary techniques.

Baumrind (1971) and Shaffer (1979) presented the idea that discipline in its natural setting does not occur in a vacuum, but that discipline is administered in different contexts or milieus by parents who differ in warmth, restrictiveness, authoritarianism, attitudes toward child rearing, and a host of other attributes known to affect the character of parent-child interactions.

Compliance was studied in the context of parent-child interaction in a sample of $9021 / 2$-year-old-boys by Lytton (1977). Home observations and interviews demonstrated that consistently enforced discipline, encouragement of independence, psychological rewards, and maternal play made important contributions to the positive predictions of compliance, whereas physical punishment and use of rewards were negatively associated with compliance. Lytton (1977) used correlational techniques to examine demographic variables and found a relationship between child compliance and the educational level of the mother.

In another investigation, Lytton (1979) studied 136 boys from working-class and middle-class homes. He observed that physical discipline lessened a child's compliance, an effect opposite to that presumably intended by parents. Lytton (1979) also noted that positive discipline, i.e., expression of love or approval when added to reasoning
increases the likelihood of compliance. Another important feature of these findings was that in spite of the existence of a common family climate, manifested in the similarity between the mother's and the father's disciplinary approaches, the mother involves herself more than the father in the child's doings. In other words, she is not only the primary caregiver, but she also assumes the major responsibility for the child's induction into the ways of the family and of the world beyond.

Cherry and Lewis (1976) conducted a study which provided information on how verbal aspects of mother-child interactions are differentiated by sex of the child. Twelve white, upper-middle-class, English-speaking mothers and their 2-year-old children were studied in spontaneous play situations. The findings revealed that mothers tend to use more negative sanctions on boys than on girls. The studies by Black (1976) and Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) support the findings of Cherry and Lewis (1976) that girls are generally praised and tend to internalize the blame for their mistakes and attribute it to lack of ability. Boys are more likely to attribute failure to a lack of effort or to the criticizing external agent (Dweck, 1976).

Five researchers--Forehand, Roberts, Doleys, Hobbs, and Resick (1976)--examined the effectiveness of negative attention, isolation, ignoring, and a combination of procedures in reducing noncompliance. Twenty-eight mother-child pairs were subjects. The results indicated that each of the four disciplinary procedures reduced noncompliance.

In a later study, Roberts, McMahon, Forehand, and Humphrey (1979) investigated the effects of parental instruction giving on child compliance. The study observed 27 mothers and their children. The
results indicated that when mothers issue a single command followed by five seconds of silence, the child's behavior is more compliant.

Chapman (1977) explored children's attentiveness and parental discipline in a sample of 48 predominantly white, middle-class mothers and their children. The findings supported the general conclusion that maternal discipline may be affected by children's attentiveness. The frequency of negative, controlling statements by the mother was positively related to impulsivity in interaction with their sons.

The study by Mulhern and Passman (1979) investigated how changes in children's behavior control the intensity of their parents' discipline. Thirty white, middle-class mothers from 27 to 45 years of age with one of their sons, aged from 45 to 78 months were recruited from a university day-care center. The results indicated that differential conditioning of both high and low maternal punitiveness can be achieved by using the child's successes as reinforcers. When required to punish intensely to obtain successes, mothers responded by punishing more severely than they had initially when their children's behaviors had been independent of the discipline administered. These results substantiate that children provide antecedent as well as consequent control over parental punitiveness.

In summary, the research relating to the discipline of children in the 1970's focused primarily on issues involved with the relationship of discipline and moral development. Compliance was studied as well as types of discipline. In spite of the fact that Lamb (1976) found there had been an increase in the father's participation in child-rearing and household tasks as authority was being shared reciprocally by husband
and wife, the research on the fathers' participation in the discipline of their children remained sparse.

Discipline in the 1980's
The research on the discipline of children in the 1980 's was diverse. An effort was made to isolate and critically explore variables in the parent-child relationship which may affect parents' discipline techniques and children's responses. Lamb's (1981) research with the emphasis on the role of the father in child development added a significant dimension to the investigation of discipline of children.

In 1980, Grusec and Kuczynski asked mothers how they would respond to 12 different kinds of transgression on the part of their 4- to 8-year-old children. Each of the 12 situations were developed to elicit similar disciplinary techniques from different mothers. However, individual mothers were generally not consistent in their disciplinary practices across the 12 situations. Thus, a mother's reported discipline appeared to be determined more by what the child did in a situation than by some internally consistent child-rearing approach on the mother's part.

The study by Passman and Blackwelder (1981) investigated the effects of children's behavior on their parents' subsequent disciplinary actions. Thirty mothers and their sons participated. The mothers, separated from their sons, were randomly assigned to one of three experimental conditions in which the proportion of their children's correct to incorrect responses appeared to vary systematically. The boys' performance either progressively improved, declined, or remained
stable over 90 trials. Signals from the investigator defined successes and errors for which the mothers presented or removed up to nine candies. The mothers consistently rewarded more than punished, regardless of the trend of their sons' apparent performance. The research by Passman and Blackwelder (1981) supported the earlier work by Kagan and Ender (1975) where it was observed that rewarding more than punishing appears to be a highly stable, systematic feature of maternal discipline.

Forty parents accompanied by one of their children participated in a study by Mulhern and Passman (1981) which investigated parental discipline as affected by the sex of the parent, the sex of the child, and the child's apparent responsiveness to discipline. The findings suggested that children are able to influence parental discipline which is directed toward them. Mothers not only reacted more punitively than fathers when their child appeared unresponsive to discipline, but the mothers also rewarded desirable behavior more quickly and intensely.

Wolfe, Katell, and Drabman (1982) investigated parents' and preschool children's choices of disciplinary childrearing methods in a sample of 40 children ranging in age from 4 to 6 years of age from a local preschool program in Jackson, Mississippi. The children were from stable homes and the occupations of the fathers were primarily professional and managerial positions. Six mothers worked full time. The results indicated that preschoolers tended to choose disciplinary actions in accordance with their perceptions of their parents' manner of dealing with the same situation.

Zahn-Waxler and Chapman (1982) studied 24 mothers and their children for nine months in order to observe the children's behaviors and the caretakers' disciplinary practices. The investigators found that the most frequent initial responses to children's misbehavior were verbal prohibitions. Discipline methods less commonly used were explanations, restraint, instruction, physical punishment, and love withdrawal. Mothers made greater use of this range of control methods following children's noncompliance to discipline. The association between child behaviors and parental discipline methods illustrates the interactive roles of child and parent in mediating parental attempts to control, teach, and punish their children.

Lamb's (1981) research on the role of the father in the child's development indicated that moral internalization and relatively high guilt are most likely fostered by the frequent use of inductive discipline and the frequent expression of affection outside the discipline encounter when the mother is involved with the child. The findings for the father were less clear. It may be that when the mother is the main disciplinarian, any effects of the father's discipline are transient and overridden in the long run by the mother's discipline and affection patterns. Lamb (1981) supported the findings of other child development researchers that the mother's function is viewed as an expressive one and is characterized by a concern with interpersonal relationships, emotional support, nurturance, and caregiving. The father's function is delineated as instrumental and is characterized by a concern with mastery and competence. Mothers are perceived by their
children as more nurturant and affectionate, and fathers are seen as more punitive and restrictive.

In summary the research on the discipline of children by their parents in the 1980's illustrated the research value in isolating and exploring a critical variable. There remains a need for descriptive as well as empirically based research in the area of discipline of children.

## Summary

From the abundance of studies and from the gross methodological differences in the studies no definitive conclusions can be drawn about the relationship of specific factors and parents' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1960's, 1970's, and 1980's. Perhaps one of the reasons for this is the awesome task called for in determining which complex and interrelated factors are significant in a parent-child relationship when parents' perceptions of their discipline are being explored. No reports of studies were located which simply described the discipline methods of parents.

CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of the study was to describe how specific demographic factors relate to the perceptions of parents' discipline of their preschool children in the $1960^{\prime} \mathrm{s}, 1970^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$, and $1980^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$. The specific factors were the age, sex, and birth order of the child, the age and education of each parent, and the amount of time the child spent each day with each parent. Hypotheses were formulated to test each factor.

## Formal Statement of Hypotheses

The null hypotheses for the present study were the following:

1. There is no relationship between the ages of the children and the parents' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1960's, 1970's, and 1980's.
2. There is no relationship between the sex of the children and the parents' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the $1960^{\prime} \mathrm{s}, 1970^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$, and $1980^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$.
3. There is no relationship between the fathers' ages and the fathers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1960's, 1970's, and 1980's.
4. There is no relationship between the mothers' ages and the mothers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1960's, 1970's, and 1980's.
5. There is no relationship between the fathers' education and the fathers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the $1960^{\prime} \mathrm{s}, 1970^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$, and $1980^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$.
6. There is no relationship between the mothers' education and the mothers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the $1960^{\prime} \mathrm{s}, 1970^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$, and $1980^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$.
7. There is no relationship between the birth order of the children and the parents' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the $1960^{\prime} \mathrm{s}, 1970^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$, and $1980^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$.
8. There is no relationship between the amount of time the fathers spend with their children and the fathers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1960's, 1970's, and $1980^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$.
9. There is no relationship between the amount of time the mothers spend with their children and the mothers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children. in the $1960^{\prime} \mathrm{s}, 1970^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$, and $1980^{\prime}$ s.

## Description of the Sample

For the present research three groups of children and their parents were studied, each of which had an equal number of girls and boys. Subjects were 180 intact (i.e., both parents present), first-marriage family groups composed of mothers, fathers, and children (90 girls and 90 boys). All of the children were enrolled in the Toddler, Toddler-Two, or Nursery School Preschool Laboratory Centers at the UNC-G School of Home Economics, Department of Child Development and Family

Relations. All subjects were white and born in the United States. The age of the children ranged from at least 15 months to no more than 59 months.

The intact family groups were divided into three groups of 60 children. The first group consisted of children who attended the Toddler ( 10 girls and 10 boys, 15 months to 24 months of age), Toddler-Two ( 10 girls and 10 boys, 25 months to 36 months of age), or Nursery School ( 10 girls and 10 boys, 37 months to 59 months of age) Preschool Laboratory Centers from January, 1968 to December, 1969.

The second group was composed of children who attended the Toddler ( 10 girls and 10 boys, 15 months to 24 months of age), Toddler-Two (10 girls and 10 boys, 25 months to 36 months of age), or Nursery School (10 girls and 10 boys, 37 months to 59 months of age) Preschool Laboratory Centers from January, 1975 to December, 1976. The third group was composed in the same way of Toddler ( 10 girls and 10 boys, 15 months to 24 months of age), Toddler-Two ( 10 girls and 10 boys, 25 months to 36 months of age), or Nursery School (10 girls and 10 boys, 37 months to 59 months) programs at the Preschool Laboratory Centers from January, 1982 to December, 1983.

## Methods of Selecting the Sample

In order to obtain subjects for the study, the investigator photocopied the rosters listing the names of the children who attended the Toddler, Toddler-Two, and Nursery School Preschool Laboratory Centers during the years of 1968, 1969, 1975, 1976, 1982, and 1983. The investigator dropped from the study all duplicate names of children and
siblings from the same family so that no sets of parents were included more than once in the study. The permanent records of the remaining children's names were pulled and reviewed, then coded directly into a code book. Many family groups were eliminated when the permanent records were reviewed because (a) the child or parents were not native Americans, (b) the child was adopted, (c) a parent was a step-parent, (d) a parent was a single parent, or (e) the parents' answers to the questionnaire were incomplete.

## Instrument

When their children were admitted to the Preschool Laboratory Centers, all parents completed a questionnaire entitled "Form 19: Your Child and His Development." This form has been used in the Preschool Laboratory Centers since the early 1960's. After completion by the parents, the form was filed in the child's permanent record.

## Analysis of Data

The parents' responses to questions on "Form 19: Your Child and His Development" were coded by the investigator and typed into a data file for computer-assisted analysis. To analyze the data, the Statistical Packages for the Social Sciences (1983) was used, employing the frequencies, condescriptives, and crosstabulations procedures. Responses to 14 questions on "Form 19: Your Child and His Development" were used to test the nine hypotheses. With respect to the descriptive nature of the study and the number of categorical variables involved, a test of significance was not performed on each hypothesis.

Consequently, the hypotheses were not accepted or rejected, but descriptive statistics were used to report the results of the relationship. The results from the computer-assisted analysis are discussed and presented in table form in Chapter IV.

## CHAPTER IV

RESULIS

The statistical analyses of the data are described in this chapter followed by a discussion of the findings of the investigation. The findings are reported in reference to the sample (children, mothers, and fathers) and to each of the nine hypotheses tested. Each hypothesis is stated, and then subdivided into specific components to provide clarity. A description of the statistical findings and a statement of the results are presented for each subdivision.

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences ${ }^{\mathrm{X}}$ was used to perform the needed computations. The major statistical procedures used to analyze the data were frequencies, condescriptives, and crosstabulations. The statistical procedure used to analyze the hypotheses was a crosstabulation of the independent variables, perceptions of mothers' discipline and perceptions of fathers' discipline, and the dependent variables, age of the child, sex of the child, father's age, mother's age, father's education, mother's education, birth order of the child, amount of time child spends each day with the father, and amount of time the child spends each day with the mother. The crosstabulation procedure was used to analyze the data for each decade separately, and then as a whole.

## The Sample

## Children

The sample included 180 children and their mothers and fathers. As shown in Table 1, 90 (50.0\%) children were female and 90 (50.0\%) were male. Sixty (33.3\%) children in the study were toddlers between the ages of 15 and 24 months, there were 60 (33.3\%) children between the ages of 25 months and 36 months, and 60 (33.3\%) children were 3 - and 4-year-olds between the ages of 37 months and 59 months.

The three groups of children were equally divided according to time of attendance in the Preschool Laboratory Centers, with one-third (N-60) attending in the 1960 's, one-third ( $N=60$ ) in the $1970^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$, and one-third ( $\mathrm{N}=60$ ) in the $1980^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$ (see Table 1).

The children were divided equally by decade and by age groups. As seen in Table 1, the children were also divided equally by age in each decade.

The birth order of the 180 children included in the study was not equally divided according to birth order. More than half ( $N=102$ or 56.7\%) were the first-born child in their families, 59 (32.8\%) were the second-born, and 16 ( $8.9 \%$ ) were born third (see Table 1).

## Mothers

The study included 180 mothers whose ages ranged from 19 to 46 years. More than half (56.4\%) were in their thirties, more than a third (37.8\%) were in their twenties, while only $6.1 \%$ were in their forties (see Table 2).

Table 1
Frequency Distribution of Sample Children by Factors

| Factor | Value | Frequency | * |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sex | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Female } \\ & \text { Male } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 90 \\ & 90 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50.0 \\ & 50.0 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Total | 180 | 100.0 |
| Decade Attended | 1960 | 60 | 33.3 |
| Preschool | 1970 | 60 | 33.3 |
| Laboratory Center | 1980 | 60 | 33.3 |
|  | Total | 180 | 100.0 |
| Age | 15-24 Months | 60 | 33.3 |
|  | 25-36 Months | 60 | 33.3 |
|  | 37-59 Months | 60 | 33.3 |
|  | Total | 180 | 100.0 |
| Birth Order | First Born | 102 | 56.7 |
|  | Second Born | 59 | 32.8 |
|  | Third Born | 16 | 8.9 |
|  | Fourth Born | 3 | 1.7 |
|  | Total | 180 | 100.0 |

Table 2
Frequency Distribution of Sample Mothers by Factors

| Factor | Value | Frequency | $\%$ |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Age | $19-29$ Years |  |  |
|  | $30-39$ Years | 68 | 37.8 |
|  | $40-46$ Years | 101 | 56.1 |
|  |  | 11 | 6.1 |
|  | Total | 180 | 100.0 |


| Educational | Less Than High School | 2 | 1.1 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Status | High School Diploma | 6 | 3.3 |
|  | Attended College | 26 | 14.4 |
|  | Baccalaureate Degree | 84 | 46.7 |
|  | Post Baccalaureate Degree | 62 | 34.4 |
|  |  |  | 180 |
|  |  | 100.0 |  |


| Perception | Stern | 6 | 3.3 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| of | Reasonably Firm | 109 | 60.6. |
| Discipline | Sometimes Firm, |  |  |
|  | Sometimes Lax | 34 | 18.9 |
|  | Easy Going | 30 | 16.7 |
|  | Very Lax | 1 | 0.6 |
|  | Total | 180 | 100.0 |

Amount of Time Spent With Child
0.0-3.0 Hours
1.1

Each Day
3.1 - 4.0 Hours $\quad 4 \quad 2.2$
4.1 - 5.0 Hours 95.0
5.1 - 6.0 Hours $8 \quad 4.4$
6.1 - 7.0 Hours 42.2
7.1 - 8.0 Hours $14 \quad 7.8$
8.1 - 9.0 Hours $8 \quad 4.4$
9.1 - 12.0 Hours 11061.1
12.1-24.0 Hours $21 \quad 11.7$

Total
180100.0

As shown in Table 2, the mothers' educational status varied from those who had not completed high school (1.1\%) to those with graduate degrees (34.4\%). Nearly half (46.7\%) of the mothers held a baccalaureate degree, and•nearly all (95\%) were college educated.

As shown in Table 2, the majority ( $60 \%$ ) of the mothers perceived their discipline as "reasonably firm." There were no mothers who perceived their discipline to be "rigid."

As shown in Table 2, the amount of time the mothers reported spending each day with their preschool children ranged from three to 24 hours. The mean amount of time the mothers spent with their preschool children was approximately $111 / 2$ hours a day. The largest number of mother ( $\mathrm{N}=139$ or $77.2 \%$ ) spent more than eight hours a day with their children.

## Fathers

The fathers in the sample were depicted in Table 3. The fathers' ages ranged from 21 years to 58 years. The mean age of the fathers was 33.68. Forty-one (22.8\%) fathers were between the ages of 21 and 29 years. Most of the fathers (63.3\%) were in their thirties, about one-eighth (12.8\%) were in their forties, while only two (1.1\%) were in their fifties.

As shown in Table 3, the fathers' educational status varied from those who had not completed high school (.6\%) to those with graduate degrees (35.6\%). Nearly half (47.2\%) had earned a baccalaureate degree, and nearly all (82.8\%) were college educated.

Table 3
Frequency Distribution of Sample Fathers by Factors

| Factor. | Value | Frequency | $\%$ |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Age | $20-29$ Years | 41 | 22.8 |  |
|  | $30-39$ Years | 114 | 63.3 |  |
|  | $40-49$ Years | 23 | 12.8 |  |
|  | $40-49$ Years | 2 | 1.1 |  |
|  |  |  | 180 | 100.0 |


| Educational | Less Than High School | 1 | 0.6 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Status | High School Diploma | 6 | 3.3 |
|  | Attended College | 24 | 13.3 |
|  | Baccalaureate Degree | 85 | 47.2 |
|  | Post Baccalaureate Degree | 64 | 35.6 |
|  | Total |  |  |
|  |  |  | 180 |
|  |  | 100.0 |  |


| Perception | Stern | 12 | 6.7 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| of | Reasonably Firm |  | 109 |
| Discipline | Sometimes Firm, | 55.6 |  |
|  | Sometimes Lax |  |  |
|  | Easy Going | 36 | 20.0 |
|  | Very Lax | 30 | 16.7 |
|  | Total | 2 | 1.1 |
|  |  | 180 | 100.0 |

Amount of
0.0 - 1.0 Hours
$32 \quad 17.8$
Time Spent
1.1 - 2.0 Hours
2.1 - 3.0 Hours

39
21.7

With Child
4.1 - 5.0 Hours

57
31.7

Each Day
5.1 - 6.0 Hours
6.1 - 7.0 Hours
7.1 - 8.0 Hours

12
6.7
8.1 - 12.0 Hours

Total
180

The majority ( $55.5 \%$ ) of the fathers perceived their discipline to be "reasonably firm." No fathers perceived their discipline as "rigid" (see Table 3).

The amount of time the 180 fathers spent each day with their children ranged from 10 minutes to 12 hours. The mean amount of time was approximately 3 hours.

## Hypotheses 1-9

## Hypothesis 1

There is no relationship between the ages of the children and the parents' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the $1960^{\circ} \mathrm{s}, 1970^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$, and $1980^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$. The parents' perceptions of their discipline of their children and their children's ages were crosstabulated. The control variables were the 1960, 1970, and 1980 decades.

Hypothesis 1a: There is no relationship between the age of the child and the mothers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1960's. Twenty toddlers, 20 2-year-olds, and 20 3- and 4-year-olds from the 1960 decade were studied (see Table 4).

As shown in Table 4, in relation to the 20 toddlers, 15 to 24 months of age, none of their mothers perceived their discipline to be "stern," half thought they were "reasonably firm," and six (30.0\%) mothers perceived their discipline to be "sometimes stern--sometimes lax." Four (20.0\%) mothers rated their discipline as "easy-going," but none perceived their discipline to be "very lax."

Table 4
Frequency Distribution of Mothers' Discipline by Age of Child - 1960 Decade

| Discipline Category |  | Toddlers | $\begin{gathered} \text { ren's } \\ 2 \\ \text { Years } \end{gathered}$ | 3 \& 4 Years | Row <br> Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stern | Frequency |  | 1 |  | 1 |
|  | Row \% |  | 100.0 |  |  |
|  | Column \% |  | 5.0 |  |  |
|  | Total \% |  | 1.7 |  | 1.7 |
| Reasonably | Frequency | 10 | 15 | 10 | 35 |
| Firm | Row \% | 28.6 | 42.9 | 28.6 |  |
|  | Column * | 50.0 | 75.0 | 50.0 |  |
|  | Total \% | 16.7 | 25.0 | 16.7 | 58.3 |
| Sometimes | Frequency | 6 | 1 | 7 | 14 |
| Stern- | Row\% | 42.9 | 7.1 | 50.0 |  |
| Sometimes | Column \% | 30.0 | 5.0 | 35.0 |  |
| Lax | Total \% | 10.0 | 1.7 | 11.7 | 23.3 |
| EasyGoing | Frequency | 4 | 2 | 3 | 9 |
|  | Row \% | 44.4 | 22.2 | 33.3 |  |
|  | Column \% | 20.0 | 10.0 | 15.0 |  |
|  | Total \% | 6.7 | 3.3 | 5.0 | 15.0 |
| Very | Frequency |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| Lax | Row \% |  | 100.0 |  |  |
|  | Column \% |  | 5.0 |  |  |
|  | Total \% |  | 1.7 |  | 1.7 |
| Colum | Frequency | 20 | 20 | 20 | 60 |
| Totals | * | 33.3 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 100.0 |

In relation to the 202 -year-olds, one (5.0\%) mother perceived her discipline as "stern," three-fourths thought they were "reasonably firm," and one (5.0\%) mother perceived her discipline to be "sometimes stern--sometimes lax." Two (100\%) mother perceived their discipline to be "easy-going" and one (5.0\%) mother perceived her discipline as "very lax."

Among the mothers of the 203 - and 4-year-old children, none described their discipline as "stern." Half thought their discipline was "reasonably firm," seven (35.0\%) mothers perceived their discipline to be "sometimes stern--sometimes lax," three (15.0\%) mothers perceived their discipline to be "easy-going," and none of the mothers described their discipline as "very lax" (see Table 4).

Hypothesis 1 b . There is no relationship between the age of the child and the mothers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1970's.

In relation to the 20 toddlers, none of their mothers perceived their discipline to be "stern." Fourteen (70.0\%) mothers perceived their discipline to be "reasonably firm," three (15.0\%) mothers perceived their discipline to be "sometimes stern--sometimes lax," and three (15.0\%) mothers perceived their discipline as "easy-going" (see Table 5).

Of the 202 -year-olds, one (5.0\%) mother perceived her discipline to be "stern." Half of the mothers described their discipline as "reasonably firm," six (30.0\%) mothers perceived their discipline as "sometimes stern--sometimes lax," and three (15.0\%) perceived their discipline to be "very lax."

Table 5
Frequency Distribution of Mothers' Discipline by Age of Child - 1970 Decade

| Discipline Category |  | Toddlers | $\stackrel{2}{\text { Years }}$ | 3 \& 4 Years | Row Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stern | Frequency |  | 1 | 1 | 2 |
|  | Row \% |  | 50.0 | 50.0 |  |
|  | Column \% |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  |
|  | Total \% |  | 1.7 | 1.7 | 3.3 |
| Reasonably | Frequency | 14 | 10 | 14 | 38 |
| Firm | Row \% | 36.8 | 26.3 | 36.8 |  |
|  | Column \% | 70.0 | 50.0 | 70.0 |  |
|  | Total \% | 23.3 | 16.7 | 23.3 | 63.3 |
| Sometimes SternSometimes Lax | Frequency | 3 | 6 | 2 | 11 |
|  | Row \% | 27.3 | 54.5 | 18.2 |  |
|  | Column \% | 15.0 | 30.0 | 10.0 |  |
|  | Total \% | 5.0 | 10.0 | 3.3 | 18.3 |
| EasyGoing | Frequency | 3 | 3 | 3 | 9 |
|  | Row \% | 33.3 | 33.3 | 33.3 |  |
|  | Column \% | 15.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 |  |
|  | Total \% | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 15.0 |
| Column Totals | Frequency | 20 | 20 | 20 | 60 |
|  | \% | 33.3 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 100.0 |

In the 3- and 4-year olds group, one (5.0\%) mother perceived her discipline to be "stern." Fourteen (70.0\%) mothers perceived their discipline to be "reasonably firm," two (10.0\%) mothers perceived their discipline to the "sometimes stern--sometimes lax," and three (15.0\%) mothers perceived their discipline to be "easy going."

Hypothesis 1c: There is no relationship between the age of the child and the perceptions of the mothers of their discipline of their preschool children in the $1980^{\circ} \mathrm{s}$.

As shown in Table 6, in the toddlers, there were two (10.0\%) mothers who perceived their discipline to be "stern," eight (40.0\%) mothers rated their discipline as "reasonably firm," four (20.0\%) mothers perceived their discipline to be "sometimes stern--sometimes lax," six (30.0\%) mothers indicated their discipline was "easy-going," and no mothers perceived their discipline as "very lax."

Of the 20 2-year-olds, there were no mothers who perceived their discipline as "stern," 13 (65.0\%) mothers perceived their discipline as "reasonably firm," two (10.0\%) mothers perceived her discipline to be "sometimes stern--sometimes lax, five (25.0\%) perceived their discipline to be easy-going, and there were not any mothers who perceived their discipline to be "very lax."

Of the 20 children who were 3 and 4 years old, one (5.0\%) mother perceived her discipline as "stern," three-fourths of the mothers perceived their discipline to be "reasonably firm," three (15.0\%) mothers rated their discipline to be "sometimes stern--sometimes lax," and one (5.0\%) mother perceived her discipline to be "easy-going." None

Table 6
Frequency Distribution of Mothers' Discipline by Age of Child - 1980 Decade

| Discipline Category |  | Toddlers | $\begin{gathered} \text { cen's } \\ 2 \\ \text { Years } \end{gathered}$ | $3 \& 4$ <br> Years | Row Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stern | Frequency | 2 |  | 1 | 3 |
|  | Row \% | 66.7 |  | 33.3 |  |
|  | Column \% | 10.0 |  | 5.0 |  |
|  | Total \% | 3.3 |  | 1.7 | 5.0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Reasonably } \\ & \text { Firm } \end{aligned}$ | Frequency | 8 | 13 | 15 | 36 |
|  | Row\% | 22.2 | 36.1 | 41.7 |  |
|  | Column \% | 40.0 | 65.0 | 75.0 |  |
|  | Total \% | 13.3 | 21.7 | 25.0 | 60.0 |
| Sometimes <br> Stern- <br> Sometimes <br> Lax | Frequency | 4 | 2 | 3 | 9 |
|  | Row \% | 44.4 | 22.2 | 33.3 |  |
|  | Column \% | 20.0 | 10.0 | 15.0 |  |
|  | Total \% | 6.7 | 3.3 | 5.0 | 15.0 |
| EasyGoing | Frequency | 6 | 5 | 1 | 12 |
|  | Row \% | 50.0 | 41.7 | 8.3 |  |
|  | Column * | 30.0 | 25.0 | 5.0 |  |
|  | Total \% | 10.0 | 8.3 | 1.7 | 20.0 |
| Column Totals | Frequency | 20 | 20 | 20 | 60 |
|  | \% | 33.3 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 100.0 |

of their mothers perceived their discipline of their 3- and 4-year-olds to be "very lax" in the 1980 's.

Hypothesis 1d: There is no relationship between the age of the child and the fathers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1960 's.

As shown in Table 7, of the 20 toddlers, there was one (5.0\%) father who rated his discipline to be "stern," seven (35.0\%) fathers who perceived their discipline to be "reasonably firm, one-fourth of the fathers perceived their discipline to be "sometimes stern--sometimes lax," and six (30.0\%) fathers who perceived their discipline to be "easy-going." There was one (5.0\%) father who noted his discipline of his child to be "very lax."

Of the 20 2-year-olds, there was one (5.0\%) father who rated his discipline to be "stern," 14 (70.0\%) who perceived their discipline to be "reasonably firm," and three (15.0\%) fathers who noted their discipline to be "sometimes stern--sometimes lax." There was one (5.0\%) father who perceived his discipline to be "easy-going" and one father who perceived his discipline to be "very lax."

For the 3- and 4-year-olds, one (5.0\%) father perceived his discipline to be "stern," 13 (65.0\%) fathers rated their discipline to be "reasonably firm," one-fourth of the fathers perceived their discipline to be "sometimes stern--sometimes lax," and one (5.0\%) father rated his discipline to be "easy-going." None of the fathers perceived their discipline of their 3- and 4-year-old to be "very lax" in the 1960's.

Table 7

## Frequency Distribution of Fathers' Discipline by Age of Child - 1960 Decade

| Discipline Category |  | Toddlers | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ \text { Years } \end{gathered}$ | $3 \& 4$ Years | Row <br> Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stern | Frequency | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
|  | Row\% | 33.3 | 33.3 | 33.3 |  |
|  | Column \% | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |  |
|  | Total \% | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 5.0 |
| Reasonably | Frequency | 7 | 14 | 13 | 34 |
| Firm | Row \% | 20.6 | 41.2 | 38.2 |  |
|  | Column \% | 35.0 | 70.0 | 65.0 |  |
|  | Total * | 11.7 | 23.3 | 21.7 | 56.7 |
| Sometimes | Frequency | 5 | 3 | 5 | 13 |
| Stern- | Row \% | 38.5 | 23.1 | 38.5 |  |
| Sometimes | Column * | 25.0 | 15.0 | 25.0 |  |
| Lax | Total \% | 8.3 | 5.0 | 8.3 | 21.7 |
| EasyGoing | Frequency | 6 | 1 | 1 | 8 |
|  | Row \% | 75.0 | 12.5 | 12.5 |  |
|  | Column \% | 30.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |  |
|  | Total \% | 10.0 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 13.3 |
| Very Lax | Frequency | 1 | 1 |  | 2 |
|  | Row \% | 50.0 | 50.0 |  |  |
|  | Column * | 5.0 | 5.0 |  |  |
|  | Total \% | 1.7 | 1.7 |  | 3.3 |
| Column Totals | Frequency | 20 | 20 | 20 | 60 |
|  | * | 33.3 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 100.0 |

Hypothesis 1e: There is no relationship between the age of the child and the perceptions of the fathers' discipline of their preschool children in the 1970's.

As shown in Table 8, among the fathers of the toddlers, one (5.0\%) father noted his discipline to be "stern," 11 (55.0\%) fathers perceived their discipline to be "reasonably firm," and two (10.0\%) fathers noted their discipline as "sometimes stern--sometimes lax." There were 6 (30\%) fathers who perceived their discipline "easy-going."

Among the fathers of the 2-year-old children, none of the fathers rated their discipline as "stern." Twelve (60\%) fathers perceived their discipline to be "reasonably firm," one-fifth of the fathers noted their discipline to be "sometimes stern--sometimes lax," and one-fifth perceived their discipline to be "easy-going."

In the 3- and 4-year-old group, there were 3 (15\%) fathers who rated their discipline as "stern," 12 (60.0\%) fathers who perceived their discipline to be "reasonably firm," and three (15.0\%) fathers who perceived their discipline to be "sometimes stern--sometimes lax." There were 2 fathers who perceived their discipline to be "easy-going."

Hypothesis 1f: There is no relationship between the age of the child and the fathers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1980's.

In the toddlers group, there were not any fathers who perceived their discipline to be "stern" or "very lax." Nine (45.0\%) fathers rated their discipline to be "reasonably firm," seven (35.0\%) fathers noted their discipline to be "sometimes stern--sometimes lax," and four (20.0\%) fathers perceived their discipline to be "easy-going."

## Table 8

Frequency Distribution of Fathers' Discipline by Age of Child - 1970 Decade

| Discipline Category |  | Toddlers | $\begin{gathered} \text { ren's } \\ 2 \\ \text { Years } \end{gathered}$ | $3 \& 4$ Years | Row <br> Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stern | Frequency | 1 |  | 3 | 4 |
|  | Row \% | 25.0 |  | 75.0 |  |
|  | Column \% | 5.0 |  | 15.0 |  |
|  | Total \% | 1.7 |  | 5.0 | 6.7 |
| Reasonably | Frequency | 11 | 12 | 12 | 35 |
| Firm | Row \% | 31.4 | 34.3 | 34.3 |  |
|  | Column \% | 55.0 | 60.0 | 60.0 |  |
|  | Total \% | 18.3 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 58.3 |
| Sometimes SternSometimes Lax | Frequency | 2 | 4 | 3 | 9 |
|  | Row \% | 22.2 | 44.4 | 33.3 |  |
|  | Column \% | 10.0 | 20.0 | 15.0 |  |
|  | Total \% | 3.3 | 6.7 | 5.0 | 15.0 |
| EasyGoing | Frequency | 6 | 4 | 2 | 12 |
|  | Row \% | 50.0 | 33.3 |  |  |
|  | Column \% | 30.0 | 20.0 | 10.0 |  |
|  | Total \% | 10.0 | 6.7 | 3.3 | 16.7 |
| Column Totals | Frequency | 20 | 20 | 20 | 60 |
|  | $\%$ | 33.3 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 100.0 |

As shown in Table 9 in the 2-year-old group, there were 2 ( $10.0 \%$ ) fathers who perceived their discipline to be "stern," 12 (60.0\%) fathers who perceived their discipline to be "reasonably firm," and four (20.0\%) who rated their discipline to be "sometimes stern--sometimes lax." Ten percent of the fathers perceived their discipline to be "easy-going."

Of the children in the 3 - and 4-year-old group, there were 3 (15.0\%) fathers who perceived their discipline to be "stern," fifty percent of the fathers who perceived their discipline to be "reasonably firm," and 3 (15.0\%) fathers who perceived their discipline to be "sometimes stern--sometimes lax." There were four (20.0\%) fathers who perceived their discipline to be "easy-going."

Interpretation of Results of Hypothesis 1: The statistical findings in support of Hypothesis 1 (including Hypothesis 1a-1f) reveal that in the toddlers, the 2-year-old children and the 3- and 4-year-old children, the majority of mothers and fathers rated their discipline of their children to be "reasonably firm." The findings are based on percentages, and any inferences should be cautious since the numbers were not tested for significance (see Tables 10 and 11).

## Hypothesis 2

There is no relationship between the sex of the children and the parents' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1960's, 1970's, and 1980's. The parents' perceptions of their discipline of their children and the age of the children were crosstabulated. The control variables were the 1960, 1970, and 1980 decade.

Frequency Distribution of Fathers' Discipline by Age of Child - 1980 Decade

| Discipline Category |  | Toddlers | ren's 2 Years | 3 \& 4 Years | Row <br> Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stern | Frequency |  | 2 | 3 | 5 |
|  | Row * |  | 40.0 | 60.0 |  |
|  | Column \% |  | 10.0 | 15.0 |  |
|  | Total \% |  | 3.3 | 5.0 | 8.3 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Reasonably } \\ & \text { Firm } \end{aligned}$ | Frequency | 9 | 12 | 10 | 31 |
|  | Row \% | 29.0 | 38.7 | 32.3 |  |
|  | Column * | 45.0 | 60.0 | 50.0 |  |
|  | Total \% | 15.0 | 20.0 | 16.7 | 51.7 |
| Sometimes SternSometimes Lax | Frequency | 7 | 4 | 3 | 14 |
|  | Row \% | 50.0 | 28.6 | 21.4 |  |
|  | Column \% | 35.0 | 20.0 | 15.0 |  |
|  | Total \% | 11.7 | 6.7 | 5.0 | 23.3 |
| EasyGoing | Frequency | 4 | 2 | 4 | 10 |
|  | Row \% | 40.0 | 20.0 | 40.0 |  |
|  | Column \% | 20.0 | 10.0 | 20.0 |  |
|  | Total \% | 6.7 | 3.3 | 6.7 | 16.7 |
| Column Totals | Frequency | 20 | 20 | 20 | 60 |
|  | * | 33.3 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 100.0 |

Table 10
Frequency Distribution of Mothers' Discipline by Age of Child

| Discipline Category |  | Toddlers | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ \text { Years } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \& 4 \\ & \text { Years } \end{aligned}$ | Row Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stern | Frequency | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 |
|  | Row \% | 33.3 | 33.3 | 33.3 |  |
|  | Column * | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 |  |
|  | Total \% | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 3.3 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Reasonably } \\ & \text { Firm } \end{aligned}$ | Frequency | 32 | 38 | 39 | 109 |
|  | Row \% | 29.4 | 34.9 | 35.8 |  |
|  | Column \% | 53.3 | 63.3 | 65.0 |  |
|  | Total \% | 17.8 | 21.1 | 21.7 | 60.6 |
| Sometimes SternSometimes Lax | Frequency | 13 | 9 | 12 | 34 |
|  | Row \% | 38.2 | 26.5 | 35.3 |  |
|  | Column \% | 21.7 | 15.0 | 20.0 |  |
|  | Total \% | 7.2 | 5.0 | 6.7 | 18.9 |
| EasyGoing | Frequency | 13 | 10 | 7 | 30 |
|  | Row \% | 43.3 | 33.3 | 23.3 |  |
|  | Column \% | 21.7 | 16.7 | 11.7 |  |
|  | Total \% | 7.2 | 5.6 | 3.9 | 16.7 |
| Very Lax | Frequency |  | 1 |  | 1 |
|  | Row \% |  | 100.0 |  |  |
|  | Column \% |  | 1.7 |  |  |
|  | Total \% |  | 0.6 |  | 0.6 |
| Column <br> Totals | Frequency | 60 | 60 | 60 | 180 |
|  | \% | 33.3 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 100.0 |

Table 11
Frequency Distribution of Fathers' Discipline by Age of Child

| Discipline Category |  | Toddlers | $\begin{gathered} \text { ren's } \\ 2 \\ \text { Years } \end{gathered}$ | $3 \& 4$ Years | Row Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stern | Frequency | 2 | 3 | 7 | 12 |
|  | Row \% | 16.7 | 25.0 | 58.3 |  |
|  | Column \% | 3.3 | 5.0 | 11.7 |  |
|  | Total \% | 1.1 | 1.7 | 3.9 | 6.7 |
| Reasonably Firm | Frequency | 27 | 38 | 35 | 100 |
|  | Row \% | 27.0 | 38.0 | 35.0 |  |
|  | Column \% | 45.0 | 63.3 | 58.3 |  |
|  | Total \% | 15.0 | 21.1 | 19.4 | 55.6 |
| Sometimes <br> Stern- <br> Sometimes Lax | Frequency | 14 | 11 | 11 | 36 |
|  | Row \% | 38.9 | 30.6 | 30.6 |  |
|  | Column \% | 23.3 | 18.3 | 18.3 |  |
|  | Total \% | 7.8 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 20.0 |
| EasyGoing | Frequency | 16 | 7 | 7 | 30 |
|  | Row\% | 53.3 | 23.3 | 23.3 |  |
|  | Column \% | 26.7 | 11.7 | 11.7 |  |
|  | Total \% | 8.9 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 16.7 |
| VeryLax | Frequency | 1 | 1 |  | 2 |
|  | Row \% | 50.0 | 50.0 |  |  |
|  | Column \% | 1.7 | 1.7 |  |  |
|  | Total \% | 0.6 | 0.6 |  | 1.1 |
| Column <br> Totals | Frequency | 60 | 60 | 60 | 180 |
|  | \% | 33.3 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 100.0 |

Hypothesis 2a: There is no relationship between the sex of the child and the mothers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1960 's.

As shown in Table 12, of the 30 female children, no mothers perceived their discipline to be "stern." Eighteen (60.0\%) mothers noted their discipline to be "reasonably firm," seven (23.3\%) mothers perceived their discipline to be "sometimes stern--sometimes lax," four (13.3\%) mothers rated their discipline to be "easy-going," and one (3.3\%) mother perceived her discipline to be "very lax."

Of the 30 boys, only one had a mother who perceived her discipline to be "stern." Seventeen (56.7\%) mothers perceived their discipline to be "reasonably firm," seven (23.3\%) mothers perceived their discipline to be "sometimes stern--sometimes lax," and five (16.7\%) mothers perceived their discipline to be "easy-going." There were not any mothers who perceived their discipline to be "very lax."

Hypothesis 2b: There is no relationship between the sex of the child and the mothers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1970 's.

As shown in Table 13, there were two (6.7\%) mothers of girls who noted discipline to be "stern." Seventeen (56.7\%) mothers perceived their discipline to be "reasonably firm," one-fifth of the mothers rated their discipline to be "sometimes stern--sometimes lax," and one-fifth of the mothers perceived their discipline as "easy-going."

Among the mothers of the 30 boys, only one (3.3\%) rated her discipline as "stern," 21 (70.0\%) mothers perceived their discipline to be "reasonably firm," five (16.7\%) noted their discipline as "sometimes

Table 12
Frequency Distribution of Mothers' Discipline by Sex of Child - 1960 Decade

| Discipline Category |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text {--Children's } \\ & \text { Girls } \end{aligned}$ | Sex-Boys | Row Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stern | Frequency |  | 1 |  |
|  | Row\% |  | 100.0 |  |
|  | Column \% |  | 3.3 |  |
|  | Total \% |  | 1.7 | 1.7 |
| ReasonablyFirm | Frequency | 18 | 17 | 35 |
|  | Row \% | 51.4 | 48.6 |  |
|  | Column \% | 60.0 | 56.7 |  |
|  | Total \% | 30.0 | 28.3 | 58.3 |
| Sometimes SternSometimes Lax | Frequency | 7 | 7 | 14 |
|  | Row \% | 50.0 | 50.0 |  |
|  | Column \% | 23.3 | 23.3 |  |
|  | Total \% | 11.7 | 11.7 | 23.3 |
| EasyGoing | Frequency | 4 | 5 | 9 |
|  | Row \% | 44.4 | 55.6 |  |
|  | Column \% | 13.3 | 16.7 |  |
|  | Total \% | 6.7 | 8.3 | 15.0 |
| Very <br> Lax | Frequency | 1 |  | 1 |
|  | Row \% | 100.0 |  |  |
|  | Column \% | 3.3 |  |  |
|  | Total \% | 1.7 |  | 1.7 |
| Column Totals | Frequency | 30 | 30 | 60 |
|  | * | 50.0 | 50.0 | 100.0 |

## Table 13

Frequency Distribution of Mothers' Discipline by Sex of Child - 1970 Decade

| Discipline Category |  | $\begin{array}{r} - \text { Child } \\ \text { Girls } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sex-- } \\ & \text { Boys } \end{aligned}$ | Row Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stern | Frequency | 1 | 1 | 2 |
|  | Row \% | 50.0 | 50.0 |  |
|  | Column \% | 3.3 | 3.3 |  |
|  | Total \% | 1.7 | 1.7 | 3.3 |
| Reasonably Firm | Frequency | 17 | 21 | 38 |
|  | Row \% | 44.7 | 55.3 |  |
|  | Column \% | 56.7 | 70.0 |  |
|  | Total \% | 28.3 | 35.0 | 63.3 |
| Sometimes SternSometimes Lax | Frequency | 6 54 | 45 | 11 |
|  | Row \% | 54.5 | 45.5 |  |
|  | Column \% | 20.0 | 16.7 |  |
|  | Total \% | 10.0 | 8.3 | 18.3 |
| EasyGoing | Frequency | 6 | 3 | 9 |
|  | Row \% | 66.7 | 33.3 |  |
|  | Column * | 20.0 | 10.0 |  |
|  | Total \% | 10.0 | 5.0 | 15.0 |
| Column <br> Totals | Frequency | 30 | 30 | 60 |
|  | \% | 50.0 | 50.0 | 100.0 |

stern--sometimes lax," and ten percent of the mothers perceived their discipline to be "easy-going."

Hypothesis 2c: There is no relationship between the sex of the child and the mothers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1980's.

As shown in Table 14, two (6.7\%) mothers of girls perceived their discipline to be "stern." Eighteen (60.0\%) mothers perceived their discipline as "reasonably firm," ten percent of the mothers noted their discipline to be "sometimes stern--sometimes lax, and seven (23.3\%) mothers who rated their discipline to be "easy-going."

Of the 30 boys, only one (3.3\%) had a mother who perceived her discipline to be "stern." Eighteen (60.0\%) mothers perceived their discipline to be "reasonably firm," one-fifth of the mothers perceived their discipline as "sometimes stern--sometimes lax," and five (16.7\%) mothers noted their discipline to be "easy-going."

Hypothesis 2d: There is no relationship between the sex of the child and the fathers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1960 's.

As shown in Table 15, two (6.7\%) had fathers who perceived their discipline to be "stern." Half of the fathers rated their discipline to be "reasonable firm," seven (23.3\%) had fathers who noted their discipline to be "sometimes stern--sometimes lax," five (16.7\%) fathers perceived their discipline as "easy-going," and only one (3.3\%) father perceived his discipline to be "very lax."

There was only one (3.3\%) father of boys who perceived his discipline to be "stern." Nineteen (63.3\%) fathers perceived their

Table 14

## Frequency Distribution of Mothers' Discipline by Sex of Child - 1980 Decade

| Discipline Category |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text {--Children's } \\ & \text { Girls } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sex-- } \\ & \text { Boys } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Row } \\ & \text { Totals } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stern | Frequency | 2 | 1 | 3 |
|  | Row \% | 66.7 | 33.3 |  |
|  | Column \% | 6.7 | 3.3 |  |
|  | Total \% | 3.3 | 1.7 | 5.0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Reasonably } \\ & \text { Firm } \end{aligned}$ | Frequency | 18 | 18 | 36 |
|  | Row \% | 50.0 | 50.0 |  |
|  | Column \% | 60.0 | 60.0 |  |
|  | Total \% | 30.0 | 30.0 | 60.0 |
| Sometimes SternSometimes Lax | Frequency | 3 | 6 | 9 |
|  | Row \% | 33.3 | 66.7 |  |
|  | Column \% | 10.0 | 20.0 |  |
|  | Total \% | 5.0 | 10.0 | 15.0 |
| EasyGoing | Frequency | 7 | 5 | 12 |
|  | Row \% | 58.3 | 41.7 |  |
|  | Column \% | 23.3 | 16.7 |  |
|  | Total * | 11.7 | 8.3 | 20.0 |
| Column <br> Totals | Frequency | 30 | 30 | 60 |
|  | * | 50.0 | 50.0 | 100.0 |

Table 15

## Frequency Distribution of Fathers' Discipline by Sex of Child - 1960 Decade

| Discipline Category |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text {--Children's } \\ & \text { Girls } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sex-- } \\ & \text { Boys } \end{aligned}$ | Row Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stern | Frequency | 2 | 1 | 3 |
|  | Row \% | 66.7 | 33.3 |  |
|  | Column \% | 6.7 | 3.3 |  |
|  | Total \% | 3.3 | 1.7 | 5.0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Reasonably } \\ & \text { Firm } \end{aligned}$ | Frequency | 15 | 19 | 34 |
|  | Row \% | 44.1 | 55.9 |  |
|  | Column \% | 50.0 | 63.3 |  |
|  | Total \% | 25.0 | 31.7 | 56.7 |
| Sometimes Stern- <br> Sometimes Lax | Frequency | 7 | 6 | 13 |
|  | Row\% | 53.8 | 46.2 |  |
|  | Column * | 23.3 | 20.0 |  |
|  | Total \% | 11.7 | 10.0 | 21.7 |
| EasyGoing | Frequency | 5 | 3 | 8 |
|  | Row \% | 62.5 | 37.5 |  |
|  | Column \% | 16.7 | 10.0 |  |
|  | Total \% | 8.3 | 5.0 | 13.3 |
| Very Lax | Frequency | 1 | 1 | 2 |
|  | Row \% | 50.0 | 50.0 |  |
|  | Column \% | 3.3 | 3.3 |  |
|  | Total \% | 1.7 | 1.7 | 3.3 |
| Column Totals | Frequency | 30 | 30 | 60 |
|  | * | 50.0 | 50.0 | 100.0 |

discipline to be "reasonably firm," one-fifth of the fathers rated their discipline as "sometimes stern--sometimes lax," ten percent of the fathers perceived their discipline to be "easy-going," and only one (3.3\%) father rated his discipline to be "very lax."

Hypothesis 2e: There is no relationship between the sex of the child and the fathers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1970 's.

As shown in Table 16, of the 30 girls, there were only 2 ( $6.7 \%$ ) fathers who rated their discipline as "stern." Seventeen (56.7\%) fathers perceived their discipline as "reasonably firm," four (13.3\%) fathers noted their discipline to be "sometimes stern--sometimes lax," and seven (23.3\%) fathers perceived their discipline as "easy-going."

There were $2(6.7 \%)$ fathers who rated their discipline of the female children as "stern." Eighteen (60.0\%) fathers perceived their discipline as "reasonably firm," five (16.7\%) noted their discipline as "sometimes stern--sometimes lax," and five (16.6\%) fathers perceived their discipline to be "easy-going."

Hypothesis 2f: There is no relationship between the sex of the child and the perceptions of the fathers' discipline of their preschool children in the 1980's.

There was one (3.3\%) father who perceived his discipline of his female child as "stern." Over half of the fathers perceived their discipline as "reasonably firm," six (20.0\%) fathers noted their discipline as "sometimes stern--sometimes lax," and seven (23.3\%) fathers rated their discipline as "easy-going."

Table 16
Frequency Distribution of Fathers' Discipline by Sex of Child - 1970 Decade

| Discipline Category |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text {--Children's } \\ & \text { Girls } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sex- } \\ & \text { Boys } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Row } \\ & \text { Totals } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stern | Frequency | 2 | 2 | 4 |
|  | Row \% | 50.0 | 50.0 |  |
|  | Column \% | 6.7 | 6.7 |  |
|  | Total \% | 3.3 | 3.3 | 6.7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Reasonably } \\ & \text { Firm } \end{aligned}$ | Frequency | 17 | 18 | 35 |
|  | Row \% | 48.6 | 51.4 |  |
|  | Column \% | 56.7 | 60.0 |  |
|  | Total \% | 28.3 | 30.0 | 58.3 |
| Sometimes <br> Stern- <br> Sometimes <br> Lax | Frequency | 4 | 5 | 9 |
|  | Row \% | 44.4 | 55.6 |  |
|  | Column \% | 13.3 | 16.7 |  |
|  | Total \% | 6.7 | 8.3 | 15.0 |
| EasyGoing | Frequency | 7 | 5 | 12 |
|  | Row \% | 58.3 | 41.7 |  |
|  | Column \% | 23.3 | 16.7 |  |
|  | Total \% | 11.7 | 8.3 | 20.0 |
| Column <br> Totals | Frequency | 30 | 30 | 60 |
|  | \% | 50.0 | 50.0 | 100.0 |

Table 17
Frequency Distribution of Fathers' Discipline by Sex of Child - 1980 Decade

| Discipline Category |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text {--Children's } \\ & \text { Girls } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sex-- } \\ & \text { Boys } \end{aligned}$ | Row Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stern | Frequency | 1 | 4 | 5 |
|  | Row \% | 20.0 | 80.0 |  |
|  | Column \% | 3.3 | 13.3 |  |
|  | Total \% | 1.7 | 6.7 | 8.3 |
| Reasonably Firm | Frequency | 16 | 15 | 31 |
|  | Row \% | 51.6 | 48.4 |  |
|  | Coluran \% | 53.3 | 50.0 |  |
|  | Total \% | 26.7 | 25.0 | 51.7 |
| Sometimes <br> Stern- <br> Sometimes <br> Lax | Frequency | 6 | 8 | 14 |
|  | Row\% | 42.9 | 57.1 |  |
|  | Column \% | 20.0 | 26.7 |  |
|  | Total \% | 10.0 | 13.3 | 23.3 |
| Easy- <br> Going | Frequency | 7 | 3 | 10 |
|  | Row \% | 70.0 | 30.0 |  |
|  | Column \% | 23.3 | 10.0 |  |
|  | Total \% | 11.7 | 5.0 | 16.7 |
| Column Totals | Frequency | 30 | 30 | 60 |
|  | \% | 50.0 | 50.0 | 100.0 |

Of the male children, there were four (13.3\%) fathers who perceived their discipline to be "stern." Almost half of the fathers perceived their discipline to be "reasonably firm," eight (26.7\%) fathers rated their discipline to be "sometimes stern--sometimes lax," and ten percent of the fathers perceived their discipline to be "easy-going" (see Table 16).

Interpretation of Results of Hypothesis 2: As shown in Table 18 and Table 19, the statistical findings in support of Hypothesis 2 (including Hypothesis 2a-2f) reveal that the majority of parents perceive their discipline to be "reasonably firm" in the 1960's, 1970's, and 1980's. The discipline category least selected by mothers and fathers was "very lax." The findings are based on percentages, and any inferences should be drawn cautiously since the numbers were not tested for significance.

Hypothesis 3
There is no relationship between the fathers' ages and the fathers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1960's, 1970's, and 1980's. The fathers' perceptions of their discipline of their children and the fathers' age were crosstabulated. The control variables were the 1960, 1970, and 1980 decade.

Hypothesis 3a: There is no relationship between the fathers' ages and the fathers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1960's.

As shown in Table 20, of the 21 fathers 21 to 29 years of age, nine (42.0\%) rated their discipline of their chidren to be "reasonably firm."

Table 18
Frequency Distribution of Mothers' Discipline by Sex of Child


Table 19
Frequency Distribution of Fathers' Discipline by Sex of Child

| Discipline Category |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text {--Children's } \\ & \text { Girls } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sex-- } \\ & \text { Boys } \end{aligned}$ | Row <br> Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stern | Frequency | 5 | 7 | 12 |
|  | Row \% | 41.7 | 58.3 |  |
|  | Column \% | 5.6 | 7.8 |  |
|  | Total \% | 2.8 | 3.9 | 6.7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Reasonably } \\ & \text { Firm } \end{aligned}$ | Frequency | 48 | 52 | 100 |
|  | Row \% | 48.0 | 52.0 |  |
|  | Column \% | 53.3 | 57.8 |  |
|  | Total \% | 26.7. | 28.9 | 55.6 |
| Sometimes <br> Stern- <br> Sometimes <br> Lax | Frequency | 17 | 19 | 36 |
|  | Row \% | 47.2 | 52.8 |  |
|  | Column * | 18.9 | 21.1 |  |
|  | Total * | 9.4 | 10.6 | 20.0 |
| Easy- <br> Going | Frequency | 19 | 11 | 30 |
|  | Row \% | 63.3 | 36.7 |  |
|  | Column \% | 21.1 | 12.2 |  |
|  | Total * | 10.6 | 6.1 | 16.7 |
| Very Lax | Frequency | 1 | 1 | 2 |
|  | Row \% | 50.0 | 50.0 |  |
|  | Column * | 1.1 | 1.1 |  |
|  | Total \% | 0.6 | 0.6 | 1.1 |
| Column <br> Totals | Frequency | 90 | 90 | 180 |
|  | * | 50.0 | 50.0 | 100.0 |

Table 20
Frequency Distribution of Fathers' Discipline by Fathers' Ages - 1960 Decade

| Discipline Category |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text {--Fat } \\ & \text { 20-29 } \end{aligned}$ | hers' 30-39 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Ages--- } \\ 40-49 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Row } \\ & \text { Totals } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stern | Frequency | 2 | 1 |  | 3 |
|  | Row \% | 66.7 | 33.3 |  |  |
|  | Column \% | 9.5 | 3.7 |  |  |
|  | Total \% | 3.3 | 1.7 |  | 5.0 |
| Reasonably Firm | Frequency | 9 | 16 | 9 | 34 |
|  | Row \% | 26.5 | 47.1 | 26.5 |  |
|  | Column \% | 42.9 | 59.3 | 75.0 |  |
|  | Total \% | 15.0 | 26.7 | 15.0 | 56.7 |
| Sometimes SternSometimes Lax | Frequency | 5 | 7 | 1 | 13 |
|  | Row \% | 38.5 | 53.8 | 7.7 |  |
|  | Column \% | 23.8 | 25.9 | 8.3 |  |
|  | Total \% | 8.3 | 11.7 | 1.7 | 21.7 |
| EasyGoing | Frequency | 4 | 3 | 1 | 8 |
|  | Row\% | 50.0 | 37.5 | 12.5 |  |
|  | Column \% | 19.0 | 11.1 | 8.3 |  |
|  | Total \% | 6.7 | 5.0 | 1.7 | 13.3 |
| Very Lax | Frequency | 1 |  | 1 | 2 |
|  | Row \% | 50.0 |  | 50.0 |  |
|  | Column \% | 4.8 |  | 8.3 |  |
|  | Total \% | 1.7 |  | 1.7 | 3.3 |
| Column Totals | Frequency | 21 | 27 | 12 | 60 |
|  | \% | 35.0 | 45.0 | 20.0 | 100.0 |

Sixteen (59.3\%) fathers between the ages of 30 and 39 perceived their discipline to be "reasonably firm," and three-fourths of the fathers in the 40 to 58 years of age group noted their discipline to be "reasonably firm."

Hypothesis 3b: There is no relationship between the fathers' ages and the fathers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1970 's.

As shown in Table 21, eight (66.7\%) fathers between the ages of 21 and 29 rated their discipline to be "reasonably firm," and 24 (55.8\%) fathers in the 30 to 39 age group noted their discipline as "reasonably firm." There were 3 (60.0\%) fathers; 40 to 58 years of age, who perceived their discipline as "reasonably firm."

Hypothesis 3c: There is no relationship between the fathers' ages and the fathers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1980 's.

As shown in Table 22, there were 5 (62.5\%) fathers between the ages of 21 and 29 who rated their discipline to be "reasonably firm." Twenty-three (52.3\%) fathers in the 30 to 39 age group noted their discipline to be "reasonably firm," and three (37.5\%) fathers in the 40 to 58 age group perceived their discipline to be "reasonably firm." Also, 3 (37.0\%) fathers, 40 to 58 years of age, rated their discipline as "sometimes stern--sometimes lax."

Interpretation of Results of Hypothesis 3: As shown in Table 23, the statistical findings in support of Hypothesis 3 (including Hypothesis $3 a-3 c$ ) reveal that a majority of the fathers in all age groups with the exception of the 50 to 58 age group (the smallest group)

Table 21
Frequency Distribution of Fathers' Discipline by Fathers' Ages - 1970 Decade

| Discipline Category |  | $\begin{aligned} & -- \text { Fat } \\ & 20-29 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { hers' }^{\prime} \\ 30-39 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Ages--- } \\ 40-49 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Row } \\ & \text { Totals } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stern | Frequency |  | 4 |  | 4 |
|  | Row \% |  | 100.0 |  |  |
|  | Column \% |  | 9.3 |  |  |
|  | Total \% |  | 6.7 |  | 6.7 |
| ReasonablyFirm | Frequency | 8 | 24 | 3 | 35 |
|  | Row \% | 22.9 | 68.6 | 8.6 |  |
|  | Column \% | 66.7 | 55.8 | 60.0 |  |
|  | Total \% | 13.3 | 40.0 | 5.0 | 58.3 |
| Sometimes Stern- <br> Sometimes Lax | Frequency | 2 | 7 |  | 9 |
|  | Row \% | 22.2 | 77.8 |  |  |
|  | Column \% | 16.7 | 16.3 |  |  |
|  | Total \% | 3.3 | 11.7 |  | 15.0 |
| EasyGoing | Frequency | 2 | 8 | 2 | 12 |
|  | Row \% | 16.7 | 66.7 | 16.7 |  |
|  | Column \% | 16.7 | 18.6 | 40.0 |  |
|  | Total \% | 3.3 | 13.3 | 3.3 | 20.0 |
| Column Totals | Frequency | 12 | 43 | 5 | 60 |
|  | \% | 20.0 | 71.7 | 8.3 | 100.0 |

Table 22
Frequency Distribution of Fathers' Discipline by Fathers' Ages - 1980 Decade

| Discipline Category |  | ------Fathers ${ }^{\circ}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Ages- } \\ 40-49 \end{gathered}$ | 50-58 | Row <br> Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 20-29 | 30-39 |  |  |  |
| Stern | Frequency | 1 | 4 |  |  | 5 |
|  | Row \% | 20.0 | 80.0 |  |  |  |
|  | Column \% | 12.5 | 9.1 |  |  |  |
|  | Total \% | 1.7 | 6.7 |  |  | 8.3 |
| Reasonably Firm | Frequency | 5 | 23 | 3 |  | 31 |
|  | Row \% | 16.1 | 74.2 | 9.7 |  |  |
|  | Column \% | 62.5 | 52.3 | 50.0 |  |  |
|  | Total \% | 8.3 | 38.3 | 5.0 |  | 51.7 |
| Sometimes SternSometimes Lax | Frequency |  | 711 | 14 2 | 7 | 14 |
|  | Row \% |  | 78.6 | 14.3 | 7.1 |  |
|  | Column * |  | 25.0 | 33.3 | 50.0 |  |
|  | Total \% |  | 18.3 | 3.3 | 1.7 | 23.3 |
| EasyGoing | Frequency | 2 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 10 |
|  | Row \% | 20.0 | 60.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |  |
|  | Column \% | 25.0 | 13.6 | 16.7 | 50.0 |  |
|  | Total * | 3.3 | 10.0 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 16.7 |
| Column Totals | Frequency \% | 8 13.3 | $\begin{array}{r} 44 \\ 73.3 \end{array}$ | 6 10.0 | $3.3{ }^{2}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 60 \\ 100.0 \end{array}$ |

Table 23
Frequency Distribution of Fathers' Discipline by Fathers' Age

| Discipline Category |  | 20-29 | Fathers 30-39 | Ages $40-49$ | 50-58 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Row } \\ & \text { Totals } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stern | Frequency | 3 | 9 |  |  | 12 |
|  | Row \% | 25.0 | 75.0 |  |  |  |
|  | Column \% | 7.3 | 7.9 |  |  |  |
|  | Total \% | 1.7 | 5.0 |  |  | 6.7 |
| Reasonably Firm | Frequency | 22 | 63 | 15 |  | 100 |
|  | Row 1 | 22.0 | 63.0 | 15.0 |  |  |
|  | Column * | 53.7 | 55.3 | 65.2 |  |  |
|  | Total \% | 12.2 | 35.0 | 8.3 |  | 55.6 |
| Sometimes SternSometimes Lax | Frequency | 7 | 25 | 3 | 1 | 36 |
|  | Row \% | 19.4 | 69.4 | 8.3 | 2.8 |  |
|  | Column \% | 17.1 | 21.9 | 13.0 | 50.0 |  |
|  | Total \% | 3.9 | 13.9 | 1.7 | 0.6 | 20.0 |
| EasyGoing | Frequency | 8 | 17 | 4 | 1 | 30 |
|  | Row \% | 26.7 | 56.7 | 13.3 | 3.3 |  |
|  | Column \% | 19.5 | 14.9 | 17.4 | 50.0 |  |
|  | Total \% | 4.4 | 9.4 | 2.2 | 0.6 | 16.7 |
| Very Lax | Frequency | 1 |  | 1 |  | 2 |
|  | Row\% | 50.0 |  | 50.0 |  |  |
|  | Column \% | 2.4 |  | 4.3 |  |  |
|  | Total \% | 0.6 |  | 0.6 |  | 1.1 |
| Column <br> Totals | Frequency | 41 | 114 | 23 | 2 | 180 |
|  | \% | 22.8 | 63.3 | 12.8 | 1.1 | 100.0 |

perceived their discipline of their children to be "reasonably firm" in the 1960's, 1970's and 1980's. The discipline category least selected ( $N=2$ ) by fathers of all ages was "very lax." The findings are based on percentages, and any inferences should be drawn with caution since the numbers were not subjected to a test for significance.

## Hypothesis 4

There is no relationship between the mothers' ages and the mothers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool chidren in the 1960's, 1970's, and 1980's. The mothers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children and the mothers' ages were crosstabulated. The control variables were the three decades--1960's, 1970's, and 1980's.

Hypothesis 4a: There is no relationship between the mothers' ages and the mothers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1960's.

As shown in Table 24, there were 18 ( $60.0 \%$ ) mothers in the 19 to 29 years of age group who perceived their discipline to be "reasonably firm." Fifteen (53.6\%) mothers rated their discipline to be "reasonably firm" in the 30 to 39 age group, and all of the mothers in the 40 to 46 age group perceived their discipline to be "reasonably firm."

Hypothesis 4b: There is no relationship between the mothers' ages and the mothers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1970's.

There were 19 (76.0\%) mothers 19 to 29 years of age who perceived their discipline to be "reasonably firm." Seventeen (53.1\%) mothers 30

Table 24
Frequency Distribution of Mothers' Discipline by Mothers' Ages - 1960 Decade

| Discipline Category |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text {--Motl } \\ & 19-29 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Chers' } \\ 30-39 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Ages--- } \\ 40-46 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Row } \\ & \text { Totals } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stern | Frequency | 1 |  |  | 1 |
|  | Row \% | 100.0 |  |  |  |
|  | Column \% | 3.3 |  |  |  |
|  | Total \% | 1.7 |  |  | 1.7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Reasonably } \\ & \text { Firm } \end{aligned}$ | Frequency | 18 | 15 | 2 | 35 |
|  | Row\% | 51.4 | 42.9 | 5.7 |  |
|  | Column * | 60.0 | 53.6 | 100.0 |  |
|  | Total \% | 30.0 | 25.0 | 3.3 | 58.3 |
| Sometimes SternSometimes Lax | Frequency | 6 | 8 |  | 14 |
|  | Row \% | 42.9 | 57.1 |  |  |
|  | Colurn \% | 20.0 | 28.6 |  |  |
|  | Total \% | 10.0 | 13.3 |  | 23.3 |
| EasyGoing | Frequency | 55 | 4 |  | 9 |
|  | Row \% | 55.6 | 44.4 |  |  |
|  | Column \% | 16.7 | 14.3 |  |  |
|  | Total \% | 8.3 | 6.7 |  | 15.0 |
| Very <br> Lax | Frequency |  | 1 |  | 1 |
|  | Row \% |  | 100.0 |  |  |
|  | Column \% |  | 3.6 |  |  |
|  | Total \% |  | 1.7 |  | 1.7 |
| Column Totals | Frequency | 30 | 28 | 2 | 60 |
|  | \% | 50.0 | 46.7 | 3.3 | 100.0 |

to 39 years of age rated their discipline to be "reasonably firm," and only two (66.7\%) mothers 40 to 46 years of age perceived their discipline to be "reasonably firm" (see Table 25).

Hypothesis 4c: There is no relationship between the mothers' ages and the mothers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1980's.

As shown in Table 26, ten (76.9\%) mothers in the 19 to 29 years of age group rated their discipline as "reasonably firm," and 22 (53.7\%) mothers, 30 to 39 years of age, perceived their discipline to be "reasonably firm." There were four (66.7\%) mothers, 40 to 46 years of age, who noted their discipline was "reasonably firm."

Interpretation of Results of Hypothesis 4: The statistical findings in support of Hypothesis 4 (including Hypothesis 4a-4c) indicate that the majority (101 or 56.1\%) of the mothers were 30 to 39 years of age in the $1960^{\prime} \mathrm{s}, 1970$ 's, and $1980^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$. Fifty-four (53.3\%) of these mothers rated their discipline as "reasonably firm." The least number ( $N=11$ ) of mothers were 40 to 46 years of age. The discipline category least ( $N=1$ ) selected by all age groups was "very low." The findings are based on percentages. Inferences should be drawn with caution since the numbers were not tested for significance.

## Hypothesis 5

There is no relationship between the fathers' education and the fathers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the $1960^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$, $1970^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$, and $1980^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$. The fathers' perceptions of their

Table 25
Frequency Distribution of Mothers' Discipline by Mothers' Ages - 1970 Decade

| Discipline Category |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text {---Mot } \\ & \text { 19-29 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Chers } \\ 30-39 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Ages--- } \\ 40-46 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Row } \\ & \text { Totals } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stern | Frequency |  | 2 |  | 2 |
|  | Row \% |  | 100.0 |  |  |
|  | Column \% |  | 6.3 |  |  |
|  | Total \% |  | 3.3 |  | 3.3 |
| ReasonablyFirm | Frequency | 19 | 17 | 2 | 38 |
|  | Row ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 50.0 | 44.7 | 5.3 |  |
|  | Column \% | 76.0 | 53.1 | 66.7 |  |
|  | Total \% | 31.7 | 28.3 | 3.3 | 63.3 |
| Sometimes SternSometimes Lax | Frequency | 5 | 6 |  | 11 |
|  | Row \% | 45.5 | 54.5 |  |  |
|  | Column \% | 20.0 | 18.8 |  |  |
|  | Total \% | 8.3 | 10.0 |  | 18.3 |
| EasyGoing | Frequency | 1 | 7 | 1 | 9 |
|  | Row \% | 11.1 | 77.8 | 11.1 |  |
|  | Column \% | 4.0 | 21.9 | 33.3 |  |
|  | Total \% | 1.7 | 11.7 | 1.7 | 15.0 |
| Column <br> Totals | Frequency | 25 | 32 | 3 | 60 |
|  | \% | 41.7 | 53.3 | 5.0 | 100.0 |

## Table 26

Frequency Distribution of Mothers' Discipline by Mothers' Ages - 1980 Decade

| Discipline Category |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text {--Mot } \\ & \text { 19-29 } \end{aligned}$ | $30-39$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Ages-- } \\ 40-46 \end{array}$ | Row <br> Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stern | Frequency |  | 2 | 1 | 3 |
|  | Row \% |  | 66.7 | 33.3 |  |
|  | Column \% |  | 4.9 | 16.7 |  |
|  | Total \% |  | 3.3 | 1.7 | 5.0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Reasonably } \\ & \text { Firm } \end{aligned}$ | Frequency | 10 | 22 | 4 | 36 |
|  | Row \% | 7.8 | 24.6 | 3.6 |  |
|  | Column \% | 76.9 | 53.7 | 66.7 |  |
|  | Total \% | 16.7 | 36.7 | 6.7 | 60.0 |
| Sometimes SternSometimes Lax | Frequency |  | 9 |  | 9 |
|  | Row \% |  | 100.0 |  |  |
|  | Column \% |  | 22.0 |  |  |
|  | Total \% |  | 2.9 |  | 15.0 |
| EasyGoing | Frequency | 3 | 8 | 1 | 12 |
|  | Row \% | 25.0 | 66.7 | 8.3 |  |
|  | Column \% | 23.1 | 13.3 | 1.7 |  |
|  | Total \% | 5.0 | 13.3 | 1.7 | 20.0 |
| Column <br> Totals | Frequency | 13 | 41 | 6 | 60 |
|  | \% | 21.7 | 68.3 | 10.0 | 100.0 |

Frequency Distribution of Mothers' Discipline by Mothers' Age

| Discipline Category |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text {---Mothers } \\ & 19-29 \quad 30-39 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Ages--- } \\ 40-46 \end{array}$ | Row Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stern | Frequency | 1 | 4 | 1 | 6 |
|  | Row \% | 16.7 | 66.7 | 16.7 |  |
|  | Column \% | 1.5 | 4.0 | 9.1 |  |
|  | Total \% | 0.6 | 2.2 | 0.6 | 3.3 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Reasonably } \\ & \text { Firm } \end{aligned}$ | Frequency | 47 | 54 | 8 | 109 |
|  | Row\% | 43.1 | 49.5 | 7.3 |  |
|  | Column \% | 69.1 | 53.5 | 72.7 |  |
|  | Total \% | 26.1 | 30.0 | 4.4 | 60.6 |
| Sometimes <br> Stern- <br> Sometimes <br> Lax | Frequency | 11 | 23 |  | 34 |
|  | Row \% | 32.4 | 67.6 |  |  |
|  | Column \% | 16.2 | 22.8 |  |  |
|  | Total \% | 6.1 | 12.8 |  | 18.9 |
| EasyGoing | Frequency | 9 | 19 | 2 | 30 |
|  | Row \% | 30.0 | 63.3 | 6.7 |  |
|  | Column \% | 13.2 | 18.8 | 18.2 |  |
|  | Total \% | 5.0 | 10.6 | 1.1 | 16.7 |
| Very Lax | Frequency |  | 1 |  | 1 |
|  | Row * |  | 100.0 |  |  |
|  | Column \% |  | 1.0 |  |  |
|  | Total \% |  | 0.6 |  | 0.6 |
| Column <br> Totals | Frequency | 68 | 101 | 11 | 180 |
|  | \% | 37.8 | 56.1 | 6.1 | 100.0 |

discipline and the fathers' educational status were crosstabulated. The control variables were the decades of the 1960's, 1970's, and 1980's.

Hypothesis 5a: There is no relationship between the fathers education and the fathers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1960 's.

As shown in Table 28, the greatest number ( $\mathrm{N}=44$ ) of fathers had a college education. The majority ( $\mathrm{N}=34$ or $56.7 \%$ ) of the fathers, with the exception of the one father who had not completed high school, rated their discipline as "reasonably firm." The father who did not complete high school perceived his discipline to be "very lax."

Hypothesis 5b: There is no relationship between the fathers' education and the fathers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1970's.

As shown in Table 29, all ( $\mathrm{N}=60$ ) of these fathers had some college and 49 fathers had a college education. The majority ( $\mathrm{N}=35$ or $58.3 \%$ ) of the fathers at all levels of educational status rated their discipline to be "reasonably firm."

Hypothesis 5c: There is no relationship between the fathers' education and the fathers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1980 's.

Fifty-six of these fathers had a college education. The majority ( $\mathrm{N}=31$ or $51.7 \%$ ) of the fathers at all levels of educational attainment perceived their discipline to be "reasonably firm" (see Table 30).

Interpretation of Results of Hypothesis 5: As shown in Table 31, the statistical findings in support of Hypothesis 5 (including 5a-5c) indicate that 85 (47.2\%) fathers had received a college degree. This

Table 28
Frequency Distribution of Fathers' Discipline by Fathers' Education - 1960 Decade

| Discipline Category |  | No HS Diploma | --Fath HS Diploma | rs' Edu Attend College | ation-- <br> 4 Year <br> Degree | Post Bac Degree | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Row } \\ \text { Totals } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stern | Frequency |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 3 |
|  | Row \% |  | 33.3 | 10.0 | 33.3 |  |  |
|  | Column \% |  | 20.0 | 10.0 | 3.8 |  |  |
|  | Total \% |  | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 |  | 5.0 |
| ReasonablyFirm | Frequency |  | 2 | 6 | 13 | 13 | 34 |
|  | Row \% |  | 5.9 | 17.6 | 38.2 | 38.2 |  |
|  | Column \% |  | 40.0 | 60.0 | 50.0 | 72.2 |  |
|  | Total * |  | 3.3 | 10.0 | 21.7 | 21.7 | 56.7 |
| Sometimes SternSometimes Lax | Frequency |  | 1 | 3 | 7 | 2 | 13 |
|  | Row \% |  | 7.7 | 23.1 | 53.8 | 15.4 |  |
|  | Column \% |  | 20.0 | 30.0 | 26.9 | 11.1 |  |
|  | Total \% |  | 1.7 | 5.0 | 11.7 | 3.3 | 21.7 |
| EasyGoing | Frequency |  | 1 |  | 5 | 2 | 8 |
|  | Row \% |  | 12.5 |  | 62.5 | 25.0 |  |
|  | Column \% |  | 20.0 |  | 19.2 | 11.1 |  |
|  | Total \% |  | 1.7 |  | 8.3 | 3.3 | 13.3 |
| Very Lax | Frequency | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 2 |
|  | Row * | 50.0 |  |  |  | 50.0 |  |
|  | Column \% | 100.0 |  |  |  | 5.6 |  |
|  | Total \% | 1.7 |  |  |  | 1.7 | 3.3 |
| Column Totals | Frequency | 1 | 5 | 10 | 26 | 18 | 60 |
|  | * | 1.7 | 8.3 | 16.7 | 43.3 | 30.0 | 100.0 |

Table 29
Frequency Distribution of Fathers' Discipline by Fathers' Education - 1970 Decade


Table 30
Frequency Distribution of Fathers' Discipline by Fathers' Education - 1980 Decade


Table 31
Frequency Distribution of Fathers' Discipline by Fathers' Education

| Discipline Category |  | No HS Diploma | $\begin{gathered} \text { Fathe } \\ \text { HS } \\ \text { Diploma } \end{gathered}$ | rs' Educ Attend College | ation-4 Year Degree | Post Bac Degree | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Row } \\ \text { Totals } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stern | Frequency |  | 1 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 12 |
|  | Row\% |  | 8.3 | 16.7 | 58.3 | 16.7 |  |
|  | Column \% |  | 16.7 | 8.3 | 8.2 | 3.1 |  |
|  | Total \% |  | 0.6 | 1.1 | 3.9 | 1.1 | 6.7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Reasonably } \\ & \text { Firm } \end{aligned}$ | Frequency |  | 3 | 14 | 47 | 36 | 100 |
|  | Row \% |  | 3.0 | 14.0 | 47.0 | 36.0 |  |
|  | Column \% |  | 50.0 | 58.3 | 55.3 | 56.3 |  |
|  | Total \% |  | 1.7 | 7.8 | 26.1 | 20.0 | 55.6 |
| Sometimes <br> Stern- <br> Sometimes <br> Lax | Frequency |  | 1 | 5 | 20 | 10 | 36 |
|  | Row \% |  | 2.8 | 13.9 | 55.6 | 27.8 |  |
|  | Column \% |  | 16.7 | 20.8 | 23.5 | 15.6 |  |
|  | Total \% |  | 0.6 | 2.8 | 11.1 | 5.6 | 20.0 |
| EasyGoing | Frequency |  | 1 | 3 | 11 | 15 | 30 |
|  | Row \% |  | 3.3 | 10.0 | 36.7 | 50.0 |  |
|  | Column \% |  | 16.7 | 12.5 | 12.9 | 23.4 |  |
|  | Total \% |  | 0.6 | 1.7 | 6.1 | 8.3 | 16.7 |
| Very Lax | Frequency | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 2 |
|  | Row \% | 50.0 |  |  |  | 50.0 |  |
|  | Column \% | 100.0 |  |  |  | 1.6 |  |
|  | Total \% | 0.6 |  |  |  | 0.6 | 1.1 |
| Column <br> Totals | Frequency | 1 | 6 | 24 | 85 | 64 | 180 |
|  | \% | 0.6 | 3.3 | 13.3 | 47.2 | 35.6 | 100.0 |

group of fathers, as well as the majority ( $\mathrm{N}=100$ or $55.6 \%$ ) of the fathers in the other educational groups perceived their discipline of their children to be "reasonably firm" in the 1960 's, 1970 's, and 1980's. The findings are based on percentages. Inferences should be cautious since the numbers were not tested for significance.

## Hypothesis 6

There is no relationship between the mothers! education and the mothers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the $1960^{\prime} \mathrm{s}, 1970^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$, and 1980's. The mothers' perceptions of their discipline and the mothers' educational status were crosstabulated. The control variables were the decades of the $1960^{\prime} \mathrm{s}, 1970$ 's, and $1980^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$.

Hypothesis 6a: There is no relationship between the mothers' education and the mothers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1960's.

As shown in Table 32, 45 mothers had a college education. Two mothers did not complete high school. The majority ( $\mathrm{N}=35$ or $58.3 \%$ ) of the mothers at all levels of education rated their discipline to be "reasonably firm" with the exception of one (50.0\%) of the mothers who had not received a high school diploma. She perceived her discipline as "very lax."

Hypothesis 6b: There is no relationship between the mothers' education and the mothers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the $1970^{\prime}$ s.

Table 32
Frequency Distribution of Mothers' Discipline by Mothers' Education - 1960 Decade


As shown in Table 33, 47 had a college education. The majority ( $\mathrm{N}=38$ or $63.3 \%$ ) of the mothers at all levels of education perceived their discipline to be "reasonably firm."

Hypothesis 6c: There is no relationship between the mothers education and the mothers perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the $1980^{\prime}$ s.

As shown in Table 34 , 54 had received a college degree. There was only one mother who had completed her formal education with a high school diploma. The majority ( $N=36$ or $60.0 \%$ ) of the mothers at all levels of education perceived their discipline to be "reasonably firm."

Interpretation of Results of Hypothesis 6: The statistical
findings in support of Hypothesis 5 (including 6a-6c) indicate that 84 (46.7\%) mothers had received college degrees. This group of mothers, as well as the majority ( $\mathrm{N}=109$ or $60.6 \%$ ) of mothers in the other educational groups perceived their discipline of their children to be "reasonably firm" in the 1960's, 1970's, and 1980's (see Table 35). The findings are based on percentages. Inferences should be cautious since the numbers were not tested for significance.

## Hypothesis 7

There is no relationship between the birth order of the children and the parents' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the $1960^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$, 1970's, and 1980's. The parents' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children and the birth order of the children were crosstabulated. The control variables were the 1960, 1970, and 1980 decade.

Table 33
Frequency Distribution of Mothers' Discipline by Mothers' Education - 1970 Decade

| Discipline Category |  | $-----M o t h e$ No HS HS Diploma Diploma | ers' Educ Attend College | ation-- <br> 4 Year <br> Degree | Post Bac Degree | Row <br> Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stern | Frequency |  | 1 | 1 |  | 2 |
|  | Row \% |  | 50.0 | 50.0 |  |  |
|  | Column \% |  | 8.3 | 4.3 |  |  |
|  | Total \% |  | 1.7 | 1.7 |  | 3.3 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Reasonably } \\ & \text { Firm } \end{aligned}$ | Frequency | 1 | 8 | 17 | 12 | 38 |
|  | Row \% | 2.6 | 21.4 | 44.7 | 31.6 |  |
|  | Column \% | 100.0 | 66.7 | 73.9 | 50.0 |  |
|  | Total \% | 1.7 | 13.3 | 28.3 | 20.0 | 63.3 |
| Sometimes SternSometimes Lax | Frequency |  | 2 | 4 | 5 | 11 |
|  | Row \% |  | 18.2 | 36.4 | 45.5 |  |
|  | Column \% |  | 16.7 | 17.4 | 20.8 |  |
|  | Total \% |  | 3.3 | 6.7 | 8.3 | 18.3 |
| EasyGoing | Frequency |  | 1 | 1 | 7 | 9 |
|  | Row \% |  | 11.1 | 11.1 | 77.8 |  |
|  | Column \% |  | 8.3 | 4.3 | 29.2 |  |
|  | Total \% |  | 1.7 | 1.7 | 11.7 | 15.0 |
| Column Totals | Frequency | 1 | 12 | 23 | 24 | 60 |
|  | \% | 1.7 | 20.0 | 38.3 | 40.0 | 100.0 |

Table 34
Frequency Distribution of Mothers' Discipline by Mothers' Education - 1980 Decade

| Discipline Category |  | No HS HS HS Diploma Diploma | rs' Educ Attend College | ation <br> 4 Year <br> Degree | Post Bac Degree | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Row } \\ & \text { Totals } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stern | Frequency |  |  | 3 |  | 3 |
|  | Row \% |  |  | 100.0 |  |  |
|  | Column \% |  |  | 8.8 |  |  |
|  | Total \% |  |  | 5.0 |  | 5.0 |
| Reasonably | Frequency | 1 | 3 | 18 | 14 | 36 |
| Firm | Row \% | 2.8 | 8.3 | 50.0 | 38.9 |  |
|  | Column \% | 100.0 | 60.0 | 52.9 | 70.0 |  |
|  | Total \% | 1.7 | 5.0 | 30.0 | 23.3 | 60.0 |
| Sometimes | Frequency |  |  | 6 | 3 | 9 |
| Stern- | Row \% |  |  | 66.7 | 33.3 |  |
| Sometimes | Column \% |  |  | 17.6 | 15.0 |  |
| Lax | Total \% |  |  | 10.0 | 5.0 | 15.0 |
| Easy- | Frequency |  | 2 | 7 | 3 | 12 |
| Going | Row \% |  | 16.7 | 58.3 | 25.0 |  |
|  | Column \% |  | 40.0 | 20.6 | 15.0 |  |
|  | Total \% |  | 3.3 | 11.7 | 5.0 | 20.0 |
| Column | Frequency | 1 | 5 | 34 | 20 | 60 |
| Totals | \% | 1.7 | 8.3 | 56.7 | 33.3 | 100.0 |

Table 35
Frequency Distribution of Mothers' Discipline by Mothers' Education

| Discipline Category |  | No HS Diploma | -- Mothe HS Diploma | rs' Educ Attend College | ation-- <br> 4 Year <br> Deqree | Post Bac Degree | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Row } \\ & \text { Totals } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stern | Frequency |  |  | 1 | 5 |  | 6 |
|  | Row \% |  |  | 16.7 | 83.3 |  |  |
|  | Column \% |  |  | 3.8 | 6.0 |  |  |
|  | Total * |  |  | 0.6 | 2.8 |  | 3.3 |
| ReasonablyFirm | Frequency | 1 | 4 | 18 | 52 | 34 | 109 |
|  | Row \% | 0.9 | 3.7 | 16.5 | 47.7 | 31.2 |  |
|  | Column \% | 50.0 | 66.7 | 69.2 | 61.9 | 54.8 |  |
|  | Total \% | 0.6 | 2.2 | 10.0 | 28.9 | 18.9 | 60.6 |
| Sometimes <br> Stern- <br> Sometimes <br> Lax | Frequency |  | 2 | 4 | 14 | 14 | 34 |
|  | Row \% |  | 5.9 | 11.8 | 41.2 | 41.2 |  |
|  | Column \% |  | 33.3 | 15.4 | 16.7 | 22.6 |  |
|  | Total \% |  | 1.1 | 2.2 | 7.8 | 7.8 | 18.9 |
| EasyGoing | Frequency |  |  | 3 | 13 | 14 | 30 |
|  | Row \% |  |  | 10.0 | 43.3 | 46.7 |  |
|  | Column \% |  |  | 11.5 | 15.5 | 22.6 |  |
|  | Total \% |  |  | 1.7 | 7.2 | 7.8 | 16.7 |
| Very <br> Lax | Frequency | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |
|  | Row \% | 100.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Column \% | 50.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total \% | 0.6 |  |  |  |  | 0.6 |
| Column Totals | Frequency | 2 | 6 | 26 | 84 | 62 | 180 |
|  | $\%$ | 1.1 | 3.3 | 14.4 | 46.7 | 34.4 | 100.0 |

Hypothesis 7a: There is no relationship between the birth order of the child and the mothers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1960's.

As shown in Table 36, the majority ( $\mathrm{N}=48$ or $80.0 \%$ ) of the children were first-born or second-born in their families. Of the first-born, five ( $21.7 \%$ ) mothers rated their discipline to be "easy-going," of the second-born, seven ( $28.0 \%$ ) mothers perceived their discipline as "sometimes stern--sometimes lax," and of the third-born, one-fifth of the mothers noted their discipline as "sometimes stern--sometimes lax" and one-fifth of the mothers perceived their discipline as "easy-going." There were only two children who were the fourth-born in their families and one mother perceived her discipline as "reasonably firm" and the other mother rated her discipline to be "sometimes stern--sometimes lax."

Hypothesis 7b: There is no relationship between the birth order of the child and the mothers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1970's.

The majority of the children ( $\mathrm{N}=38$ or $63.3 \%$ ) were the first-born in their families. Twenty-eight (73.7\%) mothers of first-born children rated their discipline to be "reasonably firm." Half of the mothers of second-born children noted their discipline to be "reasonably firm," and one-fourth of the mothers of a third-born child perceived her discipline to be "reasonably firm" (see Table 37).

Hypothesis 7c: There is no relationship between the birth order of the child and the mothers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1980's.

Table 36
Frequency Distribution of Mothers' Discipline by Birth Order of Children - 1960 Decade

| Discipline Category |  | One | $\begin{gathered} \text {--Birth } \\ \text { Two } \end{gathered}$ | Order Three | Four | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Row } \\ \text { Totals } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stern | Frequency |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |
|  | Row \% |  | 100.0 |  |  |  |
|  | Column \% |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |
|  | Total * |  | 1.7 |  |  | 1.7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Reasonably } \\ & \text { Firm } \end{aligned}$ | Frequency | 13 | 15 | 6 | 1 | 35 |
|  | Row \% | 37.1 | 42.9 | 17.1 | 2.9 |  |
|  | Column \% | 56.5 | 60.0 | 60.0 | 50.0 |  |
|  | Total \% | 21.7 | 25.0 | 10.0 | 1.7 | 58.3 |
| Sometimes SternSometimes Lax | Frequency | 4 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 14 |
|  | Row \% | 28.6 | 50.0 | 14.3 | 7.1 |  |
|  | Column \% | 17.4 | 28.0 | 20.0 | 50.0 |  |
|  | Total \% | 6.7 | 11.7 | 3.3 | 1.7 | 23.3 |
| EasyGoing | Frequency | 5 | 2 | 2 |  | 9 |
|  | Row \% | 55.6 | 22.2 | 22.2 |  |  |
|  | Column * | 21.7 | 8.0 | 20.0 |  |  |
|  | Total \% | 8.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 |  | 15.0 |
| Very Lax | Frequency | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |
|  | Row \% | 100.0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Column \% | 4.3 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total \% | 1.7 |  |  |  | 1.7 |
| Column Totals | Frequency | 23 | 25 | 10 | 2 | 60 |
|  | * | 38.3 | 41.7 | 16.7 | 3.3 | 100.0 |

Table 37
Frequency Distribution of Mothers' Discipline by Birth Order of Children - 1970 Decade

| Discipline Category |  | One | $\begin{aligned} & \text {-Birth } \\ & \text { Two } \end{aligned}$ | Order Three | Four | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Row } \\ \text { Totals } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stern | Frequency | 1 | 1 |  |  | 2 |
|  | Row \% | 50.0 | 50.0 |  |  |  |
|  | Column \% | 2.6 | 5.6 |  |  |  |
|  | Total \% | 1.7 | 1.7 |  |  | 3.3 |
| Reasonably Firm | Frequency | 28 | 9 | 1 |  | 38 |
|  | Row \% | 73.7 | 23.7 | 2.6 |  |  |
|  | Column \% | 73.7 | 50.0 | 25.0 |  |  |
|  | Total \% | 46.7 | 15.0 | 1.7 |  | 63.3 |
| Sometimes <br> Stern- <br> Sometimes Lax | Frequency | 7 | 3 | 1 |  | 11 |
|  | Row \% | 63.6 | 27.3 | 9.1 |  |  |
|  | Column \% | 18.4 | 16.7 | 25.0 |  |  |
|  | Total \% | 11.7 | 5.0 | 1.7 |  | 18.3 |
| EasyGoing | Frequency | 2 | 5 | 2 | * | 9 |
|  | Row \% | 22.2 | 55.6 | 22.2 |  |  |
|  | Column \% | 5.3 | 27.8 | 50.0 |  |  |
|  | Total \% | 3.3 | 8.3 | 3.3 |  | 15.0 |
| Column Totals | Frequency | 38 | 18 | 4 |  | 60 |
|  | \% | 63.3 | 30.0 | 6.7 |  | 100.0 |

As shown in Table 38, the majority ( $\mathrm{N}=41$ or $68.3 \%$ ) were first-born children. In the first-born, second-born, and third-born groups, the majority ( $N=36$ or $60.0 \%$ ) of the mothers rated their discipline to be "reasonably firm." With respect to the one child who was the fourth-born in the family, the mother perceived her discipline to be "sometimes stern--sometimes lax."

Hypothesis 7d: There is no relationship between the birth order of the child and the fathers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1960 's.

As shown in Table 39, the majority ( $\mathrm{N}=48$ ) of children were either the first-born or the second-born. The majority of the fathers (34 or $56.7 \%$ ) of the children in all of the birth order groups noted their discipline to be "reasonable firm."

Hypothesis 7e: There is no relationship between the birth order of the child and the fathers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1970's.

The first-born children were the largest group ( $N=38$ ). The majority ( 35 or $58.3 \%$ ) of the fathers of the children in all of the birth order groups rated their discipline to be "reasonably firm" (see Table 40).

Hypothesis 7f: There is no relationship between the birth order of the child and the fathers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1980's.

As shown in Table 41, the greatest number ( $N=41$ ) of children were in the first-born group. The majority of the fathers (31 or $51.7 \%$ ) of

Table 38
Frequency Distribution of Mothers' Discipline by Birth Order of Children - 1980 Decade

| Discipline Category |  | One | -Birth Two | Order Three | Four | Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stern | Frequency | 1 | 2 |  |  | 3 |
|  | Row \% | 33.3 | 66.7 |  |  |  |
|  | Column \% | 2.4 | 12.5 |  |  |  |
|  | Total \% | 1.7 | 3.3 |  |  | 5.0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Reasonably } \\ & \text { Firm } \end{aligned}$ | Frequency | 24 | 10 | 2 |  | 36 |
|  | Row \% | 66.7 | 27.8 | 5.6 |  |  |
|  | Column \% | 58.5 | 62.5 | 100.0 |  |  |
|  | Total \% | 40.0 | 16.7 | 3.3 |  | 60.0 |
| Sometimes <br> Stern- <br> Sometimes <br> Lax | Frequency | 7 | 1 |  | 1 | 9 |
|  | Row\% | 77.8 | 11.1 |  | 11.1 |  |
|  | Column \% | 17.1 | 6.3 |  | 100.0 |  |
|  | Total \% | 11.7 | 1.7 |  | 1.7 | 15.0 |
| EasyGoing | Frequency | 9 | 3 |  |  | 12 |
|  | Row \% | 75.0 | 25.0 |  |  |  |
|  | Column \% | 22.0 | 18.8 |  |  |  |
|  | Total \% | 15.0 | 5.0 |  |  | 20.0 |
| Column <br> Totals | Frequency | 41 | 16 | 2 | 1 | 60 |
|  | \% | 68.3 | 26.7 | 3.3 | 1.7 | 100.0 |

Table 39
Frequency Distribution of Fathers' Discipline by Birth Order of Children - 1960 Decade

| Discipline Category |  | One | -Birth Two | Order Three | Four | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Row } \\ \text { Totals } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stern | Frequency | 2 | 1 |  |  | 3 |
|  | Row \% | 66.7 | 33.3 |  |  |  |
|  | Column \% | 8.7 | 4.0 |  |  |  |
|  | Total \% | 3.3 | 1.7 |  |  | 5.0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Reasonably } \\ & \text { Firm } \end{aligned}$ | Frequency | 11 | 15 | 6 | 2 | 34 |
|  | Row \% | 32.4 | 44.1 | 17.6 | 5.9 |  |
|  | Column \% | 47.8 | 60.0 | 60.0 | 100.0 |  |
|  | Total \% | 18.3 | 25.0 | 10.0 | 3.3 | 56.7 |
| Sometimes SternSometimes Lax | Frequency | 4 | 7 | 2 |  | 13 |
|  | Row \% | 30.8 | 53.8 | 15.4 |  |  |
|  | Column \% | 17.4 | 28.0 | 20.0 |  |  |
|  | Total \% | 6.7 | 11.7 | 3.3 |  | 21.7 |
| EasyGoing | Frequency | 4 | 2 | 2 |  | 8 |
|  | Row \% | 50.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 |  |  |
|  | Column \% | 17.4 | 8.0 | 20.0 |  |  |
|  | Total \% | 6.7 | 3.3 | 3.3 |  | 13.3 |
| Very <br> Lax | Frequency | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |
|  | Row \% | 100.0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Column \% | 8.7 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total \% | 3.3 |  |  |  | 3.3 |
| Column <br> Totals | Frequency | 23 | 25 | 10 | 2 | 60 |
|  | * | 38.3 | 41.7 | 16.7 | 3.3 | 100.0 |

Table 40
Frequency Distribution of Fathers' Discipline by Birth Order of Children - 1970 Decade

| Discipline Category |  | One | Birth <br> Two | Order <br> Three | Four | Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stern | Frequency | 3 | 1 |  |  | 4 |
|  | Row\% | 75.0 | 25.0 |  |  |  |
|  | Column \% | 7.9 | 5.6 |  |  |  |
|  | Total \% | 5.0 | 1.7 |  |  | 6.7 |
| Reasonably | Frequency | 23 | 9 | 3 |  | 35 |
| Firm | Row \% | 65.7 | 25.7 | 8.6 |  |  |
|  | Column \% | 60.5 | 50.0 | 75.0 |  |  |
|  | Total \% | 38.3 | 15.0 | 5.0 |  | 58.3 |
| Sometimes | Frequency | 6 | 3 |  |  | 9 |
| Stern- | Row \% | 66.7 | 33.3 |  |  |  |
| Sometimes | Column \% | 15.8 | 16.7 |  |  |  |
| Lax | Total * | 10.0 | 5.0 |  |  | 15.0 |
| EasyGoing | Frequency | 6 | 5 | 1 |  | 12 |
|  | Row \% | 50.0 | 41.6 | 8.3 |  |  |
|  | Column \% | 15.8 | 27.8 | 25.0 |  |  |
|  | Total \% | 10.0 | 8.3 | 1.7 |  | 20.0 |
| Column <br> Totals | Frequency | 38 | 18 | 4 |  | 60 |
|  | * | 63.3 | 30.0 | 6.7 |  | 100.0 |

Table 41
Frequency Distribution of Fathers' Discipline by Birth Order of Children - 1980 Decade

| Discipline Category |  | One | Birth Two | Order Three | Four | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Row } \\ \text { Totals } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stern | Frequency | 3 | 2 |  |  | 5 |
|  | Row\% | 60.0 | 40.0 |  |  |  |
|  | Colurn \% | 7.3 | 12.5 |  |  |  |
|  | Total \% | 5.0 | 3.3 |  |  | 8.3 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Reasonably } \\ & \text { Firm } \end{aligned}$ | Frequency | 21 | 8 | 2 |  | 31 |
|  | Row\% | 67.7 | 25,8 | 6.5 |  |  |
|  | Column \% | 51.2 | 50.0 | 100.0 |  |  |
|  | Total \% | 35.0 | 13.3 | 3.3 |  | 51.7 |
| Sometimes SternSometimes Lax | Frequency | 10 | 4 |  |  | 14 |
|  | Row\% | 71.4 | 28.6 |  |  |  |
|  | Column \% | 24.4 | 25.0 |  |  |  |
|  | Total \% | 16.7 | 6.7 |  |  | 23.3 |
| EasyGoing | Frequency | 7 | 2 |  | 1 | 10 |
|  | Row \% | 70.0 | 20.0 |  | 10.0 |  |
|  | Column \% | 17.1 | 12.5 |  | 100.0 |  |
|  | Total \% | 11.7 | 3.3 |  | 1.7 | 16.7 |
| Column Totals | Frequency | 41 | 26 | 2 | 1 | 60 |
|  | 4 | 68.3 | 26.7 | 3.3 | 1.7 | 100.0 |

the children in all of the birth order groups perceived their discipline to be "reasonably firm."

Interpretation of Results of Hypothesis 7: The statistical
findings in support of Hypothesis 7 (including 7a-7f) indicate that 109 (60.6\%) mothers perceived their discipline of their first-born, second-born, third-born, and fourth-born children to be "reasonably firm" in the 1960's, 1970's, and 1980's. One hundred (55.6\%) fathers rated their discipline of their first-born, second-born, third-born, and fourth-born children to be "reasonably firm." The findings are based on percentages. Inferences should be drawn with caution since the numbers 'were not tested for significance (see Tables 42 and 43).

## Hypothesis 8

There is no relationship between the amount of time the fathers spend each day with their children and the fathers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1960's, 1970's, and 1980's. The fathers' perceptions of their discipline and the amount of time they spent each day with their children were crosstabulated. The control variables were the decades of the $1960^{\prime} \mathrm{s}, 1970$ 's, and 1980's.

Hypothesis 8a: There is no relationship between the amount of time the child spends each day with the father and the fathers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1960's.

Hypothesis 8b: There is no relationship between the amount of time the child spends each day with the father and the fathers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1970's.

Table 42
Frequency Distribution of Mothers' Discipline by Birth Order of Children

| Discipline Category |  | One | $\begin{gathered} - \text {-Birth } \\ \text { Two } \end{gathered}$ | Order Three | Four | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Row } \\ & \text { Totals } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stern | Frequency | 2 | 4 |  |  | 6 |
|  | Row \% | 33.3 | 66.7 |  |  |  |
|  | Column \% | 2.0 | 6.18 |  |  |  |
|  | Total \% | 1.1 | 2.2 |  |  | 3.3 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Reasonably } \\ & \text { Firm } \end{aligned}$ | Frequency | 65 | 34 | 9 | 1 | 109 |
|  | Row \% | 59.6 | 31.2 | 8.3 | 0.9 |  |
|  | Column \% | 63.7 | 57.6 | 56.3 | 33.3 |  |
|  | Total \% | 36.1 | 18.9 | 5.0 | 0.6 | 60.6 |
| Sometimes <br> Stern- <br> Sometimes <br> Lax | Frequency | 18 | 11 | 3 | 2 | 34 |
|  | Row \% | 52.9 | 32.4 | 8.8 | 5.9 |  |
|  | Column * | 17.6 | 18.6 | 18.8 | 66.7 |  |
|  | Total \% | 10.0 | 6.1 | 1.7 | 1.1 | 18.9 |
| EasyGoing | Frequency | 16 | 10 | 4 |  | 30 |
|  | Row * | 53.3 | 33.3 | 13.3 |  |  |
|  | Column $*$ | 15.7 | 16.9 | 25.0 |  |  |
|  | Total \% | 8.9 | 5.6 | 2.2 |  | 16.7 |
| VeryLax | Frequency | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |
|  | Row \% | 100.0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Column \% | 1.0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total \% | 0.6 |  |  |  | 0.6 |
| Column <br> Totals | Frequency | 102 | 59 | 16 | 3 | 180 |
|  | \% | 56.7 | 32.8 | 8.9 | 1.7 | 100.0 |

Table 43
Frequency Distribution of Fathers' Discipline by Birth Order of Children

| Discipline Category |  | One | -Birth <br> Two | Order Three | Four | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Row } \\ \text { Totals } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stern | Frequency | 8 | 4 |  |  | 12 |
|  | Row \% | 66.7 | 33.3 |  |  |  |
|  | Column \% | 7.8 | 6.8 |  |  |  |
|  | Total \% | 4.4 | 2.2 |  |  | 6.7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Reasonably } \\ & \text { Firm } \end{aligned}$ | Frequency | 55 | 32 | 11 | 2 | 100 |
|  | Row \% | 55.0 | 32.0 | 11.0 | 2.0 |  |
|  | Column \% | 53.9 | 54.2 | 68.8 | 66.7 |  |
|  | Total \% | 30.6 | 17.8 | 6.1 | 1.1 | 55.6 |
| Sometimes <br> Stern- <br> Sometimes <br> Lax | Frequency | 20 | 14 | 2 |  | 36 |
|  | Row \% | 55.6 | 38.9 | 5.6 |  |  |
|  | Column \% | 19.6 | 23.7 | 12.5 |  |  |
|  | Total \% | 11.1 | 7.8 | 1.1 |  | 20.0 |
| EasyGoing | Frequency | 17 | 9 | 3 | 1 | 30 |
|  | Row \% | 56.7 | 30.0 | 10.0 | 3.3 |  |
|  | Column * | 16.7 | 15.3 | 18.8 | 33.3 |  |
|  | Total \% | 9.4 | 5.0 | 1.7 | 0.6 | 16.7 |
| Very Lax | Frequency | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |
|  | Row; | 100.0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Column \% | 2.0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total \% | 1.1 |  |  |  | 1.1 |
| Column <br> Totals | Frequency | 102 | 59 | 16 | 3 | 180 |
|  | * | 56.7 | 32.8 | 8.9 | 1.7 | 100.0 |

Hypothesis 8c: There is no relationship between the amount of time the child spends each day with the father and the fathers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1980 's.

When controlling for the 1960, 1970, and 1980 decades, and with respect to the amount of time fathers spend each day with their preschool children, the majority of fathers in each decade perceived their discipline of their preschool children to be "reasonably fira" (see Tables 44, 45, and 46).

Interpretation of Results of Hypothesis 8: As shown in Table 47, the statistical findings in support of Hypothesis 8 (including 8a-8c) indicate that 100 (55.6\%) fathers perceived their discipline of their preschool children to be "reasonably firm" in the 1960's, 1970's, and 1980's. This was true for the majority ( $\mathrm{N}=100$ or $55.6 \%$ ) of fathers spanning all amounts of time. The findings are based on percentages. Inferences should be cautious since the numbers were not tested for significance.

## Hypothesis 9

There is no relationship between the amount of time the mothers spend each day with their children and the mothers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1960's, 1970's, and 1980's. The mothers' perceptions of their discipline of their children and the amount of time the mothers spent each day with their children were crosstabulated. The control variables were the decades of the 1960's, 1970's, and 1980's.

Table 44
Frequency Distribution of Fathers' Discipilne by Amount of Time Father Spends with Child Each Day - 1960 Decade

| Discipline Category |  | s- One | Two | Three | Spent | Five | Sach | Seven | Eight | Mine to Twelve | $\begin{gathered} \text { Row } \\ \text { Totals } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stern | Frequency |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
|  | Row \% |  | 33.3 | 33.3 | 33.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Column * |  | 7.7 | 4.8 | 11.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total * |  | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Reasonably } \\ & \text { Firm } \end{aligned}$ | Frequency | 4 7 | 7 | 13 | 5 | 4 |  |  |  |  | 34 |
|  | Row \% | 14.7 | 20.6 | 38.2 | 14.7 | 11.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Coluan \% | 45.5 | 53.8 | 61.9 | 55.6 | 80.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total * | 8.3 | 11.7 | 21.7 | 8.3 | 6.7 |  |  |  |  | 56.7 |
| Sometimes | Frequency | 3 | 2 | 5 | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 13 |
| Stern- | Row * | 23.1 | 15.4 | 38.5 | 15.4 |  |  | 7.7 |  |  |  |
| Sometimes | Column \% | 27.3 | 15.4 | 23.8 | 22.2 |  |  | 100.0 |  |  |  |
| Lax | Total | 5.0 | 3.3 | 8.3 | 3.3 |  |  | 1.7 |  |  | 21.7 |
| EasyGoing | Frequency | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | , |  |  |  |  | 8 |
|  | Row \% | 37.5 | 37.5 | 12.5 | 12.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Column | 27.3 | 23.1 | 4.8 | 11.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | 5.0 | 5.0 | 1.7 | 1.7 |  |  |  |  |  | 13.3 |
| Vory Lax | Frequency |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 2 |
|  | Row |  |  | 50.0 |  | 50.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Column \% |  |  | 4.8 |  | 20.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total \% |  |  | 1.7 |  | 1.7 |  |  |  |  | 3.3 |
| Column Totals | Frequency |  | 13 | 21 | 9 | 5 |  | 1 |  |  | 60 |
|  | * | 18.3 | 21.7 | 35.0 | 15.0 | 8.3 |  | 1.7 |  |  | 100.0 |

Table 45
Frequency Distribution of Fathers' Discipline
by Anount of Time Father Spends with Child Each Day - 1970 Decade

| Discipline Category |  | く- One | Two | Three | Spent Four | Five | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1d Each } \\ & \text { Six } \end{aligned}$ | Say--- | Eight | Hine to Twelve | $\begin{gathered} \text { Row } \\ \text { Totals } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stern | Frequency |  | 1 | 1 | $5{ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |
|  | Row 4 |  | 25.0 | 25.0 | 50.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Column |  | 7.7 | 5.9 | 18.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |  | 1.7 | 1.7 | 3.3 |  |  |  |  |  | 6.7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Reasonably } \\ & \text { Firm } \end{aligned}$ | Frequency | 7 | 5 | 9 | 7 | 1 | 3 |  | 1 | 2 | 35 |
|  | Row * | 20.0 | 14.3 | 25.7 | 20.0 | 2.9 | 8.6 |  | 2.9 | 5.7 |  |
|  | Coluan \% | 63.6 | 38.5 | 52.9 | 63.6 | 50.0 | 100.0 |  | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |
|  | Total | 11.7 | 8.3 | 15.0 | 11.7 | 1.7 | 5.0 |  | 1.7 | 3.3 | 58.3 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sonetimes } \\ & \text { stern-imes } \\ & \text { Sometimes } \\ & \text { Lax } \end{aligned}$ | Frequency |  | 4 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9 |
|  | Row $*$ |  | 44.4 | 55.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Column * |  | 30.8 | 29.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total \% |  | 6.7 | 8.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15.0 |
| EasyGoing | Frequency | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 12 |
|  | Row \% | 33.3 | 25.0 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 8.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Coluan ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 36.4 | 23.1 | 11.8 | 18.2 | 50.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total \% | 6.7 | 5.0 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 1.7 |  |  |  |  | 20.0 |
| Column Totals | Frequency | 11 | 13 | 17 | 11 | 2 | 3 |  | 1 | 2 | 60 |
|  |  | 18.3 | 21.7 | 28.3 | 18.3 | 3.3 | 5.0 |  | 1.7 | 3.3 | 100.0 |

## Table 46

Frequency Distribution of Fathers' Discipiine
by Amount of Time Father Spends with Child Each Day - 1980 Decade

| Discipline Category |  | <- One | Two | Three | Four | Five | 31x | Seven | Eight | Mine to Twelve | $\begin{gathered} \text { Row } \\ \text { Totals } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stern | Frequency | 1 |  | 2 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 5 |
|  | Row | 20.0 |  | 40.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Column ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 10.0 |  | 10.5 | 8.3 | 20.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 1.7 |  | 3.3 | 1.7 | 1.7 |  |  |  |  | 8.3 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Reasonably } \\ & \text { Firm } \end{aligned}$ | Frequency | 4 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 3 |  |  |  |  | 31 |
|  | Row \% | 12.9 | 19.4 | 35.5 | 22.6 | 9.7 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Column ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 40.0 | 46.2 | 57.9 | 58.3 | 60.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total * | 6.7 | 10.0 | 18.3 | 11.7 | 5.0 |  |  |  |  | 51.7 |
| Sometimes | Frequency | 3 | 6 | 3 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |
| Stern- | Row \% | 21.4 | 42.9 | 21.4 | 14.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sometimes | Columin | 30.0 | 46.2 | 15.8 | 16.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lax | Total * | 5.0 | 10.0 | 5.0 | 3.3 |  |  |  |  |  | 23.3 |
| EasyGoing | Frequency | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 10 |
|  | Row \% | 20.0 | 10.0 | 30.0 | 20.0 | 10.0 |  |  |  | 10.0 |  |
|  | Column | 20.0 | 7.7 | 15.8 | 16.7 | 20.0 |  |  |  | 100.0 |  |
|  | Total | 3.3 | 1.7 | 5.0 | 3.3 | 1.7 |  |  |  | 1.7 | 16.7 |
| Coluan Totals | Frequency | 10 | 13 | 19 | 12 | 5 |  |  |  | 1 | 60 |
|  | \% | 16.7 | 21.7 | 31.7 | 20.0 | 8.3 |  |  |  | 1.7 | 100.0 |

Table 47
Frequency Distribution of Fathers' Discipline by Amount of Time Father Spends with Child Each Day

| Discipline Category |  | S* One | Two | Three | Four | Five | Six | Seven | Eiont | Bine to Twelve | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Row } \\ \text { Totals } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stern | Frequency | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 12 |
|  | Row* | 8.3 | 16.7 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 8.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Colum * | 3.1 | 5.1 | 7.0 | 12.5 | 8.3 |  | , |  |  |  |
|  | Total | 0.6 | 1.1 | 2.2 | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  | 6.7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Reasonably } \\ & \text { Firm } \end{aligned}$ | Frequency | 16 | 18 | 33 | 19 | 8 | 3 |  | 1 | 2 | 100 |
|  | Row \% | 16.0 | 18.0 | 33.0 | 19.0 | 8.0 | 3.0 |  | 1.0 | 2.0 |  |
|  | Column * | 50.0 | 46.2 | 57.9 | 59.4 | 66.7 | 100.0 |  | 100.0 | 66.7 |  |
|  | Total \% | 8.9 | 10.0 | 18.3 | 10.6 |  | 1.7 |  | 0.6 | 1.1 | 55.6 |
| Sometimes SternSometimes Lax | Frequency | 6 | 12 | 13 | 4 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 36 |
|  | Row * | 16.7 | 33.3 | 36.1 | 11.1 |  |  | 2.8 |  |  |  |
|  | Colunn \% | 18.8 | 30.8 | 22.8 | 12.5 |  |  | 100.0 |  |  |  |
|  | Total \% | 3.3 | 6.7 | 7.2 | 2.2 |  |  | 0.6 |  |  | 20.0 |
| EasyGoing | Frequency | 9 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 2 |  |  |  | 1 | 30 |
|  | Row * | 30.0 | 23.5 | 20.0 | 16.7 | 6.7 |  |  |  | 3.3 |  |
|  | Colurn * | 28.1 | 17.9 | 10.5 | 15.6 | 16.7 |  |  |  | 33.3 |  |
|  | Total \% | 5.0 | 3.9 | 3.3 | 2.8 | 1.1 |  |  |  | 0.6 | 16.7 |
| Very Lax | Frequency |  |  | -1 |  | -1 |  |  |  |  | 2 |
|  | Row \% |  |  | 50.0 |  | 50.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Column * |  |  | 1.8 |  | 8.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total * |  |  | 0.6 |  | 0.6 |  |  |  |  | 1.1 |
| Column Totals | Frequency | 32 | 39 | 57 | 32 | 12 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 180 |
|  | * | 17.8 | 21.7 | 31.7 | 17.8 | 6.7 | 1.7 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 1.7 | 100.0 |

Hypothesis 9a: There is no relationship between the amount of time the child spends each day with the mother and the mothers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1960's.

Hypothesis 9b: There is no relationship between the amount of time the child spends each day with the mother and the mothers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1970's.

Hypothesis 9c: There is no relationship between the amount of time the child spends each day with the mother and the mothers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1980's.

As noted in Tables 48, 49, and 50, when controlling for the 1960, 1970, and 1980 decades and with respect to the amount of time mothers spend each day with their preschool children, the majority of mothers perceived their discipline of their preschool children to be "reasonably firm."

Interpretation of Results of Hypothesis 9: The statistical findings in support of Hypothesis 9 (including 9a-9c) indicate that 109 (60.6\%) mothers perceived their discipline of their preschool children to be "reasonably firm." This was true for the majority ( $N=109$ or $60.6 \%$ ) of mothers spanning all amounts of time in the 1960's, 1970's, and 1980's. The findings are based on percentages. Inferences should be cautiously drawn since the numbers were not tested for significance (see Table 51).

## Additional Data Analysis

Two additional answers on "Form 19: Your Child and His Development" were analyzed with computer assistance. The questions were

Table 48
Frequency Distribution of Mothers' Discipline by Amount of Time Mother Spends with Child Each Day - 1960 Decade

| Discipline Category |  | Three | Four | Five | Six | Seven | Eight | Hine | Nine to Trivelve | Over Twelve | Row Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stern | Frequency Row \% Colum Total |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 1 \\ 100.0 \\ 50.0 \\ 1.7 \end{array}$ |  |  | 1 1.7 |
| Reasonably Firin | Frequency |  |  | 2 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 23 | 7 | 35 |
|  | Row \% |  |  | 5.7 | 2.9 | 2.9 |  | 2.9 | 65.7 | 20.0 |  |
|  | Columa ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ |  |  | 50.0 | 50.0 | 33.3 |  | 50.0 | 60.5 | 87.5 |  |
|  | Total |  |  | 3.3 | 1.7 | 1.7 |  | 1.7 | 38.3 | 11.7 | 58.3 |
| Sometimes | Frequency |  |  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |  | 9 |  | 14 |
| Stern- | Row \% |  |  | 7.1 | 7.1 | 14.3 | 7.1 |  | 64.3 |  |  |
| Sometimes | Colun \% |  |  | 25.0 | 50.0 | 66.7 | 33.3 |  | 23.7 |  |  |
| Lax | Total \% |  |  | 1.7 | 1.7 | 3.3 | 1.7 |  | 15.0 |  | 23.3 |
| EasyGoing | Frequency |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  | 5 | 11 | 9 |
|  | Row * |  |  | 11.1 |  |  | 22.2 |  | 55.6 | 11.1 |  |
|  | Colum ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ |  |  | 25.0 |  |  | 66.7 |  | 13.2 | 12.5 |  |
|  | Total * |  |  | 1.7 |  |  | 3.3 |  | 8.3 | 1.7 | 15.0 |
| Very | Frequency |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| Lax | Row \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100.0 |  |  |
|  | Coluan * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.6 |  |  |
|  | Total * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.7 |  | 1.7 |
| Colum <br> Totals | Frequency * |  |  | 6.7 | 2 3.3 | 5.0 | 3 5.0 | 3.3 | $\begin{array}{r} 38 \\ 63.3 \end{array}$ | 13.3 | $\begin{array}{r} 60 \\ 100.0 \end{array}$ |

Table 49
Frequency Distribution of Mothers' Discipline
by Amount of Time Mother Spends with Child Each Day - 1970 Decade

| Discipline Category |  | Three | Four | Five | Six | Seven | Eight | Nine | Nine to Twelve | Over Twelve | Row Total: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stern | Frequency |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  | 2 |
|  | Row \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100.0 |  |  |
|  | Colum ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.1 |  |  |
|  | Total \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.3 |  | 3.3 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Reasonably } \\ & \text { Firm } \end{aligned}$ | Frequency | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |  | 4 | 3 | 23 | 3 | 38 |
|  | Row * | 2.6 | 2.6 | 5.3 | 2.6 |  | 10.5 | 7.9 | 60.5 | 7.9 |  |
|  | Column \% | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 25.0 |  | 66.7 | 100.0 | 59.0 | 75.0 |  |
|  | Total \% | 1.7 | 1.7 | 3.3 | 1.7 |  | 6.7 | 5.0 | 38.3 | 5.0 | 63.3 |
| Sometimes <br> Stern- <br> Sometimes <br> Lax | Frequency |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 9 | 1 | 11 |
|  | Row \% |  |  |  | 9.0 |  |  |  | 81.8 | 9.1 |  |
|  | Column \% |  |  |  | 25.0 |  |  |  | 23.1 | 25.0 |  |
|  | Total ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ |  |  |  | 1.7 |  |  |  | 15.0 | 1.7 | 18.3 |
| EasyGoing | Frequency |  |  |  | 2 |  | 2 |  | 5 |  | 9 |
|  | Row * |  |  |  | 22.2 |  | 22.2 |  | 55.6 |  |  |
|  | Colum \% |  |  |  | 50.0 |  | 33.3 |  | 12.8 |  |  |
|  | Total * |  |  |  | 3.3 |  | 3.3 |  | 8.3 |  | 15.0 |
| Colum Totals | Frequency | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 |  | 6 | 3 | 39 | 4 | 60 |
|  | * | 1.7 | 1.7 | 3.3 | 6.7 |  | 10.0 | 5.0 | 65.0 | 6.7 | 100.0 |

Table 50
Frequency Distribution of Mothers' Discipline
by Amount of Time Mother Spends with Child Each Day - 1980 Decade

| Discipline Category |  | Three | Four | Five | 512 | Seven | Eight | Nine | Nine to Twelve | Over <br> Twelve | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Row } \\ \text { Totals } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stern | Frequency |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 65.2 | 33.1 | 3 |
|  | Colum |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 66.7 | 11.1 |  |
|  | Total $*$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.3 | 1.7 | 5.0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Reasonably } \\ & \text { Firm } \end{aligned}$ | Frequency | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |  | 21 | 5 | 36 |
|  | Row \% | 2.8 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 2.8 | 5.6 |  | 58.3 | 13.9 |  |
|  | Coluan * | 100.0 | 66.7 | 66.7 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 40.0 |  | 63.6 | 55.6 |  |
|  | Total * | 1.7 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 1.7 | 3.3 |  | 35.0 | 8.3 | 60.0 |
| Sometimes <br> Stern- <br> Sometimea <br> Lax | Frequency |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 9 |
|  | Row * |  |  | 11.1 |  |  | 22.2 | 22.2 | 33.3 | 11.1 |  |
|  | Coluan \% |  |  | 33.0 |  |  | 40.0 | 66.7 | 9.1 | 11.1 |  |
|  | Total * |  |  | 1.7 |  |  | 3.3 | 3.3 | 5.0 | 1.7 | 15.0 |
| EasyGoing | Frequency |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 7 | 2 | 12 |
|  | Row $*$ |  | 8.3 |  |  |  | 8.3 | 8.3 | 58.3 | 16.7 |  |
|  | Colum ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ |  | 33.3 |  |  |  | 20.0 | 33.3 | 21.2 | 22.2 |  |
|  | Total * |  | 1.7 |  |  |  | 1.7 | 1.7 | 11.7 | 3.3 | 20.0 |
| Colum Totals | Frequency | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 33 | 9 | 60 |
|  | * | 1.7 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 3.3 | 1.7 | 8.3 | 5.0 | 55.0 | 15.0 | 100.0 |

Table 51
Frequency Distribution of Mothers' Discipline by Amount of Time Mother Spends with Child Each Day

| Discipline Category |  | Three | Four | Five | 3ix | Seven | Eight | Nine | Mine to Twelve | Orer Trelve | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Row } \\ \text { Totals } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stern | Frequency |  |  |  |  |  |  | 16. $\frac{1}{7}$ | 65.4 | 16.1 | 6 |
|  | Colunn * |  |  |  | , |  |  | 12.5 | 3.6 | 4.8 |  |
|  | Total |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.6 | 2.2 | 0.6 | 3.3 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Reasonably } \\ & \text { Firn } \end{aligned}$ | Frequency | 2 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 67 | 15 | 109 |
|  | Row \% | 1.8 | 2.8 | 5.5 | 3.7 | 1.8 | 5.5 | 3.7 | 61.5 | 13.8 |  |
|  | Colum \% | 100.0 | 75.0 | 66.7 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 42.9 | 50.0 | 60.9 | 71.4 |  |
|  | Total \% | 1.1 | 1.7 | 3.3 | 2.2 | 1.1 | 3.3 | 2.2 | 37.2 | 8.3 | 60.6 |
| Sometimes SternSometimes Lax | Frequency |  |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 21 | 2 | 34 |
|  | Row \% |  |  | 5.9 | 5.9 | 5.9 | 8.8 | 5.9 | 61.8 | 5.9 |  |
|  | Colum \% |  |  | 22.2 | 25.0 | 50.0 | 21.4 | 25.0 | 19.1 | 9.5 |  |
|  | Total \% |  |  | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.7 | 1.1 | 11.7 | 1.1 | 18.9 |
| Easy- <br> Going | Frequency |  | $\frac{1}{3}$ | 1 | 2 |  | 5 | 1 | 817 | 3 | 30 |
|  | Row \% |  | 3.3 | 3.3 | 6.7 |  | 16.7 | 3.3 | 56.7 | 10.0 |  |
|  | Columan \% |  | 25.0 | 11.0 | 25.0 |  | 35.7 | 12.5 | 15.5 | 14.3 |  |
|  | Total |  | 0.6 | 0.6 | 1.1 |  | 2.8 | 0.6 | 9.4 | 1.7 | 16.7 |
| Very <br> Lax | Frequency |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |
|  | Row * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100.0 |  |  |
|  | Column \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.9 |  |  |
|  | Total \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.6 |  | 0.6 |
| Column Totals | Frequency | 2 | 4 | 9 | 8 | 4 | 14 | 8 | 110 | 21 | 180 |
|  | * | 1.1 | 2.2 | 5.0 | 4.4 | 2.2 | 7.8 | 4.4 | 61.1 | 11.7 | 100.0 |

(a) Parents' methods of control of child, and (b) Usual reaction of child to discipline.

As shown in Table 52, the findings indicate that the majority (73.0\%) of parents use "praising" to control their children. Only four (2.2\%) parents used "comparing unfavorably with others" as a control technique.

In response to the question "Usual reaction of child to discipline," the largest number ( $\mathrm{i}=115$ or $63.0 \%$ ) of parents noted that their child "Cries." Only six (3.0\%) parents out of 180 indicated their child was "Afraid" (see Table 53).

The findings of the additional questions are based on percentages. Therefore, inferences should be drawn cautiously since the numbers were not tested for siznificance.

Table 52
Frequency Distribution of Parents' Methods of Control of Children

| Method of Control | Value | Frequency | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ignoring | No Yes Total | $\begin{array}{r} 113 \\ 67 \\ 180 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 62.8 \\ 37.2 \\ 100.0 \end{array}$ |
| Isolation | No Yes Total | $\begin{array}{r} 106 \\ 74 \\ 180 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 58.9 \\ 41.1 \\ 100.0 \end{array}$ |
| Scolding | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No } \\ & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 91 \\ 89 \\ 180 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 50.6 \\ 49.4 \\ 100.0 \end{array}$ |
| Threatening | No Yes Total | $\begin{array}{r} 154 \\ 26 \\ 180 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 85.6 \\ 14.4 \\ 100.0 \end{array}$ |
| Depriving | No Yes Total | $\begin{array}{r} 147 \\ 33 \\ 180 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 81.7 \\ 18.3 \\ 100.0 \end{array}$ |
| Spanking | No Yes  | $\begin{array}{r} 85 \\ 95 \\ 180 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 47.2 \\ 52.8 \\ 100.0 \end{array}$ |
| Bribing | No <br> Yes Total | $\begin{array}{r} 164 \\ 16 \\ 180 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 91.1 \\ 8.9 \\ 100.0 \end{array}$ |
| Coaxing | No Yes Total | $\begin{array}{r} 149 \\ 31 \\ 180 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 82.8 \\ 17.2 \\ 100.0 \end{array}$ |
| Rewarding | No Yes Total | $\begin{array}{r} 102 \\ 78 \\ 180 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 56.7 \\ 43.3 \\ 100.0 \end{array}$ |

Table 52 (Continued)
Frequency Distribution of Parents' Methods of Control of Children

| Method of Control | Value | Frequency | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Praising | No | 47 | 26.1 |
|  | Yes | 133 | 73.9 |
|  | Total | 180 | 100.0 |
| Comparing | No | 176 | 97.8 |
|  | Yes | 4 | 2.2 |
|  | Total | 180 | 100.0 |
| Giving Choices | No | 73 | 40.6 |
|  | Yes | 107 | 59.4 |
|  | Total | 180 | 100.0 |
| Suggesting | No | 89 | 49.4 |
|  | Yes | 91 | 50.6 |
|  | Total | 180 | 100.0 |
| Reasoning | No | 93 | 51.7 |
|  | Yes | 87 | 48.3 |
|  | Total | 180 | 100.0 |
| Demonstrating | No | 109 | 60.6 |
|  | Yes | 71 | 39.4 |
|  | Total | 180 | 100.0 |
| Diverting | No | 62 | 34.4 |
|  | Yes | 118 | 65.6 |
|  | Total | 180 | 100.0 |
| Preparing Ahead | No | 90 | 50.0 |
|  | Yes | 90 | 50.0 |
|  | Total | 180 | 100.0 |
| Speaking Firmly | No | 30 | 16.7 |
|  | Yes | 150 | 83.3 |
|  | Total | 180 | 100.0 |

Table 53
Frequency Distribution of Usual Reaction of Child to Discipline

| Reaction | Value | Frequency | $\%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Afraid | No | 174 | 96.7 |
|  | Yes | 6 | 3.3 |
|  | Total | 180 | 100.0 |
| Defiant | No | 136 | 75.6 |
|  | Yes | 44 | 24.4 |
|  | Total | 180 | 100.0 |
| Sorry | No | 136 | 75.6 |
|  | Yes | 44 | 24.4 |
|  | Total | 180 | 100.0 |
| Sulks | No | 154 | 85.6 |
|  | Yes | 26 | 14.4 |
|  | Total | 180 | 100.0 |
| Cries | No | 65 | 36.1 |
|  | Yes | 115 | 63.9 |
|  | Total | 180 | 100.0 |
| Temper Tantrum | No | 143 | 79.4 |
|  | Yes | 37 | 20.6 |
|  | Total | 180 | 100.0 |
| Indifferent | No | 158 | 87.8 |
|  | Yes | 22 | 12.2 |
|  | Total | 180 | 100.0 |
| More Obedient | No | 86 | 47.8 |
|  | Yes | 94 | 52.2 |
|  | Total | 180 | 100.0 |
| Regards as Joke | No | 164 | 91.1 |
|  | Yes | 16 | 8.9 |
|  | Total | 180 | 100.0 |

CHAPTER V
SU:M'ARY AIND COMCLUSIOMS

The major purpose of the study was to describe parents' perceptions of their discipline of their children and the relationship of specific demographic factors in the 1960's, 1970's, and 1980's. The specific demographic factors were age of the child, sex of the child, father's ase, mother's age, birth order of the child, amount of time the child spends each day with the father, and the amount of time the child spends each day with the mother.

Previous studies have indicated that the age and sex of the child, and socioeconomic status affect the type of discipline mothers use with their children. The review of the literature, however, did not reveal any research which focused directly on trends in parental discipline in recent years. Methodological constraints have often made it difficult to obtain information about the discipline of children by their parents. Until this descriptive study, no research was found which focused directly on the relationship of parents' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children and specific demographic factors, which compared the relationship of parents" perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the $1960^{\prime} \mathrm{s}, 1970^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$, and $1980^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$.

## The Research Design

The basic research design was one in which information from a questionnaire was used to describe parents' perceptions of their
discipline of their preschool children and the relationship of specific demographic factors in the 1960's, 1970's, and 1980's. One-hundred and eighty children, ages 15 months to 59 months, spanning 15 years, along with their parents were the subjects.

Based on the information available on the questionnaire and literature findings; the following hypotheses were formulated.

1. There is no relationship between the ages of the children and the parents' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1960's, 1970's, and 1980's.
2. There is no relationship between the sex of the children and the parents' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1960 's, 1970 's, and 1980's.
3. There is no relationship between the fathers' age and the fathers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the $1960^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$, $1970^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$, and 1980's.
4. There is no relationship between the mothers' age and the mothers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1960's, 1970's, and 1980's.
5. There is no relationship between the fathers' education and the fathers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1960's, 1970's, and 1980's.
6. There is no relationship between the mothers' education and the mothers' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1960's, 1970's, and 1980's.
7. There is no relationship between the birth order of the children and the parents' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the $1960^{\prime} \mathrm{s}, 1970^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$, and $1980^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$.
8. There is no relationship between the amount of time the fathers spend with their children and their perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1960's, 1970's, and $1980^{\circ} \mathrm{s}$.
9. There is no relationship between the amount of time the mothers spend with their children and their perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children in the 1960 's, 1970 's, and $1980^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$.

The data were analyzed by various descriptive statistical procedures, including frequencies, condescriptives, and cross tabulations.

## Conclusions

The majority of the parents in the study perceived their discipline of their preschool children to be "reasonably firm" in all three decades. This result, by the nature of its consistency, is in agreement with research on the discipline of children by Miller and Swanson (1958), Clifford (1959), Kagan and Lemkin (1962), Emmerich (1962), Baumrind (1966), Lamb (1976), Yankelovitch, et al. (1977), Ausubel (1980), and Lamb (1981).

Research describing parental controls in the last three decades have used categories which have similar meanings but different labels. In 1966 Baumrind described and contrasted three models of parental control-permissive, authoritarian, and authoritative. Baumrind (1966)
described the permissive parent as one who attempts to behave in a nonpunitive, acceptant, and affirmative manner toward the child's impulses, desires, and actions. The authoritarian parent attempts to shape, control, and evaluate behavior and attitudes of the child in accordance with a set standard of conduct. The authoritative parent attempts to direct the child's activities in a rational, issue-oriented manner. Later, Yankelovitch et al. (1977) divided parents into three groups on the basis of their approaches to discipline. They described the permissive parents as less strict than most parents who rejected the idea that old fashioned discipline is the best way to raise children. Strict parents were described as adhering to old-fashioned discipline, not sparing the rod, and taking pride in their antipermissive attitudes. Temperate parents were those in the middle of the road between permissive and strict. Ausubel (1980) equated permissive discipline with democratic discipline and asserted that other forms of discipline were synonymous with authoritarianism. Ausubel (1980) described democratic discipline as rational and nonarbitrary and authoriatarian discipline as harsh, tyrannical, vengeful, and power-oriented.

Research concerning the mothers' responsibility in the discipline of the child has had consistent findings since 1959. Clifford (1959) found mothers to be most frequently responsible for disciplining the child. Kagan and Lemkin (1962), Emmerich (1962), and Lamb (1976; 1981) also reported the mother as providing most of the discipline of the child.

Research is consistent for the three decades in regard to mothers' and fathers: family functions. As early as 1958, Miller and Swanson
discovered fathers to exhibit primarily instrumental functions and the mother to provide expressive functions. Instrumental functions are characterized by a concern with mastery and competence. Expressive functions are characterized by a concern with interpersonal relationships, emotional support, nurturance, and caregiving. This research finding was corroborated by Lamb in 1981.

The data from the present study revealed a definite homogeneity of the group. The majority of the children were first-born in their family, their parents were 30 years of age or older, and the majority of the parents had a baccalaureate or higher level of education. The largest number of mothers spent eight hours a day with their children, whereas the greatest number of fathers spent three hours or less with their children.

Regardless of the demographic factors, the majority of the parents in the present study perceived their discipline of their preschool children as "reasonably firm." The specific demographic factors were age of the child, sex of the child, father's age, mother's age, mother's education, father's education, birth order of child, amount of time child spends each day with the father, and amount of time child spends each day with the mother.

The above finding is in agreement with Clifford's (1959) research which indicated there was a great degree of similarity in the disciplinary controls that all mothers and fathers used regardless of the age of the child. One explanation for these results might be seen in social learning theory which indicates the importance of reciprocity in any parent-child interaction. Social learning theory does not negate
the possibility of fathers influencing mothers' responses and mothers influencing fathers' responses in the disciplining of children.

Contrary to this finding, other resources (Clifford, 1959; Hoffman \& Saltzstein, 1967; Lamb, 1976) found that the age of the child, sex of the child, sex of the parent, and socioeconomic status of the family were determinants of the type of discipline parents used with their children.

## Recommendations for Future Research

The findings of the present investigation point to several potential areas for future research. Based on these results, and subsequent questions raised by the findings, the following recommendations are made: A reliable and valid instrument should be developed to measure parents' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children. Additionally, further research is needed to validate the specific demographic factors which are related to parents' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children. Because of the findings in the literature and because of the limited conclusions which could be drawn from the present investigation, the suggested relationship between parents' perceptions of their discipline and the age, sex, and birth order of the child, the parents' ages and educations, and the amount of time the child spends each day with each parent should be further explored using a large, more diverse sample across the three decades. Two further suggestions are to investigate
samples from different regions of the country and samples from varying socioeconomic levels.

Because of increased interest in parental discipline, a study combining direct observation of parents' disciplinary techniques and reports of parents' perceptions of their disciplining techniques would be important in order to determine whether parents' perceptions of their discipline accurately reflect the parents' actual behavior. Additionally, a longitudinal study is needed to identify differences in parents' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children over several decades. A longitudinal study would allow for intensive studies of parents and children at various levels.

In general, the findings suggested that the present investigation seems worthy of replication in order to determine the reliability of these results. Variations in subject characteristics, a larger sample size, and a broader random sampling procedure, would allow generalizations to much larger and more varied populations.

The present research has attempted to contribute to the large yet highly disparate body of knowledge related to parents' perceptions of their discipline of their preschool children over three decades. Gaining more knowledge about the way in which parents perceive their discipline of their children in relation to specific demographic factors plays an important part in understanding better how the discipline of children relates to parent-child interaction.
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## APPENDIX

QUESTIONNAIRE

## DEPARTIENT OF OHILD DEVELOPMEITT AND FAMILY RELATIOIS <br> SOHOOL OF HOIE ECONOMICS <br> UNIVEPSITT OF NORTH CAROLINA AT GREENSBORO

FORIA 19

## YOUR OHIL AND HIS DEVELOPR.ENT


11. FAMILY AND HOME

Parents:
Father's Name $\qquad$
Mother's Molden Name $\qquad$
Present Address $\qquad$ Phone

Length of residence at present address $\qquad$
Are parants separated? Dlvorced? Are elther of the above step-parents? $\qquad$
$\qquad$

FATHER
MOTHER
Date of blrth
Place of birth
Helght
Welght
Health
No. Brothers $\qquad$ Slsters $\qquad$ No. Brothers $\qquad$ Slsters
11. FKMILY AND HOTE (Continued)

Fother:
Education: HIgh School and Colleges attended: (Indicate Below)

1. NAIE DEGREE MASOR FIELD
2. 
3. 

Occupation:
Civic Activity: Organizations and Church Interests NAME OF ORGANIZATIONS
1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.

Mother:
Education: High School and Colleges attended: (Indicate Below)
NAME DEGREE MAJOR FIELD
2.
3.

Occupation: Prasent or previous occupations other than housewite (Indicate whether part or full time)

```
11. FAMILY AND HOME (COntInued)
    Mother:
    Clvic Activity: Organization and Chureh Interests
            NAME OF ORGANIZATION
    1.
2.
3.
4.
5 .
6.
List all chlldren In the famlly in order of birth. Include every child borm
Into the famlly:
NAME SEX AGE BIRTHDATE IN SOHOOL
```

Are any of the above siblings half or step-siblings?
Are any slblings deceased?
List other members of the household:
NAIE
AGE
RELATION TO CHILD
List time child is in care of persons other then parents.
Dally?
Weokly
Where had chlld ilved since birth and for how long?
Has child been separated from either parent for a long perlod of time?
If so, how did chlld react?
A. Eoting

As a rule is your child's appetite excellent, good, falr, poor?
$\qquad$ Does chlldeat alone or with family? $\qquad$
Cen chlld feed himself completely? $\qquad$ Partlally? $\qquad$
List food aflergles $\qquad$
Llst any foods ellminated by doctor's orders
Llst favorite foods $\qquad$
List foods espectally disllked
Name $\qquad$ and amount $\qquad$ of dally
vitamin supplement. Any teeding problems? $\qquad$
B. Sleeping

Approximate time chlld goes to bed $\qquad$
Approximate time chlld wakes in the morning $\qquad$
Attitude at bed time $\qquad$ - Usual activitles before goling to bed

Does chlld have a room of his own? $\qquad$ Sleep alone? $\qquad$
Dally nap? $\qquad$ Length of nap $\qquad$ If not, does chlld have
a rest perlod during the day?
C. Elimination

At what age was training started for:
Bowel control $\qquad$ Response to tralning $\qquad$
Bladder control $\qquad$ Response to tralning $\qquad$
is control now established durling the day? $\qquad$ Night? $\qquad$
Does chlid state need for Urination $\qquad$ What does he say? $\qquad$
Bowel Hovement $\qquad$ What does the say? $\qquad$
is chlld taken up at night? $\qquad$ Time $\qquad$ State any Irregu-
larlties or difficultles connected with tolleting?
111. ROUTINES (Contlnued)

## D. Self-Help

Circle those things which the chlid usually does himself. Dress himself, undress himself, wash face, wash hands, bathe himself, use tollet for urination, use tolifet for bowel movement, put on wraps, take off wraps, put clothes away, put toys away, lace shoes, brush teeth, comb hair, tle shoes.
iv. ACTIVITIES

Where does the child play when indoors?
there does the child play when outdoors?
is child happy playlng alone? $\qquad$ Does he preter the companionshlp of chlidren or adults?

Llst age and sex of child's most frequent playmates: Age $\qquad$
Sex $\qquad$
Child's favorlte indoor toys and play equipment are $\qquad$
Chlid's favorlte outdoor toys and play equipment are $\qquad$
Favorlte actlvities $\qquad$
Does he get along well with children in his own family?
Does he get along well with children outside his own famlly?
Amount of time chlid spends each day with father $\qquad$ itother $\qquad$
Circle the activitles jointly engaged in by members of the famlly and the chlld:

Reading, listening to music, routines, hobbles, excurslons to park, airport, ralifoad, marketing, nature walks, picnics, gardening and yard work, television, playing ball, drive-in movies, storles, cooking, helping with household dutles, riding. Specl ty Other Does chlld enjoy storles? $\qquad$ Who usually reads to hlm? $\qquad$ Can your chlid raad?
IV. ACTIVITIES (Continued)

What activities do you enjoy doling with your child? $\qquad$

Activities your famlly does as a group?

What music experiences are provided for the chlid?

Time spent dally watching telavision Types of programs $\qquad$

Is chlid dependent on adult direction and suggestion for his play activitles?

List child's pets
Has chlld attended a play group before?
Where? How often ? $\qquad$
Does your chlld have a group experience outside his home regularly? $\qquad$
Olificultles encountered in play situations?
Any unusual experiences or extensive travel?
Does child have Imaginary playmates? $\qquad$ Describe $\qquad$

## V. BEHAVIOR AND DEVELOPIENT

```
Parents' methods of control of chlld:
    Circle those words which describe the usual methods of control:
    lgnoring, Isolating, scolding, threatening, depriving of pleasure,
    spanking, bribing, coaxing, rewarding, praising, comparing unfavorably
    with others, offering chol ces, suggesting, reasoning, demonstrating,
    diverting, preparing child In advance, speaking in a tirm volce.
```

V. BEHAVIOR AND DEVELOPMENT (ContInued)

| Mother's discipline of child: | Rigid, stem, reasonably flrm, easy-going, |
| ---: | :--- |
|  | very lax, sometimes stem - sometimes lax. |
| Father's discipline of child: | Rigld, stern, reasonably firm, easy-going, |
|  | very lax, sometimes stern - sometimes lax. |

Usual reaction of chlid to disclpline: Atraid, deflant, sorry, sulks, crles, temper-tentrums, Indifferent, more obedlent, regards it as a joke.

Personallty traits: Clreie all words which describe the child's usual personality behavior: Irritable, lazy, slow, unstable, changeable, shy, timid, self-consclous, Inattentive, flighty, bossy, aggressive, stable, calm, self-controlled, wall-adjusted, "spolled", courageous, cheerful, trustful, antagonlstic, susplclous, whines, becones angry easily, happy, affectionate, patient.

Circle any of the following items with which you feel you need help:
Thumb-sucking, fingar-sucking, nall biting, masturbation, baby talk, Inability to swallow solld foods, speech defect, poor articulation, stuttering, refusal to talk, lyling, swearing, running away, destructive, cruel to other chlidren, teases, seaks attention, selfish, quarrelsome, temper-tantrums, over-affectionate, jealous, eats dirt, day dreams, susplcious, sensitiveness, picks at parts of body, timidity, lack of self-confldence, feelling of insecurity, fighting, submissiveness, anxlety, awkwardness, nose picking, twitehing, excitablility.

Anything else you would like to add:
Has chlld shown fear of anything? What?

What things oppeatedly cause conflict between parant and chlld?

Any vary unusual clrcumstance which has taken place in your family? $\qquad$

## V. BEHAVIOR AND DEVELOPIENT (Continued)

Personality Traits: (Continued)
Child's reaction to these unusual el reumstances

## Sex Interest and Instruction:

Hes child shown any interest in his own body? $\qquad$
Does your chlid know the proper names for the parts of his body? $\qquad$
Has the noticed or asked about differences between boys and girls? $\qquad$

Has he asked where bables come from?
How did you meet the situation? $\qquad$

