HERRING, CAROL ANN. A Comparative Study of the Attitudes of Mother-Father Pairs to Child-Rearing Practices in 1960 and 1970. (1970) Directed by: Dr. Nancy White. Pp. 110.

The purpose of this study was to determine whether there had been significant changes in the attitudes of a selected group of mother-father pairs to child rearing since 1960 and to compare the scores on the University of Southern California Parent Attitude Survey (USCPAS) with respect to variables concerned with changes in the family from 1960 to 1970.

During home visits, general information sheets and the USCPAS were administered to eighteen of the parent pairs that had been tested in 1960.

After employing the t test, no significant differences were found between the mothers' and fathers' scores on the subscales of the USCPAS; however, a significant difference at .05 level was found between the total scores of mothers and fathers with the mothers making lower, more favorable scores. A comparison of the mothers' scores in 1960 and 1970 revealed significantly lower scores in 1970 at .001 level of confidence.

Analysis of variance and t ratios were employed in order to ascertain the effect of certain variables on child rearing attitudes. No significant relationship was found between total survey scores of either fathers or mothers and the following variables: age, education, ordinal position, number of children, and number of years associated with a

nursery school. Neither was there any significant relationship between scores and variables concerned with change: additional children, serious illness in the family, parental concerns, and changes in financial status, occupation, and place of residence.

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE ATTITUDES OF MOTHER-FATHER PAIRS TO CHILD-REARING PRACTICES IN 1960 AND 1970

by

Carol Ann Herring

A Thesis Submitted to
the Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science in Home Economics

Greensboro
June, 1971

Approved by

Nancy White
Thesis Adviser

APPROVAL SHEET

This thesis has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Thesis Adviser Nancy White

Oral Examination Committee Members Gail M. Hennis

Helen Canaday

Rebecca M. Smith

July 13, 1970
Date of Examination

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer would like to express her sincere gratitude to:

Dr. Nancy White, for her patient and inspirational guidance throughout this study;

Dr. Helen Canaday, Dr. Rebecca Smith, and Dr. Gail Hennis, the committee members, for their cooperation and guidance in preparing this thesis;

Mrs. Vira Kivett, for her encouragement and support in undertaking a follow-up of the 1960 study;

Mrs. Cora Lee Jones, for her assistance with statistical procedures; and

Parents who participated in this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

It is generally accepted that parents occupy the primary position among all of a child's interpersonal relationships during his formative years. In fact, "parental influences are so crucial and pervasive in child development that it is almost impossible to discuss any aspect of this field without considering its relationship to parent attitudes and behavior (Ausubel, 1957, p. 349)."

Whether intentional or incidental, all parent attitudes affect child-rearing practices. Attitudes of the mother and father are extremely important in determining the personality and characteristic need expression of a child. This is especially true during early childhood when the parent is viewed as a special person to the child due to the parent's role in satisfying the child's basic physical and emotional needs. Likewise, ". . . early experience has a disproportionate effect on development because it enjoys the benefits of primacy (Ausubel, 1957, p. 359)."

Although a definite relationship between certain parental attitudes and child behavior has been established, there is

> . . . an increasing need for more knowledge in relation to the degree of agreement or disagreement

> toward child-rearing methods of mother and father pairs, specifically, the factors that tend to affect this similarity or dissimilarity of attitudes (Kivett, 1960, p. 1).

There appears to be a need to determine whether parent attitudes toward child rearing remain the same or whether they change from one period to another in a parent's life. Studies by Walters and Fisher (1958), Costin (1958), Bernhardt, Johnston, Foster, and Brown (1959), and Hereford (1963) all investigated change in attitudes; however, none of these studies encompassed more than a two-year period of time. According to Hoffman and Lippitt (1960), ". . . replication and longitudinal studies are still the most promising methods for studying changes over time (p. 953)." Herein lies the value of the proposed study.

Statement of the Problem

It was the purpose of this study to:

(1) determine whether there have been significant changes in the attitudes of a selected group of mother-father pairs to child rearing since 1960 with regard to:
   (a) differences between the attitudes of mothers and fathers, and
   (b) differences in the relationship of such factors as age and education of parent, ordinal position of parent among his brothers and sisters, number of children in the home, and

number of years associated with a nursery school (Kivett, 1960); and

(2) compare the scores on the University of Southern California Parent Attitude Survey with respect to eight variables concerned with changes in the family over the ten-year period from 1960 to 1970:

(a) change in marital status,

(b) additional children,

(c) serious illnesses in the immediate family,

(d) deaths in the immediate family,

(e) parental concerns about children,

(f) serious financial reverses or appreciable financial gains,

(g) change in occupation, and

(h) change in place of residence.

Definitions of Terms Used

The following definitions were adapted from the work of Kivett (1960) in order to maintain consistency between the 1960 and 1970 research:

Attitude. An attitude was considered to be a general emotional and intellectual state of readiness to act in a positive or negative direction as a result of personal experience and inborn tendencies.

Age of parent. The age of parent referred to the

chronological age of the parent, at the time of the interview, taken to the nearest birth date.

Education of parent. The education of the parent referred to the total years completed in primary, secondary, undergraduate school, graduate school, higher specialized training, or other professional training.

Ordinal position. The ordinal position referred to whether the parent was born an only child, the oldest child, the youngest child, or the middle child in his family.

Number of children in the home. This item included all of the children born of or adopted by the parent pair being interviewed.

Number of years associated with a nursery school. This item referred to the total number of years in which the parents had been exposed to the atmosphere of a nursery school. This also included association with the toddler's program at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro (Kivett, 1960, pp. 4-5).

Additional definitions clarify terms peculiar to the 1970 study. They are as follows:

Change in marital status. Change in marital status referred to any modification of the marital status of the husband-wife pair. Changes could have included separation, divorce, death of a spouse, and/or remarriage.

Additional children. Additional children referred to any children born to or adopted by the parent pair after

their interview for the 1960 study.

Serious illness in the immediate family. Serious illness in the immediate family referred to any chronic or acute diseases, operations, or accidents sustained by members of the family which the parent pair considered "serious."

Immediate family. The immediate family referred to the mother-father pair and their children.

Parental concerns about children. Parental concerns about children referred to any area of the child's behavior or development which caused the parent appreciable anxiety.

Serious financial reverses. Serious financial reverses referred to any loss of capital which were considered significant by the parental pair.

Appreciable financial gains. Appreciable financial gains referred to any increase in finances which were considered significant by the parent pair.

Change in occupation. Change in occupation referred to the parent's present occupation as compared with the parent's occupation in 1960.

Change in place of residence. Change in place of residence referred to the parents' present home address as compared with their address in 1960.

Organization of the remainder of thesis

The remainder of this thesis is organized into chapters which include (1) a review of literature relating

previous terms, methods, and studies relevant to the study of parental attitudes; (2) a description of methods and procedures employed in this study; (3) a description of the findings involving eighteen mother-father pairs who were previously tested in 1960; and (4) an overview of the study, findings, and conclusions.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Literature on the definition of attitude

Because the term attitude has been used often and indiscriminately in educational, psychological, and sociological literature, many different meanings have been ascribed to it. Allport (1935) commented that no other term had been used more frequently in experimental and theoretical literature. He said, "The concept of attitude is probably the most distinctive and indispensable concept in contemporary American social psychology (p. 798)."

The importance of the term has not been refuted; however, there has been discussion about the precise definition. The word attitude comes from the Latin word "aptus" which signifies "fitness" or "adaptedness." This derivation was used by Allport as a basis for the following definition:

> An attitude is a mental and neural state of readiness, organized through experience, exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual's response to all objects and situations with which it is related (p. 810).

Accordingly, an attitude can initiate behavior that is "acquisitive or avertive, favorable or unfavorable, affirmative or negative (p. 819)."

To clarify the concept of attitude, Shaw and Wright

(1967) compiled a list of the dimensions of attitudes as seen by various authorities in the field of attitudinal research. The following statements were representative:

1. Attitudes are based upon evaluative concepts regarding characteristics of the referent object and give rise to motivated behavior.

2. Attitudes are construed as varying in quality and intensity (or strength) on a continuum from positive through neutral to negative.

3. Attitudes are learned rather than being innate or a result of constitutional development and maturation.

4. Attitudes have specific social referents, or specific classes thereof.

5. Attitudes possess varying degrees of interrelatedness to one another (pp. 6-9).

In summary, the stability of an attitude is directly related to the interplay of attitudes, the history of reinforcement in the learning of the attitudes, and the amount of active resistance to change within the individual's own schemata (Shaw & Wright, 1967).

Literature on the measurement of attitude

The question of whether attitudes are measurable has long been a controversial one. While most authorities agreed that some attitudes could be measured, few supported the possibility of measuring the entire scope of an individual's attitudes. Thurstone (1928), who was widely known for his theories on attitude, gave a basis for research when he wrote:

> We shall measure the subject's attitudes expressed by the acceptance or the rejection of opinions. But we shall not thereby imply that he will necessarily act in accordance with the opinions that he has endorsed. Let this limitation be clear. The measurement of attitudes expressed by a man's opinions does not necessarily mean the prediction of what he will do. If his expressed opinions and his actions are inconsistent, that does not concern us now, because we are not setting out to predict overt conduct. We shall assume that it is of interest to know what people say they believe even if their conduct turns out to be inconsistent with their professed opinions. Even if they are intentionally distorting their attitudes, we are measuring at least the attitude that they are trying to make people believe they have (p. 533).

In a review of the theories and measurement of attitudes as far back as 372 and 288 B.C., Sherman (1932) found that objectification of attitudes did not begin until the early 1900's. Even though a variety of methods was used to measure attitudes, Sherman found that rating scales, questionnaires and tests, and mechanically-objective measurements were the most frequently adapted methods. Under the rating scales, he listed self-rating, rating by others, and ranking. The self-rating scale was outlined as follows:

1. The subject makes an absolute judgment of the presence or absence of the given traits in himself.

2. The subject checks the points on a numerically arranged scale which he believes represents the degree in which the trait is present in himself.

3. In the use of paired adjectives, one desirable, the other undesirable, the subject checks the one which he believes applies to himself.

4. In the man-to-man comparison, the subject compares himself with the "scale men" (previously

selected by the experimenter) (Sherman, 1932, p. 20).

Rating others involved similar procedures: the main criterion was that the rater knew the subject well. Ranking was advantageous because it could be done by the examinee or by others as follows:

1. In self-ranking the examinee shifts any given number of words and phrases written on separate slips of paper into the order of merit he believes they represent in the living of life.

2. In ranking by others, the observers rank the persons by arranging them on a sliding scale from the highest to the lowest according to the degree in which they possess the given traits (Sherman, 1932, p. 20).

Questionnaires and tests were also used. Both methods often involved oral or written responses by the subject himself or by others about the subject. Typical forms of questionnaires included:

1. Crossing out of words which are distasteful or which are considered irrelevant.

2. Word association. Upon hearing the stimulus word the subject immediately responds with the first word which occurs to him.

3. Series of questions to be answered:
   (a) By yes or no, true or false.
   (b) By written answers which may involve only brief replies but may also involve lengthy ones concerning perhaps the solution of social problems, etc.

4. Series of situations are described involving choice, following each one of which are three or more solutions or responses from which the subject selects the one he would use.

5. Statements of fact are given, each followed by several conclusions. The subject is to check

> only those conclusions which are established by the facts given in the statement itself (Sherman, 1932, p. 20).

The mechanically-objective test--as distinguished from the objective tests which involve voluntary responses--measured the involuntary response of the subject. No outline of the procedure was listed in Sherman's article.

One problem recently observed in the field of attitude measurement was noted by Oppenheim (1966). Response sets of the subject presented a false picture of his attitudes. This misrepresentation occurred when response to attitude-scale items was almost independent of content. For example, the social-desirability response set involved the tendency to agree to items which the subject believed reflected socially desirable attitudes. The acquiescence response set was a general tendency to agree rather than disagree with statements. Other response tendencies were observed involving aspects of rigidity, dogmatism, and authoritarianism. Unfortunately, the incorporation of both positive and negative items into the scale did not overcome these problems since response sets were largely independent of content. However, the presence of a response set could be detected by reversing scales and items.

The chief function of attitude scale measurement was to divide people into broad categories with regard to specific attitudes. Such scales were not designed to provide sufficient information for specific individual cases. The

attitude scales should be used as a basis for placing persons in relation to each other on a continuum (Oppenheim, 1966).

Selected literature on methods used in previous studies

In a review of methods used in earlier studies, Kivett (1960) listed contributions by Laws (1927), Jack (1932), Koch, Dentler, Dysart, and Streit (1934), Stogdill (1936), Champney (1941), Merrill (1946), Wiley (1955), and Haynie (1957). The following are descriptions of the techniques widely used since 1960.

In 1958, Schaefer and Bell developed the Parent Attitude Research Instrument (PARI). According to Becker and Krug (1965)

> . . . the degree of popularity this instrument has obtained in research applications makes it important to take stock of the current status of the findings with this instrument as a guideline for future research (p. 329).

Before evaluating the instrument, a review of its development would be in order.

Schaefer and Bell (1958) had the items from previous parental attitude surveys by Mark (1953) and Shoben (1949) sorted by three clinical psychologists. A common conceptual scheme was agreed upon, and all items were placed in a category. It was noted by the researchers that items expressing attitudes generally approved by psychologists did not aid in

the differentiation of parental attitudes; most parents indorsed them. To compensate for this tendency, Schaefer and Bell tried to develop items which were a balance between the "negative"-attitude items and the positive-attitude "rapport" items, designed merely to make test-taking more satisfying. They also developed new items in order to include new concepts of parent-child relationships.

A series of test runs revealed variations in attitudes and showed consistency with other items in the scale. From these results the final set of 23 five-item scales were selected and tested for internal-consistency reliability. Test-retest reliability was sufficient enough for Schaefer and Bell to proceed with the PARI. In its final form, the PARI contained 115 generalized third-person statements about child rearing to which the subject could respond with strongly agree, mildly agree, mildly disagree, or strongly disagree.

After a review of research done with the PARI, Becker and Krug (1965) suggested that there were difficulties inherent in the design and structure of the instrument. They concluded, "The bulk of the evidence suggests that the PARI does not predict much very well (p. 329)."

Another instrument called the Stanford Parent Attitude Questionnaire (SPAQ) was devised by Winder and Rau in 1962. Two forms, one for mothers and one for fathers, had 491 and 518 items respectively grouped into 27 and 28 scales. A

choice of answers on a four-point agree-disagree continuum was listed with each item. In the original study using the SPAQ, parental attitudes were compared with preadolescent boys' scores on the Peer Nomination Inventory (PNI). The five social reputation scales of the PNI--Aggression, Dependency, Withdrawal, Depression, and Likeability--were correlated with attitudes of the parents of deviant boys. The first four social reputation scales related positively to maladjustive behaviors. Parental attitudes of deviant boys included ambivalence, punitiveness, demands for aggression, restrictiveness, and low maternal self-esteem.

In 1963, Hereford developed the Parent Attitude Survey (PAS) specifically for use in his research on changes in parental attitudes through group discussion. Scales were constructed to measure parent attitudes in five areas: (a) confidence in parental role, (b) causation of the child's behavior, (c) acceptance of the child's behavior and feelings, (d) mutual understanding, and (e) mutual trust. Items were borrowed from similar instruments and were written by Hereford's research staff. Through classification of items by five judges, the 200 items were narrowed to 125 items, i.e., 25 items for each area. These 125 items were used in the preliminary testing of 72 parents. From the results the scales were refined and shortened to the 15 items with the highest correlation coefficients in each of the five areas. The respondents had a choice of answers from strongly agree

to strongly disagree on each item of the survey.

The problem of response sets of subjects was considered in the survey designed by Pumroy (1966). He constructed the Maryland Parent Attitude Survey (MPAS) with the specific idea of controlling social desirability. He began by accumulating items from various surveys and from various books on child rearing. A pool of items was then administered to a group of subjects with instructions to mark each statement with strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree, as each thought a "good" parent would. The entire pool of items was given to a group of nine psychologists to categorize according to the type of parent the item represented. If six of the nine psychologists agreed on the placement of the item, it was retained. After this had been done, the following categories of items remained: (a) Disciplinarian, (b) Indulgent, (c) Protective, and (d) Rejecting. An analysis of items showed the number who answered at each of the four levels of social desirability and the category used by a majority of the psychologists. An item was paired with another if: "(a) it represented a different type of parent, and (b) approximately the same percentage of answers fell in each category when answered as a 'good' parent should (Pumroy, 1966, p. 76)." Of the 90 pairs of items formed, 45 items represented each of the four types of parent. The final draft of the MPAS was composed of these 90 items and 5 buffer items at the

beginning. The task of the subject was to read the pair of items and mark the one which most closely represented his attitude. The test was scored according to the number of answers falling into each category. The validity of the MPAS was determined by the split-half and test-retest methods. When Tolor (1967) tested the adequacy of social desirability control of the MPAS, he found the instrument to be "free of the social desirability set (p. 74)."

Literature on the attitudes of mother-father pairs to child-rearing

Much research has been published on the relationship of the mother-father pair and the child since Kivett's study in 1960. Attitudes of parents have sometimes been designated as causal factors of child behavior.

The hypothesis that the attitudes of fathers are as intimately related as the attitudes of mothers to maladjustive tendencies among children was proven significantly in a study of child behavior problems and parental attitudes (Peterson, Becker, Shoemaker, Luria, & Hellmer, 1961). The study involved 53 kindergarten children, 24 guidance-clinic children, and their parents. The correlations between parental attitudes and child problems clearly supported the importance of paternal attitudes.

In 1961, Medinnus used the PARI and the Fels Parent Behavior Rating Scales in the comparison of parent attitudes

and the child's adjustment in school. The child's first grade teacher provided the index for evaluation by filling out a 52-item First Grade Adjustment Scale which Medinnus had devised. Results were not significant; however, Medinnus stated that lower scores of parents of poorly adjusted children reflected parental rejection. He saw this rejection as a possible causal factor in the child's poor adjustment at school.

Zunich (1962) found a significant relationship between junior high school students' problems and parental attitudes toward child rearing. Of the 644 relations examined between parental attitudes as measured by the PARI and students' problems as measured by the Mooney Problem Check List, 92 were significant at the .05 level or beyond.

From a sample of 79 emotionally disturbed adolescent boys and their parents, Chorost (1962) found maternal and paternal authoritarian control attitudes positively correlated with overt adolescent hostility. A tendency for paternal warmth attitudes to be negatively correlated with overt hostility was also discovered. The findings were consistent with the hypothesis that parental child-rearing attitudes are correlated with adolescent hostility. In a similar study of parental attitudes associated with social deviance in pre-adolescent boys, Winder and Rau (1962) found the boys' mal-adjustive social behaviors related to parental ambivalence, punitiveness, demands for aggression, and restrictiveness.

Another study by Medinnus (1963) tested the relationship between parental attitudes and parental acceptance of the child. Three parent attitude factors taken from the PARI--Authoritarian-Control, Hostility-Rejection, and Democratic Attitudes--were combined with the parents' Q sorts on their children. Since only two of six correlation coefficients were significant, Medinnus concluded that there was little relationship between a parent's certain attitudes toward child rearing and his acceptance of the child.

A sample of 40 grade-school children and their parents was the basis for research on the relationship of parents' attitudes and children's academic achievements (Crandall, Dewey, Katkovsky, & Preston, 1964). The children were given standard intelligence tests and scholastic achievement tests, and the parents were interviewed on aspects of behavior (affection, rejection, nurturance) and on their feelings about children's intellectual achievement efforts. The results showed that mothers of academically competent girls were less affectionate and nurturant than mothers of less proficient girls. A positive correlation was also found between mothers' evaluations and satisfactions concerning children's academic competence and children's actual academic achievements while those of fathers were not positively correlated. However, fathers most accurately predicted their daughter's academic achievement-test performance; fathers of proficient girls praised their

daughters more than they criticized them. It was noted that more significant relationships were found between parents' attitudes and behaviors and their daughters' academic achievements than in the relationship of parents and their sons.

Wyer (1965) studied the effect of child-rearing attitudes on children's responses to hypothetical social situations. In the testing situation, 35 preschool children responded verbally to situations presented to them by the experimenter. As each child told what would happen to him in a certain situation, the attractiveness of his selection and the amount of time taken for his explanation were recorded. The decision-making time was compared with teacher's rating of social inhibition and was found to be positively correlated; thus, the amount of time taken in explanation was interpreted as an index of uncertainty in social situations. Parents of these children were asked to fill out questionnaires concerning their child-rearing attitudes and behaviors. Results revealed a positive correlation of indexes of social uncertainty with

(a) the magnitude of the absolute difference between parents in their child-rearing attitudes and behavior and

(b) the degree to which the mother exceeded the father in warm personal contact with the child (Wyer, 1965, p. 480).

In 1966, Zunich attempted to relate the attitudes of parents with the behavior of their children in a preschool laboratory situation. The behavior of 36 children was

observed by the time-sampling technique and recorded in predetermined categories. The parents took the PARI after the children's behavior had been recorded. Comparisons were made between 288 attitude subscales and child behavior categories, but only nine were found to be significant. Zunich indicated that results could possibly be attributed to the fact that a child's behavior in a preschool setting was sometimes not the same as the child's behavior at home.

The relationship of interparental differences of opinion and children's academic achievement was studied by Kramer and Fleming (1966). From scores on a 50-item child-rearing questionnaire, mothers and fathers were divided into low, medium, and high differences-of-opinion groups. Fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-grade children were tested on intelligence, reading, and arithmetic. Significant differences were found in the low and high, and medium and high differences-of-opinion groups in intelligence quotient and reading. In general, more significant differences were found between boys and their parents than between girls and their parents.

In a comparison of the attitudes of mothers, fathers, and adolescents, Groppelli (1967) found that attitudes were fundamentally alike. Only three of the 23 PARI subscales were different for fathers and mothers, and only two were different for the male and female adolescents.

The mothers and fathers of 38 children from six- to

eight-years-old were tested in a temptation situation at school (Walsh, 1968). Each child was left in a room full of toys for approximately fifteen minutes. The experimenter explained that the child was not to play with the toys and then left the room. The children's reactions were recorded and compared with the parents' scores on the PARI. Results showed that children who did not leave the chair in the testing situation had mothers who felt that children should be obedient and act grown up. Children who walked around and merely looked at the toys and children who touched or played with the toys had mothers whose expectations were different. The scores of the fathers on the PARI were not significantly related to the children's behavior.

The social behavior of children in a private camp was related to parental attitudes toward child rearing (Friedman, 1969). Seventy-six boys and girls were ranked by peers and observers on leadership, conformity, anxiety, aggression, and other behavioral characteristics. The scores made by parents on Hereford's Parental Attitude Survey were correlated with each child's social behavior. Leadership was the only characteristic that was significantly related to the attitude of the parent pair; it correlated significantly with the child trust scale of the Hereford survey.

Literature on selected studies incorporating the University of Southern California Parent Attitude Survey

Since Shoben's University of Southern California Parent Attitude Survey (USCPAS) was used in this study to assess attitudes toward child rearing, a review of recent literature using the survey would be in order.

A 1957 study by Drews and Teaham attempted to determine the relationship of parental attitudes and children's academic achievement. An abridged scale containing 30 items from Shoben's survey was administered to the mothers of the children. It was found that mothers of high-achieving children, in contrast with mothers of low-achieving children, were more authoritarian, restrictive, and punitive.

In an attempt to discover the relationship between a particular kind of maternal attitude and a specific emotional disorder in the child, Abbe (1958) found no significant correlation. Consequently, the hypothesis that mothers of children with diagnosed emotional disorders would show more restrictive, lax, and overindulgent attitudes than mothers of normal children was rejected.

Burchinal (1958) tested the hypothesis that a positive relationship existed between certain parental attitudes and personality adjustment characteristics of children. After administering the attitude survey and a parental acceptance scale to the parents and two personality tests to the fifth-

grade children, no significant correlations were found.

Using Shoben's instrument, Trapp and Kausler (1959) did research on the relationship of dominance attitudes in parents and adult avoidance in young children. Nursery school children were observed during free play for a total of 10 five-minute time samplings. The dependent variable was the amount of time spent with adults during the observation period. Two hypotheses were supported:

> (1) . . . nursery school children of parents scoring either high or low on dominance attitude will avoid adult contacts in a free activity setting to a greater degree than nursery school children of parents scoring in the intermediate range on dominance attitudes.
>
> (2) . . . nursery school children of parents reflecting large differences in dominance attitudes will avoid adult contacts in a free activity setting to a greater degree than nursery school children of parents reflecting small differences in dominance attitudes (p. 512).

Another study related parental dominance to children's ethnocentrism (Dickens & Hobart, 1959). The Bogardus Ethnic Distance Scale was administered to 134 college students. Parents of students scoring lowest and highest on the scale were chosen to take the USCPAS. Both dominance and ignoring were related significantly to child ethnocentrism at the .01 level.

Fitzelle (1959) designed a study to investigate whether there was a difference in attitudes of parents of asthmatic children and parents of children with other physical problems. Fitzelle expected to find the personality

characteristics and attitudes of parents of asthmatic children distinctive from those of the other parents. The only significant finding was that mothers of asthmatic children and control mothers differed in their parent attitude survey scores; the former reflected more unfavorable attitudes toward child rearing. None of the other relationships were statistically significant.

In 1961, a comparison of child-rearing attitudes of mothers in Germany and the United States was made by Rapp. Mothers were matched according to social class, age, and number of children in the family. The samples differed significantly on each area of the parent attitude survey. The German mothers possessed more controlling attitudes than the mothers living in the United States. Social class analyses showed similarities within the same social class in both Germany and the United States; upper and middle classes were about the same while lower class scores reflected controlling and authoritarian attitudes. In general, the range of attitudes within a social class was less variable in the United States than in Germany with respect to child-rearing attitudes.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

Selection and description of subjects

The names and addresses of the parents tested in 1960 by Kivett were secured from the University of North Carolina at Greensboro Nursery School records in April, 1970. Of the twenty-one mother-father pairs, twenty agreed to participate in the study. The couple who refused to participate had since the 1960 testing experienced the death of their former nursery school child due to an incurable illness.

Of the results obtained from the twenty couples who consented to participate, eighteen were used in the present study. Two couples' parent attitude surveys could not be scored because they marked more than one answer on some items and completely omitted others. Scoring was impossible; consequently, the sample was narrowed to eighteen mother-father pairs.

As reported by Kivett (1960), the age range of the parents was quite wide. The fathers' ages ranged from 38 to 69 years while mothers' ages ranged from 38 to 56 years. The mean age for fathers and mothers was 51.2 and 45.1, respectively.

Each father had completed high school; 72.2 per cent

had completed college. Of those who graduated from college, 38.5 per cent had completed one or more years of graduate work. Among those who completed high school or college, there were five business presidents, two business executives, three business managers, two salesmen, and one engineer. One lawyer, two physicians, one psychologist, and one consulting engineer were included in the graduate study group. The mean years of schooling for the entire sample of fathers was 16.4.

The educational level of the mothers was somewhat comparable to that of the fathers in that all had completed high school. The mean number of school years completed was 15.4. Those who completed college comprised 61.1 per cent of the sample. Of those who completed college, 36.3 per cent went on to one or more years of graduate work. All except two of the mothers were full-time homemakers. Of the two mothers who worked outside the home, one was an interior decorator and the other was a part-time hospital employee.

In comparison of the father's ordinal position as only child, youngest child, middle child, or oldest child, it was discovered that more fathers fell into the category of youngest child in the family (38.9 per cent) than in other categories. Among mothers, more were the middle child (44.4 per cent).

Variables which were identical for both parents included number of children and number of years associated

with a nursery school. Of the eighteen mother-father pairs, twelve had three children. Of the remaining couples, two had two children while four had four children. The number of years the couple had been associated with a nursery school varied from one to nine years with the distribution approximately equal along the continuum.

In addition to the variables previously mentioned, several others were concerned with changes in the family over the ten-year period. Changes in marital status, additional children, serious illnesses and deaths in the immediate family, parental concerns, appreciable financial gains or reverses, and changes in place of residence were all reported by parents in the sample.

There had been no change in the marital status of the eighteen couples. Additional children were born to 38.9 per cent of the parents. Half of the couples experienced at least one serious illness in the immediate family. Reported diseases included ulcerative colitis, diabetes, hepatitis, and Addison's disease. Operations to remove tumors of the brain, lymph glands, female organs, and breasts were recorded along with one heart attack. The duration of illness ranged from one month to five years with some remaining chronic for a longer period of time. None of the couples considered as the sample experienced a death in the immediate family.

In addition to the concern expressed by parents about

their children's illnesses, four mother-father pairs reported great concern about their children. One couple listed the current college rebellion as a cause for concern since they had two children in college. Another mother and father were greatly concerned about their child's marriage to a person whom they did not approve. Others listed normal growing problems and underachievement in school as causes of concern.

Seven of the couples reported appreciable financial gains over the past ten years while only one reported a loss. Most of the fathers (72.2 per cent) remained in the same vocation during the ten-year period. More mothers than fathers changed occupation; of those working outside the home, all except two became full-time homemakers.

Over half of the mother-father pairs changed their place of residence. Of those who moved, all except two moved to other homes in Greensboro. Those two moved out of the state.

Description of the instrument used

Since the present study was a replication of Kivett's work, the USCPAS was administered to the mother-father pairs in order to provide comparable data. Kivett's choice of the instrument was based upon "its ease of administration, its applicability to the sample, and its high validity coefficients (p. 32)."

Shoben (1949) described the USCPAS as "a self-inventory type scale designed to assess parent attitudes in relation to behavior and/or personality problems in children (p. 117)." Under the following hypotheses:

> (a) that a given parent behaves toward a given child with sufficient consistency from situation to situation to differentiate himself measurably from other parents, and
>
> (b) that the success or failure of the child's adjustment is in large part a function of the parental behavior to which he has been exposed (p. 25),

Shoben composed 148 items for the original scale. These were administered to 50 mothers of problem children and 50 mothers of non-problem children. Item analysis revealed that 85 items were sufficiently discriminatory between the two groups of mothers at the .05 level or beyond. The mothers of the non-problem children characteristically made lower, more favorable scores.

Consequently, the final form of the survey was comprised of 85 items to which the respondent could reply Strongly Agree, Mildly Agree, Mildly Disagree, or Strongly Disagree. The items were divided by five judges into four subscales: Dominant, Possessive, Ignoring, and Miscellaneous. In order to obtain the scores for the total scale, each of the weights in the subscale was summed. Low scores depicted more favorable attitudes toward child rearing than did high scores. When eight clinical psychologists filled out the survey in the manner of an "ideal" parent, they had

a mean score of 286.38 for the total scale (Shoben, 1949, p. 135).

Items reflecting a tendency to put the child in a subordinate role and to expect conformity under penalty of severe punishment were included in the Dominant subscale. The Possessive subscale items referred to a tendency to humor a child, to put undue emphasis on the affectional aspect of the parent-child relationship, to encourage the child's dependency upon the parent, and to limit the child's activities to his own family group. The Ignoring subscale was comprised of statements in which the parent disregarded the individuality of the child, considered the "good" child as one who required little parental attention, and disavowed any responsibility for the child's behavior. The Miscellaneous subscale consisted of a variety of items concerning sex, religion, and socio-economic differences.

The reliability of the survey was determined by computing the scores of the 50 mothers of problem children and the 50 mothers of non-problem children. The split-half method raised by the Spearman-Brown formula was used. Results revealed the following: Total scale, .95; Dominant, .91; Possessive, .90; and Ignoring, .84.

Validity coefficients from the original administration of the survey and from the second administration to 20 parents of problem children and 20 parents of non-problem children were computed as follows:

SHRINKAGE IN VALIDITY COEFFICIENTS

SURVEY VARIABLE	ORIGINAL	SECOND	SHRINKAGE
Total	.904	.769	.135
Dominant	.801	.623	.178
Possessive	.790	.721	.069
Ignoring	.968	.624	.344

(Shoben, 1949, p. 134)

The validity of both administrations was high, and the amount of shrinkage was not excessive. According to Shoben, "This permits the tentative interpretation that the Survey has some genuine relevance in the assessment of parent attitudes in relation to child adjustment (p. 134)."

In a test of the validity of the USCPAS, Gordon (1957) correlated the scores of mothers of deaf children with thirteen observers' rankings. Each observer ranked the mothers according to his opinion of whether the mother's attitudes and behavior toward the child would result in "problem" behavior by the child. A comparison of the observers' rankings over a twelve-day period and the mothers' scores on the survey revealed no significant findings. Gordon suggested that "Shoben's validation procedures may have involved too narrow a definition of problem children for the scale to be used with confidence in clinical practice (p. 156)."

A similar study testing the validity of parent attitude measurement was undertaken by Leton (1958). He administered the USCPAS and the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory to a large sample of parents. He found no

significant relationship between the two instruments; however, he did find a significant similarity between attitudes of mother-father pairs, with the mothers in most cases obtaining the more favorable scores. The attitude scores were more discrepant between mothers and fathers of poorly adjusted children than between parent pairs of well adjusted children.

Becker and Krug (1965), in a review of literature including studies done with Shoben's USCPAS, concluded that the instrument was not very useful in measuring parent attitudes. He cited studies by Gordon (1957), Burchinal (1958), and Leton (1958) which found the survey unsuccessful in predicting adjustment measures on children. Nevertheless, four studies by Abbe (1958), Dickens and Hobart (1959), Drews and Teahan (1959), and Trapp and Kausler (1958) did suggest positive associations between elements of the survey and child measures. The findings of all of these studies were reviewed in Chapters II and III.

A copy of the USCPAS, including weights and subscales, is in Appendix C.

Collection of data

To introduce the parents to the present study, the director of the Nursery School wrote a letter to explain the purpose of the study. She reminded the parents of their participation in the Kivett study and explained that the

present investigator would like to do a follow-up study with the same group of parents. She also indicated to the parents that they would be contacted at a later date. A copy of the letter is entered as Appendix A.

The investigator secured names, addresses, and telephone numbers from the Nursery School records. Two parent pairs who had moved from Greensboro were mailed the USCPAS, general information sheets, and a letter explaining the study. Stamped, self-addressed envelopes were enclosed to facilitate mailing. A copy of the accompanying letter is entered as Appendix A.

Parents living in Greensboro were contacted by telephone. Upon making the call, the investigator identified herself, explained briefly the purpose of the study, and asked for a convenient time to visit with both parents during the month of May. She also gave the parent information concerning the type of survey to be administered and the approximate length of time that it would take. Each couple was asked to plan for a one-hour home visit even though the administration of the survey required about thirty minutes. The hour was suggested so that a few minutes were allowed for the mother-father pair to compare answers and discuss survey items if they desired.

Before visiting any of the parents, the investigator secured the key to the coding system used by Kivett. According to her system, the letter M represented the

fathers, and the letter F represented the mothers. Numbers ranging from one to twenty-one identified each couple according to the alphabetical standing in the group. The parent pairs were coded M-1 and F-1 through M-21 and F-21, respectively. Consequently, each parent was given the same code number that was used in 1960. This procedure assured anonymity to the parents yet gave the investigator a basis for the comparison of the 1960 and 1970 general information and scores.

When the investigator arrived for the interview, she introduced herself and talked with the mother and father a few minutes before presenting the questionnaire. She then explained again the purpose of the study and gave each parent an opportunity to ask questions. The parents were asked to work together on the general information sheets so that their answers would be in agreement. Instructions for taking the USCPAS were given after both parents had completed the general information section. They were asked to read the instructions before beginning the survey and, in order to insure validity, to refrain from discussing any of the items.

The administration of the survey took about half an hour. Usually the husband finished before his wife. The second part of the home visit was allotted for discussion of items on the survey. Although most of the parents expressed their opinion about the survey in general, only three

couples cared to compare their answers and discuss reasons for responses.

The above procedure was followed in all except two cases involving parents living in Greensboro. Hospitalization of one parent and the full appointment schedule of another prevented home visits. After talking with each of the couples involved in the scheduling problems, the investigator decided to mail general information sheets, surveys, and instructions to them. When the surveys were returned, the investigator scored them along with the others.

The reactions to the USCPAS ranged from polite compliance to overt repugnance. Many thought the survey items were ambiguous, biased, or too trite to be significant. However, they tried to answer the items to the best of their ability. Several wrote qualifying statements beside some of their answers. A few stated that their responses were inconsistent and that they had misinterpreted some of the items.

The home visits were made during the first three weeks of May. The length of the visits ranged from 30 minutes to 90 minutes. The average length was 50 minutes.

Selection of statistical tests

In order to determine the difference between scores of mothers and fathers, the *t* test was employed. The *Dominant*, *Possessive*, *Ignoring*, and *Miscellaneous* subscales as

well as total scores were handled in this manner. The .05 level of significance was used throughout the study.

In assessing the effects of certain variables upon child-rearing attitudes, the analysis of variance was used. This method was chosen because it was

> (1) . . . a convenient method for evaluating by a single test the overall differences among the means of several experimental groups and
>
> (2) . . . a means of avoiding errors of interpretation due to the inflation of probabilities when a number of means are to be compared (Courts, 1966, p. 263).

For other variables which had only two categories of scores, a t ratio was used. The rationale behind this choice was that "when N is small, t must be used because the error in using z becomes large (Courts, p. 179)."

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Differences in child-rearing attitudes of mother-father pairs

One of the purposes of this study was to investigate the differences between selected mother-father pairs in child-rearing attitudes. The null hypothesis was employed stating that no significant difference existed. In order to ascertain the differences, scores on the four subscales and total scale of the USCPAS were tabulated and matched for each parent pair.

To determine the relationship between the scores of mothers and fathers, the *t* test was employed (Kivett, 1960). The difference between each pair of scores and the mean of the distribution was determined. The same formula, used by Kivett, was employed in this study:

$$t = \frac{M_O - M_H}{\sqrt{\frac{\Sigma d^2}{n(n-1)}}}$$ (Lindquist, 1940, p. 59)

It was chosen because it accounted for error caused by deviations from the mean when the sample is small (Courts, 1966).

The 95 per cent confidence interval was used throughout the study to avoid accepting the null hypothesis when a significant difference existed or rejecting it when no difference existed (Garrett, 1947).

Dominant subscale. The 39 items in the Dominant subscale reflected a parental tendency to put the child in a subordinate role and to expect conformity under penalty of severe punishment.

A comparison of the value of t to the tabled t at .05 confidence level revealed 1.89 and 2.11, respectively. Consequently, there was no significant difference, and the null hypothesis was supported.

Possessive subscale. The 21 items in the Possessive subscale referred to a tendency to humor a child, to put undue emphasis on the affectional aspect of the parent-child relationship, to encourage the child's dependency upon the parent, and to limit the child's activities to his own family group.

The value of t for the distribution of differences was 1.93 while 2.11 was the distribution at the .05 level of confidence. No significant differences were found in possessive attitudes of the sample parents.

Ignoring subscale. The 15 items in the Ignoring subscale consisted of statements in which the parent disregarded the individuality of the child, considered the "good" child as one who required little parental attention, and

disavowed any responsibility for the child's behavior.

In the Ignoring subscale the value of *t* for the distribution of differences was 1.42. The probability was 2.11 at the .05 level of confidence. The null hypothesis was again supported.

Miscellaneous subscale. The ten items in the Miscellaneous subscale consisted of a variety of statements about religion, sex, and socio-economic differences. The value of *t* for the distribution of differences was 2.09 with a probability of 2.11 at the .05 level of confidence. The null hypothesis was substantiated and retained.

Total score. The 85 items in the four subscales made up the total number of items in the USCPAS. A high score indicated less favorable attitudes toward child rearing while a low score indicated more favorable attitudes.

Calculation of *t* for the total scores of the USCPAS revealed a value of 2.34 with a probability of 2.11 at the .05 level of confidence. Therefore, a significant difference was found in the total scores of fathers and mothers with the fathers making the higher scores. The null hypothesis was rejected.

In order to probe more deeply into the question of why Kivett did not find significance when comparing total scores and this investigator found significance, total scores in 1960 and 1970 were compared for each sex. Calculation of *t* for the total scores of fathers on the USCPAS in

1960 and 1970 revealed a value of .21 with a probability of 2.11 at the .05 level of confidence. A comparison of mothers' scores revealed a value of 4.04 with a probability of 3.97 at the .001 level of confidence. The mothers' scores were significantly lower in 1970. The lower mean score for mothers in 1970 accounted for the wider difference between the 1970 scores of mothers and fathers. Tables showing calculations are in Appendix B.

Relationship of certain variables and child-rearing attitudes

Another purpose of this study was to investigate the attitudes of mother-father pairs as related to such factors as age and education of parent, ordinal position of the parent among his own brothers and sisters, number of children in the home, and number of years associated with a nursery school (Kivett, 1960). In assessing the effect of these variables the analysis of variance was used since it evaluated the overall differences among the means of several groups and avoided errors of interpretation due to inflation of probabilities (Courts, 1966).

The procedure described by Kivett (1960) was also followed in this study:

> The sum of squares . . . was determined by computing the difference between the sum of the total mean squares of each column and of the mean square of the grand total. The within mean was determined by computing the difference between the sum of the within squares and the sum of the total mean squares of

each column. The total mean was determined by computing the difference in the sum of the within squares and of the mean square of the grand total. This latter value equaled the sum of the means and the within means. The mean squares were obtained by dividing the sum of squares by the degrees of freedom. The F ratio was then determined by dividing the mean square by the within mean square (p. 41).

The formulas for testing were as follows:

Between sum of squares:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{K} \frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n_j} x_{ij} \right)^2}{n_j} - \frac{\left(\sum_{j=1}^{K} \sum_{k=1}^{n_j} x_{ij} \right)^2}{N}$$

Degrees of freedom

K-1

Within sum of squares:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{K} \sum_{i=1}^{n_j} x_{ij}^2 - \sum_{j=1}^{K} \frac{\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{ij} \right]^2}{nj}$$

Degrees of freedom

$$\sum_{j=1}^{K} n_j = N-K$$

Total sum of squares:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{K} \sum_{i=1}^{n_j} x_{ij}^2 - \frac{\left(\sum_{j=1}^{K} \sum_{i=1}^{n_j} x_{ij} \right)^2}{N}$$

(Dixon, 1951, pp. 121-126)

The null hypothesis that these variables would not be significantly related to scores on the parent attitude survey was employed.

Age of parents. The parents ranged in age from 38 to 69-years old. The difference of means among fathers' scores in relation to their age revealed an F ratio of 1.23 with a significant F ratio of 3.18 at the .05 confidence level. The difference of means among mothers' scores in relation to their age revealed an F ratio of 1.40 with a significant F ratio of 3.68 at the .05 confidence level. Neither was significant, and the null hypothesis was retained.

Educational status. The parents in the sample had completed from 12 to 21 years of schooling. A comparison of the calculated F ratio and the significant F ratio of fathers revealed values of .73 and 3.18, respectively. For mothers the difference of means was .31 with the significant F ratio of 3.18 at the .05 confidence level. The null hypothesis that education did not significantly affect attitudes toward child rearing was upheld.

Ordinal position. In an attempt to discover differences among parents who were the only child, youngest child, middle child, or oldest child in the family, the analysis of variance was again employed. The F ratio for the fathers was 1.18 while the tabled F ratio was 3.34 at the .05 confidence level. The F ratio for mothers was .65 while the

tabled F ratio was 3.34 at the .05 confidence level. Neither was significant so the null hypothesis was again supported and retained.

Number of children. The total scores of both the mothers and fathers were analyzed in relation to the number of children born to them. The F ratio for fathers and mothers had a value of .15 and .76, respectively. When compared with the F ratio of 3.68 at .05 level of confidence, neither was significant. The findings supported the null hypothesis.

Years associated with a nursery school. The total number of years associated with a nursery school ranged from one to nine. The difference of means among fathers' scores in relation to their association with a nursery school was .74 with a significant ratio of 3.34 at the .05 level of confidence. For mothers, the difference of means was .70 with a significant ratio of 3.34. Neither refuted the null hypothesis; consequently, it was retained.

Relationship of changes in the family to child-rearing attitudes

The scores of the mothers and fathers on the USCPAS were compared with respect to changes in the family over the ten-year period from 1960 to 1970. Since there were only two categories representing either change or no change, the t ratio was used. The rationale behind this choice was that

"when N is small, t must be used because the error in using z becomes large (Courts, 1966, p. 179)." The formula used to calculate t was as follows:

$$t = \frac{M_1 - M_2}{\sqrt{\frac{s_1^2}{N_1} + \frac{s_2^2}{N_2}}}$$

$$\text{where } s^2 = \frac{\Sigma X^2 - \frac{(\Sigma X)^2}{N}}{N - 1}$$

(McNemar, 1962, p. 103)

The null hypothesis was again employed stating that variables would bear no significant relationship to scores on the USCPAS.

Change in marital status. Since there had been no change in marital status of the eighteen mother-father pairs, this variable was eliminated from the study.

Additional children. Seven of the parent pairs had children born to them since 1960. A t test for the effect of children born to fathers revealed a t of -.84 as compared to a t of 2.12 at the .05 confidence level. The same test on mothers' scores revealed a t of .12 with the tabled t of 2.12. Neither was significant, and the null hypothesis was supported.

Serious illnesses in the immediate family. Half of

the couples in the sample reported at least one serious illness in the family during the past ten years. A comparison of fathers' scores according to family health revealed a t of -.07. The t ratio at .05 level of confidence was 2.12. For mothers, the t was -.20 as compared with a t of 2.12 at .05 level of significance. The t ratio was not significant for fathers or mothers, and the null hypothesis that serious illness in the family is not related significantly to child-rearing attitudes was supported.

Deaths in the immediate family. No deaths in the immediate family were reported by parent pairs. Consequently, this variable could not be tested in this study.

Parental concerns about children. Four of the parent pairs listed causes of great concern about their children. A comparison of the concern and no concern groups revealed a t of .49 for fathers and -.31 for mothers. This was not significant when compared to the tabled t of 2.12 at .05 level of confidence. The findings supported the null hypothesis.

Serious financial reverses or appreciable financial gains. Of the eight couples who reported a change in financial status, only one reported a financial reverse. The other seven reported appreciable financial gains. In order to assess the relationship of financial status to child-rearing attitudes, change and no change groups were compared. For fathers the t ratio was .54, and for mothers it

was .35. Neither was significant when compared to the t ratio of 2.12 at .05 level of confidence. The results of the t test confirmed the null hypothesis.

Change in occupation. Five of the fathers and seven of the mothers had changed occupations since 1960. The t ratio for fathers and mothers was .38 and -1.06, respectively. Neither was significant when compared to the tabled t of 2.12 for .05 level of confidence.

Change in place of residence. Ten of the couples in the sample had changed their place of residence since 1960. In comparing the changes to child-rearing attitudes, no significant relationship was found. The t ratio for fathers was .91 and for mothers was -.14. The tabled t was 2.12. Findings supported the null hypothesis. Tables for each variable are in Appendix B.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The present study was based on the hypothesis that the 18 mother-father pairs in the sample would not differ significantly in their attitudes toward child-rearing as measured by the USCPAS. It was also hypothesized that child-rearing attitudes would not be significantly correlated with selected variables including age and education of parents, ordinal position of parents, number of children in the family, and the number of years associated with a nursery school. Variables concerned with changes in the family over the ten-year period from 1960 to 1970 were also included: (a) change in marital status, (b) additional children, (c) serious illness in the immediate family, (d) deaths in the immediate family, (e) parental concerns about children, (f) change in financial status, (g) change in occupation, and (h) change in place of residence. Data for 1960 were obtained from a study conducted by Kivett who interviewed parents of children attending the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, School of Home Economics Nursery School. Data for 1970 were obtained by interviewing the same parent pair after ten years had elapsed.

Since all parent attitudes affect child-rearing practices, these attitudes are extremely important in molding a child's personality. They help determine the way a child expresses himself. Because the parents' role is so significant, one of the purposes of this study was to investigate the differences in attitudes of parent pairs and to determine whether these attitudes remained the same or changed from one period to another in a parent's life.

Although there had been some discussion about the measurability of attitudes, most authorities agreed that they were measurable. This was not to say that the attitudes expressed by a person predict what he will do; they only tell what he believes or wants to make people think he believes.

Many methods of attitude assessment have been employed over the years; however, objectification of attitudes did not begin until the early 1900's. Those methods used most frequently included rating scales, questionnaires and tests, and mechanically-objective measurements.

Most of the methods used in studies since 1960 consisted of self-inventory type scales of generalized third-person statements about child rearing to which the subject could respond on a four-point agree-disagree continuum. In a departure from this method, each subject was asked to read a pair of items and mark the one which most closely represented his attitude.

Studies using a variety of methods have supported the hypothesis that parent attitudes have a significant effect upon the child. Positive correlations were found between parent attitudes and each of the following areas: maladjustive tendencies or problem behavior in children, academic achievement of children, and social behavior of children.

Likewise it was discovered that children were affected by differences in the attitudes of the mother-father pair. In the realm of child adjustment, it was found that mothers and fathers of poorly adjusted children had more discrepant attitude survey scores than did parents of well adjusted children. In the area of social behavior, studies showed a positive correlation between a child's uncertainty in social situations and the magnitude of difference between attitudes of the mother and father. Adult avoidance in children was related to a difference in parental dominance attitudes. Interparental differences of opinion were related to a child's academic achievement in school, especially with intelligence quotient and reading ability.

A selected group of parent pairs participated in this study; each parent had been previously tested in 1960. The sample, a homogeneous grouping, contained individuals with similar socio-economic and educational backgrounds. Although there was a wide age range between parents, other aspects were similar. Since 1960, none of the parent pairs had experienced a change in marital status. Half had

experienced a serious illness in the family although none had experienced death in the immediate family. As a group they were upwardly mobile, many had experienced financial gains and had changed their place of residence since 1960.

The University of Southern California Parent Attitude Survey was selected for the study in order to provide data comparable to Kivett's data. Other factors related to the choice of the instrument were its ease of administration, its applicability to the sample, and its high validity coefficients. The survey was a self-inventory test of parental attitudes toward child rearing. The respondent replied either Strongly Agree, Mildly Agree, Mildly Disagree, or Strongly Disagree to each of the 85 items on the survey. For scoring purposes the 85 items had been broken down into four subscales: Dominant, Possessive, Ignoring, and Miscellaneous. Items in the Dominant subscale reflected a tendency to put the child in a subordinate role and to expect conformity under penalty of severe punishment. Items in the Possessive subscale referred to a tendency to humor a child, to put undue emphasis on the affectional aspect of the parent-child relationship, to encourage the child's dependency upon the parent, and to limit the child's activities to his own family group. The Ignoring subscale was comprised of statements in which the parent disregarded the individuality of the child, considered the "good" child as one who required little parental attention, and disavowed any responsibility for the

child's behavior. The Miscellaneous subscale consisted of a variety of items concerning sex, religion, and socio-economic differences.

Before administering the USCPAS, the investigator asked the parent pair to complete general information sheets. She then requested that each parent read the survey instructions and refrain from discussing any of the statements until both had made choices for each one on the survey.

Upon completion of the home visits, the investigator scored the surveys and recorded the results on appropriate tables. In order to compare the scores of mothers and fathers, the t test was employed. It was used to ascertain differences in the Dominant, Possessive, Ignoring, and Miscellaneous subscales as well as the total score of the USCPAS. Total scores of mothers in 1960 and 1970 and of fathers in 1960 and 1970 were compared in order to ascertain change.

In assessing the effects of certain variables upon child-rearing attitudes, the analysis of variance was used. This statistical test provided a means of evaluating the overall differences among the means of several groups. Total scores were categorized according to the group in which they belonged.

For variables concerned with changes during the ten-year period from 1960 to 1970, a t ratio was used. Since these variables had only two categories of scores, the

method was a simple, as well as accurate, one for determining differences between groups.

Findings and conclusions

When the subscale scores on the USCPAS were compared for significant differences, none were found between the Dominant, Possessive, Ignoring, or Miscellaneous scores of mothers and fathers. This finding led to the conclusion that parents had similar dominance attitudes concerning the subordinate role of the child and the degree of conformity they expect from the child. They also had somewhat similar ideas about the degree of parental possessiveness of the child and the amount of individuality allowed the child. Mother-father pairs also agreed about a variety of items concerning sex, religion, and socio-economic differences.

A significant difference was found between the total scores of the mothers and fathers with the fathers making the higher scores. This finding led to the conclusion that the attitudes of the mothers toward child rearing were more favorable than those of the fathers. A comparison of the scores of the fathers in 1960 and 1970 revealed no significant changes during the ten-year period. However, there was a significant difference between the 1960 and 1970 scores of the mothers at the .001 confidence level. The mothers' scores were significantly lower and more favorable in 1970. This finding accounts for the significant difference between

mothers' and fathers' scores in 1970.

The relationship of certain variables to total scores on the parent attitude survey was determined. No significant relationship was found between total parent attitude scores of either mothers or fathers and the following variables: age, education, ordinal position, number of children, or number of years associated with a nursery school. This finding led to the conclusion that none of the variables had a significant effect upon child-rearing attitudes.

Likewise, no significant relationships were found between total scores and variables concerned with changes in the family over the past ten years. The variables which were not significant for fathers or mothers included: additional children, serious illness in the immediate family, parental concerns about children, and changes in financial status, occupation, and place of residence. From these findings the investigator concluded that variables concerned with change had no significant effect upon child-rearing attitudes.

It appeared from the results of this study that there were no significant changes in the attitudes of a selected group of mother-father pairs to child rearing since 1960 with regard to the variables studied. There was, however, a significant difference in the total scores of the mothers and fathers on the USCPAS and in the total scores of mothers

in 1960 and 1970 on the USCPAS. No significant differences were found between mothers and fathers on the four subscales of the USCPAS.

Recommendations for further research

After completing the study, this investigator recommends further research on attitudes toward child rearing from one period to another in a parent's life by using a larger, more representative sample. With a more heterogeneous sample, the effects of variables could more easily be seen. Because the validity and reliability of all parent attitude instruments have been questioned, this investigator recommends that a more comprehensive measuring device be developed and tested for both reliability and validity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbe, A. E. Maternal attitudes towards children and their relationship to diagnostic category of the child. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1958, 92, 167-173.

Allport, G. W. Attitudes. In C. Murchison (Ed.), Handbook of social psychology. Worchester, Mass.: Clark University Press, 1935.

Ausubel, D. P. Theory and problems of child development. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1958.

Becker, W. C., & Krug, R. S. The parent attitude research instrument--A research review. Child Development, 1965, 36, 329-365.

Bernhardt, K. S., Johnston, F. L., Foster, N., & Brown, M. Attitude change in members of parent education courses. Mental Hygiene, 1959, 43, 394-399.

Burchinal, L. G. Parents' attitudes and adjustment of children. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1958, 92, 69-79.

Champney, H. The variables of parent behavior. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1941, 36, 5239.

Chorost, S. B. Parental child-rearing attitudes and their correlates in adolescent hostility. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1962, 66, 49-90.

Costin, F. The effect of child psychology on attitudes

toward parent-child relationships. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1958, 49, 37-42.

Courts, F. A. Psychological statistics: An introduction. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press, 1966.

Crandall, V., Dewey, R., Katkovsky, W., & Preston, A. Parents' attitudes and behaviors and grade-school children's academic achievements. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1964, 104, 53-66.

Dickens, S. L., & Hobart, C. Parental dominance and offspring ethnocentricism. Journal of Social Psychology, 1959, 49, 297-303.

Drews, E. J., & Teahan, J. E. Parental attitudes and academic achievement. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1957, 13, 328-332.

Fitzelle, G. T. Personality factors and certain attitudes toward child rearing among parents of asthmatic children. Psychosomatic Medicine, 1959, 21, 208-217.

Friedman, S. T. Relation of parental attitudes toward child rearing and patterns of social behavior in middle childhood. Psychological Reports, 1969, 24, 575-579.

Garrett, H. E. Statistics in psychology and education. New York: Longman, Green, and Company, 1947.

Gordon, J. E. The validity of Shoben's parent attitude survey. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1957, 13, 154-156.

Groppelli, Angela. Gli atteggiamenti della madre, del padre, e di giovani sulla crescita del bambino: Contributo di ricereca con il PARI. Bollenttino de Psicologia Applicata, 1967, No. 83-84, 151-156. (Psychological Abstracts, 1969, 43, No. 14212)

Haynie, M. C. Child rearing attitudes of rural parents and child adjustment. Unpublished master's thesis. University of Tennessee, 1957.

Hereford, C. F. Changing parental attitudes through group discussion. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1963.

Hoffman, L. W., & Lippitt, R. The measurement of family life variables. In P. H. Mussen (Ed.), Handbook of research methods in child development. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1960.

Jack, L. M. A device for the measurement of parental attitudes and practices. University of Iowa Child Welfare, 1932, 6, 135-149.

Kivett, V. R. Attitudes of mother-father pairs to child-rearing practices. Unpublished master's thesis. Woman's College of the University of North Carolina, 1960.

Koch, H. L., Dentler, M., Dysart, B., & Streit, H. A scale for measuring attitude toward the question of children's freedom. Child Development, 1934, 5, 253-266.

Kramer, D. P., & Fleming, E. S. Interparental differences of

opinion and children's academic achievement. Journal of Educational Research, 1966, 60, 136-138.

Laws, G. Parent-child relationships--A study of the attitudes and practices of parents concerning social adjustment of children. Columbia University Contribution to Education, 1927, No. 283.

Leton, D. A. A study of the validity of parent attitude measurement. Child Development, 1958, 29, 515-520.

Lindquist, E. F. Statistical analysis in educational research. Cambridge, Mass.: Riverside Press, 1940.

Mark, J. C. The attitudes of the mothers of male schizophrenics toward child behavior. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1953, 48, 185-189.

McNemar, Q. Psychological statistics. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1962.

Medinnus, G. R. Relation between several parent measures and the child's early adjustment to school. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1961, 52, 153-156.

Medinnus, G. R. The relation between parent attitudes and parental acceptance of the child. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1963, 103, 117-121.

Merrill, B. A measurement of mother-child interaction. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1946, 41, 37.

Oppenheim, A. N. Questionnaire design and attitude measurement. New York: Basic Books, 1966.

Peterson, D. R., Becker, W. C., Shoemaker, D. J., Luria, Z., & Hellmer, L. A. Child behavior problems and parental attitudes. Child Development, 1961, 32, 151-162.

Pumroy, D. K. Maryland Parent Attitude Survey: A research instrument with social desirability controlled. Journal of Psychology, 1966, 64, 73-78.

Rapp, D. W. Childrearing attitudes of mothers in Germany and the United States. Child Development, 1961, 32, 669-678.

Schaefer, E. S., & Bell, R. Q. Development of a parent attitude research instrument. Child Development, 1958, 29, 339-362.

Shaw, M. E., & Wright, J. M. Scales for the measurement of attitudes. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Sherman, M. Theories and measurement of attitudes. Child Development, 1932, 3, 15-28.

Shoben, E. J. The assessment of parental attitudes in relation to child adjustment. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1949, 39, 101-148.

Stogdill, R. M. Experiments in the measurement of attitudes toward children. Child Development, 1936, 7, 31-36.

Thurstone, L. L. Attitudes can be measured. American Journal of Sociology, 1928, 33, 529-544.

Tolor, A. An evaluation of the Maryland Parent Attitude Survey. Journal of Psychology, 1967, 67, 69-74.

Trapp, E. P., & Kausler, D. H. Dominance attitudes in parents and adult avoidance behavior in young children. Child Development, 1959, 29, 507-513.

Walsh, R. P. Parental rejecting attitudes and control in children. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1968, 24, 185-186.

Walters, J., & Fisher, C. Changes in attitudes of young women toward child guidance over a two-year period. Journal of Educational Research, 1958, 52, 115-118.

Wiley, J. H. A scale to measure parental attitudes. Speech and Hearing Disorders, 1955, 20, 284-290.

Winder, C. L., & Rau, L. Parental attitudes associated with social deviance in preadolescent boys. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1962, 64, 418-424.

Wyer, R. S. Effect of child-rearing attitudes and behavior on children's responses to hypothetical social situations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 2, 480-486.

Zunich, M. The relation between junior high-school students' problems and parental attitudes toward child rearing and family life. Journal of Educational Research, 1962, 56, 134-138.

Zunich, M. Child behavior and parental attitudes. Journal of Psychology, 1966, 62, 41-46.

APPENDIX A

LETTERS TO PARENTS

Dear

Ten years ago Mrs. Vira Rodgers Kivett did a study of Parent Attitudes of a group of parents whose children were enrolled in the Nursery School in the School of Home Economics at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro. This spring we would like to do a restudy of the same group of parents.

Would you be kind enough to participate in the study? Miss Carol Ann Herring, one of our graduate students in Child Development, will contact you. She will ask for an appointment as to when she might come and have you react to the same questionnaire you did before as well as to react to some additional questions. Both can be done in about twenty or thirty minutes.

We will be grateful to you for your help. If you have questions, please call me at 379-5810 or at my home number 288-6732.

Ten years seems a long time in the life of children yet a short time in our lives. I'm sure the nursery school alums have grown. We hope sometime you will bring them by to renew friendships. They will have forgotten us to be sure. We remember each of them with warm feelings and real fondness.

Cordially,

Helen Canaday
Associate Professor Home Economics
Director Nursery School

HC:vb

Dear

A few weeks ago you received a letter from Dr. Helen Canaday explaining my research proposal. As you know, I will be replicating Mrs. Vira Rodgers Kivett's research to see if there has been a change in parent attitudes over the past ten years. In order to do this, I have contacted each of the parents who participated in the 1960 study. Since you no longer live in Greensboro, I will not be able to make a home visit. However, it would help me greatly if both of you would fill out the enclosed questionnaires and return them within the coming week.

It is essential that you do not collaborate with each other in any way while taking the parent attitude survey since this would invalidate the results.

Thank you for your cooperation. I will be happy to share the results of the study with you when they have been ascertained.

Sincerely yours,

Carol Ann Herring

APPENDIX B

TABLES

TABLE 1

A COMPARISON OF DIFFERENCES OF MOTHER-FATHER SCORES ON THE DOMINANT SUBSCALE

Pair	M Sample I	F Sample II	Differences	d	d^2
1	146	171	-25	-33.22	1103.57
2	199	148	+51	+42.78	1830.13
3	166	167	- 1	- 9.22	85.01
4	150	135	+15	+ 6.78	45.97
5	Eliminated	---	---	------	-------
6	139	148	- 9	-17.22	296.53
7	169	151	+18	+ 9.78	95.65
8	161	163	- 2	-10.22	104.44
9	150	140	+10	+ 1.78	3.17
10	164	155	+ 9	+ .78	.61
11	Refused to participate	---	---	------	-------
12	146	149	- 3	-11.22	125.89
13	Eliminated	---	---	------	-------
14	194	153	+41	+32.78	1074.53
15	172	151	+21	+12.78	163.33
16	167	167	0	- 8.22	67.57
17	153	165	-12	-20.22	408.83
18	136	135	+ 1	- 7.22	52.13

TABLE 1 (continued)

A COMPARISON OF DIFFERENCES OF MOTHER-FATHER SCORES
ON THE DOMINANT SUBSCALE

Pair	M Sample I	F Sample II	Differences	d	d^2
19	150	137	+13	+ 4.78	22.85
20	169	146	+23	+14.78	218.45
21	154	156	- 2	-10.22	104.45
Means	160.28	152.06	+8.22	(5803.13 = Σd^2)	

$$\underline{t} = \frac{M_O - M_H}{\sqrt{\frac{\Sigma d^2}{n(n-1)}}} = \frac{8.22 - 0}{\sqrt{\frac{5803.13}{18(18-1)}}} = \frac{8.22}{4.35} = 1.89$$

Tabled t = 2.11
(17 df; 2 Q = .05)

TABLE 2

A COMPARISON OF DIFFERENCES OF MOTHER-FATHER SCORES
ON THE POSSESSIVE SUBSCALE

Pair	M Sample I	F Sample II	Differences	d	d^2
1	73	71	+ 2	- 1.33	1.77
2	88	75	+13	+ 9.67	93.51
3	79	80	- 1	- 4.33	18.75
4	80	76	+ 4	+ .67	.45
5	Eliminated	--	---	------	-----
6	76	71	+ 5	+ 1.67	2.79
7	78	73	+ 5	+ 1.67	2.79
8	69	83	-14	-17.33	300.33
9	66	71	- 5	- 8.33	69.39
10	84	73	+11	+ 7.67	58.83
11	Refused to participate	--	---	------	------
12	74	77	- 3	- 6.33	40.07
13	Eliminated	--	---	------	------
14	85	78	+ 7	+ 3.67	13.47
15	92	80	+12	+ 8.67	75.17
16	88	79	+ 9	+ 5.67	32.15
17	73	82	- 9	-12.33	152.03
18	76	70	+ 6	+ 2.67	7.13

TABLE 2 (continued)

A COMPARISON OF DIFFERENCES OF MOTHER-FATHER SCORES ON THE POSSESSIVE SUBSCALE

Pair	M Sample I	F Sample II	Differences	d	d^2
19	79	70	+ 9	+ 5.67	32.15
20	82	79	+ 3	- .33	.11
21	78	72	+ 6	+ 2.67	7.13
Means	78.89	75.56	+3.33	(907.92 = Σd^2)	

$$\underline{t} = \frac{M_O - M_H}{\sqrt{\frac{\Sigma d^2}{n(n-1)}}} = \frac{3.33 - 0}{\sqrt{\frac{907.92}{18(18-1)}}} = \frac{3.33}{1.72} = 1.93$$

Tabled $\underline{t}$ = 2.11
(17 df; 2 Q = .05)

TABLE 3

A COMPARISON OF DIFFERENCES OF MOTHER-FATHER SCORES ON THE IGNORING SUBSCALE

Pair	M Sample I	F Sample II	Differences	d	d^2
1	56	58	- 2	- 3.56	12.67
2	56	51	+ 5	+ 3.44	11.83
3	52	54	- 2	- 3.56	12.67
4	55	56	- 1	- 2.56	6.55
5	Eliminated	--	---	------	-----
6	53	53	0	- 1.56	2.43
7	56	51	+ 5	+ 3.44	11.83
8	56	55	+ 1	- .56	.31
9	49	55	- 6	- 7.56	57.15
10	52	54	- 2	- 3.56	12.67
11	Refused to participate	--	---	------	-----
12	52	54	- 2	- 3.56	12.67
13	Eliminated	--	---	------	-----
14	56	47	+ 9	+ 7.44	55.35
15	64	52	+12	+10.44	108.99
16	58	50	+ 8	+ 6.44	41.47
17	52	51	+ 1	- .56	.31
18	59	56	+ 3	+ 1.44	2.07

TABLE 3 (continued)

A COMPARISON OF DIFFERENCES OF MOTHER-FATHER SCORES
ON THE IGNORING SUBSCALE

Pair	M Sample I	F Sample II	Differences	d	d^2
19	55	56	- 1	- 2.56	6.55
20	60	58	+ 2	+ .44	.19
21	50	52	- 2	- 3.56	12.67
Means	55.06	53.50	+1.56		(368.38 = Σd^2)

$$\underline{t} = \frac{M_O - M_H}{\sqrt{\frac{\Sigma d^2}{n(n-1)}}} = \frac{1.56 - 0}{\sqrt{\frac{368.38}{18(18-1)}}} = \frac{1.56}{1.10} = 1.42$$

Tabled t = 2.11
(17 df; 2Q = .05)

TABLE 4

A COMPARISON OF DIFFERENCES OF MOTHER-FATHER SCORES
ON THE MISCELLANEOUS SUBSCALE

Pair	M Sample I	F Sample II	Differences	d	d^2
1	40	39	+ 1	- .94	.88
2	49	42	+ 7	+5.06	25.60
3	44	42	+ 2	+ .06	.01*
4	41	37	+ 4	+2.06	4.24
5	Eliminated	--	---	-----	-----
6	40	35	+ 5	+3.06	9.36
7	42	38	+ 4	+2.06	4.24
8	36	40	- 4	-5.94	35.28
9	35	35	0	-1.94	3.76
10	42	44	- 2	-3.94	15.52
11	Refused to participate	--	---	-----	-----
12	45	40	+ 5	+3.06	9.36
13	Eliminated	--	---	-----	-----
14	42	36	+ 6	+4.06	16.48
15	42	39	+ 3	+1.06	1.12
16	32	37	- 5	-6.94	48.16
17	41	42	- 1	-2.94	8.64
18	37	35	+ 2	+ .06	.01*

* $(.06)^2$ is equal to .0036

TABLE 4 (continued)

A COMPARISON OF DIFFERENCES OF MOTHER-FATHER SCORES
ON THE MISCELLANEOUS SUBSCALE

Pair	M Sample I	F Sample II	Differences	d	d^2
19	42	43	- 1	-2.94	8.64
20	42	43	- 1	-2.94	8.64
21	44	34	+10	+8.06	64.96
Means	40.88	38.94	+1.94		(264.90 = Σd^2)

$$\underline{t} = \frac{M_O - M_H}{\sqrt{\frac{\Sigma d^2}{n(n-1)}}} = \frac{1.94 - 0}{\sqrt{\frac{264.90}{18(18-1)}}} = \frac{1.94}{.93} = 2.09$$

Tabled $\underline{t}$ = 2.11
(17 df, 2Q = .05)

TABLE 5

A COMPARISON OF DIFFERENCES OF THE TOTAL SCORES OF MOTHERS AND FATHERS

Pair	(Fathers) Sample I	(Mothers) Sample II	Differences	d	d^2
1	315	339	-24	-39.06	1525.68
2	392	316	+76	+60.94	3713.68
3	341	343	- 2	-17.06	291.04
4	326	304	+22	+ 6.94	48.16
5	Eliminated	---	---	------	-------
6	308	307	+ 1	-14.06	197.68
7	345	313	+32	+16.94	286.96
8	322	341	-19	-34.06	1160.08
9	300	301	- 1	-16.06	257.92
10	342	326	+16	.94	.88
11	Refused to participate	---	---	------	-------
12	317	320	- 3	-18.06	326.16
13	Eliminated	---	---	------	-------
14	377	314	+63	+47.94	2298.24
15	370	322	+48	+32.94	1085.04
16	345	333	+12	- 3.06	9.36
17	319	340	-21	-36.06	1300.32
18	308	296	+12	- 3.06	9.36

TABLE 5 (continued)

A COMPARISON OF DIFFERENCES OF THE TOTAL SCORES
OF MOTHERS AND FATHERS

Pair	(Fathers) Sample I	(Mothers) Sample II	Differences	d	d^2
19	326	306	+20	+ 4.94	24.40
20	353	326	+27	+11.94	142.56
21	326	314	+12	- 3.06	9.36
Means	335.11	320.05	+15.06	(12686.88 = Σd^2)	

$$\underline{t} = \frac{M_O - M_H}{\sqrt{\frac{\Sigma d^2}{n(n-1)}}} = \frac{15.06 - 0}{\sqrt{\frac{12686.88}{18(18-1)}}} = \frac{15.06}{6.44} = 2.34$$

Tabled $\underline{t} = 2.11$
(17 df, 2Q = .05

TABLE 6

A COMPARISON OF DIFFERENCES OF THE TOTAL SCORES
OF FATHERS IN 1960 AND 1970

Pair	(1960) Sample I	(1970) Sample I	Differences	d	d^2
1	305	315	-10	-11.22	125.88
2	370	392	-22	-23.22	539.17
3	364	341	+23	+21.78	474.37
4	309	326	-17	-18.22	331.97
5	Eliminated	---	---	------	------
6	323	308	+15	+13.78	189.89
7	325	345	-20	-21.22	450.29
8	369	322	+47	+45.78	2095.81
9	326	300	+26	+24.78	614.05
10	330	342	-12	-13.22	174.77
11	Refused to participate	---	---	------	------
12	336	317	+19	+17.78	316.13
13	Eliminated	---	---	------	------
14	348	377	-29	-30.22	913.25
15	340	370	-30	-31.22	974.69
16	338	345	- 7	- 8.22	67.57
17	346	319	+27	+25.78	664.61
18	306	308	- 2	- 3.22	10.37

TABLE 6 (continued)

A COMPARISON OF DIFFERENCES OF THE TOTAL SCORES
OF FATHERS IN 1960 AND 1970

Pair	(1960) Sample I	(1970) Sample I	Differences	d	d^2
19	365	326	+39	+37.78	1427.33
20	349	353	- 4	- 5.22	27.25
21	305	326	-21	-22.22	493.73
Means	336.33	335.11	+1.22	(9891.13 = Σd^2)	

$$\underline{t} = \frac{M_0 - M_H}{\sqrt{\frac{\Sigma d^2}{n\,(n-1)}}} = \frac{1.22 - 0}{\sqrt{\frac{9891.13}{18(18-1)}}} = \frac{1.22}{5.68} = .21$$

Tabled t = 2.11
(17 df, 2Q = .05)

TABLE 7

A COMPARISON OF DIFFERENCES OF THE TOTAL SCORES
OF MOTHERS IN 1960 AND 1970

Pair	(1960) Sample II	(1970) Sample II	Differences	d	d^2
1	331	339	- 8	-22.39	501.37
2	332	316	+16	+ 1.61	2.59
3	371	343	+28	+13.61	185.23
4	326	304	+22	+ 7.61	57.91
5	Eliminated	---	---	------	------
6	331	307	+24	+ 9.61	92.35
7	352	313	+39	+24.61	605.65
8	348	341	+ 7	- 7.39	54.61
9	327	301	+26	+11.61	134.79
10	333	326	+ 7	- 7.39	54.61
11	Refused to participate	---	---	------	------
12	301	320	-19	-33.39	1114.89
13	Eliminated	---	---	------	------
14	349	314	+35	+20.61	424.77
15	336	322	+14	- .39	.15
16	349	333	+16	+ 1.61	2.59
17	346	340	+ 6	- 8.39	70.39
18	309	296	+13	- 1.39	1.93

TABLE 7 (continued)

A COMPARISON OF DIFFERENCES OF THE TOTAL SCORES
OF MOTHERS IN 1960 AND 1970

Pair	(1960) Sample II	(1970) Sample II	Differences	d	d^2
19	334	306	+28	+13.61	185.23
20	336	326	+10	- 4.39	19.27
21	309	314	- 5	-19.39	375.97
Means	334.44	320.05	+14.39	(3884.24 = Σd^2)	

$$\underline{t} = \frac{M_O - M_H}{\sqrt{\frac{\Sigma d^2}{n(n-1)}}} = \frac{14.39 - 0}{\sqrt{\frac{3884.24}{18(18-1)}}} = \frac{14.39}{3.54} = 4.04$$

Tabled $\underline{t}$ = 3.97
(17 df, 2Q = .001)

TABLE 8

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF TOTAL SCORES AND AGE OF FATHERS

37-43 Years	44-50 Years	51-57 Years	58-64 Years	65-71 Years
341	315	392	319	377
322	308	326	326	353
326	345	317		
	300	370		
	342	308		
	345			
T 989	1955	1713	645	730 (T.. = 6032)
$\bar{X}$ 329.7	325.8	342.6	322.5	365.0

	Sum of Squares	d.f.	Mean Square	F ratio
Means	2990.58	4	747.65	$F = \frac{747.65}{610.09} = 1.23$
Within	7931.20	13	610.09	$F = .05\ (4, 13) = 3.18$
Total	10921.78	17		

TABLE 9

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF TOTAL SCORES AND AGE OF MOTHERS

37-43 Years	44-50 Years	51-57 Years	58-64 Years	65-71 Years
339	304	316		
343	301	306		
307	326	326		
313	320			
341	314			
333	322			
314	340			
	296			
T 2290	2523	948		(T.. = 5761)
$\bar{X}$ 327.1	315.4	316.0		

	Sum of Squares	d.f.	Mean Square	F ratio
Means	576.21	2	288.11	$F = \frac{288.11}{206.32} = 1.40$
Within	3094.73	15	206.32	$F_{.05(2,15)} = 3.68$
Total	3670.94	17		

TABLE 10

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF TOTAL SCORES AND EDUCATIONAL STATUS OF FATHERS

12-13 Years	14-15 Years	16-17 Years	18-19 Years	20-21 Years
315	345	392	308	377
342	326	341	322	326
319		326		353
		308		
		300		
		317		
		370		
		345		
T 976	671	2699	630	1056 (T.. = 6032)
$\bar{X}$ 325.33	335.50	337.38	315.0	352.0

	Sum of Squares	d.f.	Mean Square	F ratio
Means	1992.74	4	498.19	$F = \frac{498.19}{686.85} = .73$
Within	8929.04	13	686.85	$F_{.05}(4, 13) = 3.18$
Total	10921.78	17		

TABLE 11

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF TOTAL SCORES AND EDUCATIONAL STATUS OF MOTHERS

12-13 Years	14-15 Years	16-17 Years	18-19 Years	20-21 Years
313	304	339	320	322
333	314	316	314	
340		307		
296		341		
326		301		
		326		
		306		
		343		
T 1608	618	2579	634	322 (T.. = 5761)
$\bar{X}$ 321.6	309.0	322.4	317.0	322.0

	Sum of Squares	d.f.	Mean Squares	F ratio
Means	321.86	4	80.47	$F = \frac{80.47}{257.62} = .31$
Within	3349.08	13	257.62	$F_{.05}(4, 13) = 3.18$
Total	3670.94	17		

TABLE 12

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF TOTAL SCORES AND ORDINAL POSITION OF FATHERS

Only Child	Youngest Child	Middle Child	Oldest Child
341	308	392	315
345	345	326	322
	342	300	308
	317	370	326
	377	353	
	319		
	326		
T 686	2334	1741	1271 (T..= 6032)
$\bar{X}$ 343.0	333.4	348.2	317.8

	Sum of Squares	d.f.	Mean Square	F ratio
Means	2206.52	3	735.51	$F = \frac{735.51}{622.52} = 1.18$
Within	8715.26	14	622.52	$F_{.05}(3, 14) = 3.34$
Total	10921.78	17		

TABLE 13

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF TOTAL SCORES AND ORDINAL POSITION OF MOTHERS

Only Child	Youngest Child	Middle Child	Oldest Child
316	313	339	301
307	320	343	
341	322	304	
	333	326	
	340	314	
	314	296	
		306	
		326	
T 964	1942	2554	301 (T.. = 5761)
$\bar{X}$ 321.3	323.7	319.3	301

	Sum of Squares	d.f.	Mean Square	F ratio
Means	451.44	3	150.48	$F = \frac{150.48}{229.96} = .65$
Within	3219.50	14	229.96	$F_{.05(3, 14)} = 3.34$
Total	3670.94	17		

TABLE 14

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF TOTAL SCORES AND NUMBER OF CHILDREN OF FATHERS

2 Children	3 Children	4 Children
317	315	326
345	392	342
	341	326
	308	326
	345	
	322	
	300	
	377	
	370	
	319	
	308	
	353	
T 662	4050	1320 (T.. = 6032)
$\bar{X}$ 331.0	337.5	330.0

	Sum of Squares	d.f.	Mean Squares	F ratio
Means	206.78	2	103.40	$F = \frac{103.40}{714.33} = .15$
Within	10715.00	15	714.33	$F_{.05(2, 15)} = 3.68$
Total	10921.78	17		

TABLE 15

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF TOTAL SCORES AND NUMBER OF CHILDREN OF MOTHERS

2 Children	3 Children	4 Children
320	339	304
333	316	326
	343	306
	307	314
	313	
	341	
	301	
	314	
	322	
	340	
	296	
	326	
T 653	3858	1250 (T.. = 5761)
$\bar{X}$ 326.5	321.5	312.5

	Sum of Squares	d.f.	Mean Square	F ratio
Means	336.44	2	168.22	$F = \frac{168.22}{222.30} = .76$
Within	3334.50	15	222.30	$F_{.05}(2, 15) = 3.68$
Total	3670.94	17		

TABLE 16

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF FATHERS' TOTAL SCORES AND THEIR ASSOCIATION WITH A NURSERY SCHOOL

1-2 Years	3-4 Years	5-6 Years	7 or more Years
315	341	326	392
326	345	322	342
353	317	300	377
	370	345	308
	326	319	308
T 994	1699	1612	1727 (T.. = 6032)
$\bar{X}$ 331.3	339.8	332.4	345.4

	Sum of Squares	d.f.	Mean Square	F ratio
Means	1489.91	3	496.64	$F = \frac{496.64}{673.71} = .74$
Within	9431.87	14	673.71	$F_{.05(3, 14)} = 3.34$
Total	10921.78	17		

TABLE 17

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MOTHER'S TOTAL SCORES AND THEIR ASSOCIATION WITH A NURSERY SCHOOL

1-2 Years	3-4 Years	5-6 Years	7 or more Years
339	343	304	316
306	313	341	326
326	320	301	314
	322	333	296
	314	340	307
T 971	1612	1619	1559 (T.. = 5761)
$\bar{X}$ 323.7	322.4	323.8	311.8

	Sum of Squares	d.f.	Mean Squares	F ratio
Means	477.47	3	159.16	$F = \frac{159.16}{228.11} = .70$
Within	3193.47	14	228.11	$F_{.05}(3, 14) = 3.34$
Total	3670.94	17		

TABLE 18

ADDITIONAL CHILDREN BORN TO FATHERS:
t-TEST FOR EFFECT ON TOTAL SCORE

No Additional Children	Additional Children
315	308
392	345
341	322
326	342
300	377
317	370
345	326
319	
308	
326	
353	
ΣX 3642	2390
$\bar{X}$ 331.09	341.43

$$t = \frac{M_1 - M_2}{\sqrt{\frac{S_1^2}{N_1} + \frac{S_2^2}{N_2}}}$$

$$t = \frac{331-341.43}{\sqrt{\frac{663.69}{11} + \frac{637.95}{7}}} = \frac{-10.34}{\sqrt{60.34 + 91.14}} = \frac{-10.34}{12.30} = -.84$$

Tabled $t = 2.12$
(16 df; $2\overline{Q} = .05$)

TABLE 19

ADDITIONAL CHILDREN BORN TO MOTHERS:
t-TEST FOR EFFECT ON TOTAL SCORE

No Additional Children	Additional Children
339	307
316	313
343	341
304	326
301	314
320	322
333	314
340	
296	
306	
326	
ΣX 3524	2237
$\overline{X}$ 320.36	319.57

$$t = \frac{M_1 - M_2}{\sqrt{\frac{S_1^2}{N_1} + \frac{S_2^2}{N_2}}}$$

$$t = \frac{320.36 - 319.57}{\sqrt{\frac{289.86}{11} + \frac{128.29}{7}}} = \frac{.79}{\sqrt{26.35 + 18.33}} = \frac{.79}{6.68} = .12$$

Tabled $t = 2.12$
(16 df; 2Q = .05)

TABLE 20

SERIOUS ILLNESS IN IMMEDIATE FAMILY OF FATHERS:
t-TEST FOR EFFECT ON TOTAL SCORE

No Serious Illness	Serious Illness
341	315
308	392
322	326
300	345
342	317
377	345
370	319
326	308
326	353
ΣX 3012	3020
$\bar{X}$ 334.67	335.56

$$t = \frac{M_1 - M_2}{\sqrt{\frac{S_1^2}{N_1} + \frac{S_2^2}{N_2}}}$$

$$t = \frac{334.67 - 335.56}{\sqrt{\frac{669.75}{9} + \frac{695.03}{9}}} = \frac{-.89}{\sqrt{74.42 + 77.23}} = \frac{-.89}{12.31} = -.07$$

Tabled $t = 2.12$
(16 df; $\overline{2}Q = .05$)

TABLE 21

SERIOUS ILLNESS IN IMMEDIATE FAMILY OF MOTHERS:
t-TEST FOR EFFECT ON TOTAL SCORE

No Serious Illness	Serious Illness
343	339
307	316
341	304
301	313
326	320
314	333
322	340
306	296
314	326
ΣX 2874	2887
$\bar{X}$ 319.33	320.78

$$t = \frac{M_1 - M_2}{\sqrt{\frac{S_1^2}{N_1} + \frac{S_2^2}{N_2}}}$$

$$t = \frac{319.33 - 320.78}{\sqrt{\frac{225.5}{9} + \frac{232.2}{9}}} = \frac{-1.45}{\sqrt{25.06 + 25.8}} = \frac{-1.45}{7.13} = -.20$$

Tabled $t = 2.12$
(16 df, 2Q = .05)

TABLE 22

FATHERS' CONCERNS ABOUT CHILDREN: *t*-TEST FOR EFFECT ON TOTAL SCORE

No Concerns	Concerns
392	315
341	326
308	345
342	322
317	300
370	377
345	
319	
308	
326	
353	
326	
ΣX 4047	1985
$\bar{X}$ 337.25	330.83

$$t = \frac{M_1 - M_2}{\sqrt{\frac{S_1^2}{N_1} + \frac{S_2^2}{N_2}}}$$

$$t = \frac{337.25 - 330.83}{\sqrt{\frac{647.48}{12} \quad \frac{726.98}{6}}} = \frac{6.42}{\sqrt{53.96 + 121.16}} = \frac{6.42}{13.23} = .49$$

Tabled $t = 2.12$
(16 df, $2Q = .05$)

TABLE 23

MOTHERS' CONCERNS ABOUT CHILDREN: *t*-TEST FOR EFFECT ON TOTAL SCORE

No Concerns	Concerns
316	339
343	313
304	341
307	301
326	320
333	314
340	322
296	
306	
326	
314	
ΣX 3511	2250
$\bar{X}$ 319.18	321.43

$$t = \frac{M_1 - M_2}{\sqrt{\frac{S_1^2}{N_1} + \frac{S_2^2}{N_2}}}$$

$$t = \frac{319.18 - 321.43}{\sqrt{\frac{241.6}{11} + \frac{206.29}{7}}} = \frac{-2.25}{\sqrt{21.92 + 29.47}} = \frac{-2.25}{7.16} = -.31$$

Tabled $t = 2.12$
(16 df; $\overline{2Q} = .05$)

TABLE 24

FINANCIAL STATUS OF FATHERS: t-TEST FOR EFFECT ON TOTAL SCORE

Same Financial Status	Changed Financial Status
341	315
326	392
308	322
345	300
342	317
377	370
345	308
319	326
326	
353	
ΣX 3382	2650
$\bar{X}$ 338.2	331.25

$$t = \frac{M_1 - M_2}{\sqrt{\frac{S_1^2}{N_1} + \frac{S_2^2}{N_2}}}$$

$$t = \frac{338.2 - 331.25}{\sqrt{\frac{379.73}{10} + \frac{1041.36}{8}}} = \frac{6.95}{\sqrt{37.97 + 130.17}} = \frac{6.95}{12.96} = .54$$

Tabled $t = 2.12$
(16 df; $2Q = .05$)

TABLE 25

FINANCIAL STATUS OF MOTHERS: t-TEST FOR EFFECT ON TOTAL SCORE

Same Financial Status	Changed Financial Status
343	339
304	316
307	341
313	301
326	320
314	322
333	296
340	314
306	
326	
ΣX 3212	2549
$\bar{X}$ 321.2	318.63

$$t = \frac{M_1 - M_2}{\sqrt{\frac{s_1^2}{N_1} \quad \frac{s_2^2}{N_2}}}$$

$$t = \frac{321.2 - 318.63}{\sqrt{\frac{206.84}{10} + \frac{254.27}{8}}} = \frac{2.57}{\sqrt{20.68 + 31.78}} = \frac{2.57}{7.24} = .35$$

Tabled $t = 2.12$
(16 df; 2Q = .05)

TABLE 26

OCCUPATION OF FATHERS: t-TEST FOR EFFECT ON TOTAL SCORE

Same Occupation	Changed Occupation
392	315
341	326
308	300
345	345
322	370
342	
317	
377	
319	
308	
326	
353	
326	
ΣX 4376	1656
$\bar{X}$ 336.62	331.2

$$t = \frac{M_1 - M_2}{\sqrt{\frac{S_1^2}{N_1} + \frac{S_2^2}{N_2}}}$$

$$t = \frac{336.62 - 331.2}{\sqrt{\frac{654.76}{13} + \frac{739.7}{5}}} = \frac{5.42}{\sqrt{50.37 + 147.94}} = \frac{5.42}{14.08} = .38$$

Tabled $t = 2.12$
(16 df; $2Q = .05$)

TABLE 27

OCCUPATION OF MOTHERS: t-TEST FOR EFFECT ON TOTAL SCORE

Same Occupation	Changed Occupation
316	343
304	307
313	339
341	320
301	322
326	326
314	314
333	
340	
296	
306	
ΣX 3490	2271
$\bar{X}$ 317.27	324.43

$$\underline{t} = \frac{M_1 - M_2}{\sqrt{\frac{S_1^2}{N_1} + \frac{S_2^2}{N_2}}}$$

$$\underline{t} = \frac{317.27 - 324.43}{\sqrt{\frac{245.42}{11} + \frac{166.29}{7}}} = \frac{-7.16}{\sqrt{22.31 + 23.76}} = \frac{-7.16}{6.78} = -1.06$$

Tabled $\underline{t}$ = 2.12
(16 df; $2\overline{Q}$ = .05)

TABLE 28

FATHERS' PLACE OF RESIDENCE: t-TEST FOR EFFECT ON TOTAL SCORE

Same Place of Residence	Changed Place of Residence
392	315
341	345
326	322
308	300
342	317
377	370
319	345
326	308
	353
	326
ΣX 2731	3301
$\bar{X}$ 341.38	330.1

$$t = \frac{M_1 - M_2}{\sqrt{\frac{S_1^2}{N_1} + \frac{S_2^2}{N_2}}}$$

$$t = \frac{341.38 - 330.1}{\sqrt{\frac{845.7}{8} + \frac{492.99}{10}}} = \frac{11.28}{\sqrt{105.71 + 49.3}} = \frac{11.28}{12.45} = .91$$

Tabled $t = 2.12$
(16 df; $2Q = .05$)

TABLE 29

MOTHERS' PLACE OF RESIDENCE: t-TEST FOR EFFECT ON TOTAL SCORE

Same Place of Residence	Changed Place of Residence
316	339
343	313
304	341
307	301
326	320
314	322
340	333
306	296
	326
	314
ΣX 2556	3205
$\overline{X}$ 319.5	320.5

$$t = \frac{M_1 - M_2}{\sqrt{\frac{S_1^2}{N_1} + \frac{S_2^2}{N_2}}}$$

$$t = \frac{319.5 - 320.5}{\sqrt{\frac{233.71}{8} + \frac{225.61}{10}}} = \frac{-1}{\sqrt{29.21 + 22.56}} = \frac{-1}{7.19} = -.14$$

Tabled $t = 2.12$
(16 df, $2Q = .05$)

APPENDIX C

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
PARENT ATTITUDE SURVEY

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Check one:

   Mother_____

   Father_____

2. Number of children: _____

Age	Sex
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

3. Number of other persons in the home: _____

Relationship	Sex	Length of residence
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

4. Age of parent: _____

5. Educational status: School years completed_____

6. Brothers and sisters of parent:

   A. How many brothers did you have older than you?____

   B. How many brothers did you have younger than you?___

   C. How many sisters did you have older than you?_____

   D. How many sisters did you have younger than you?___

7. Association with a nursery school:

   What is the total time that you have had any of your children in any nursery school? _____

8. Occupation in 1960: _____

   Job description: _____

   Present occupation: _____

   Job description: _____

9. Changes in the family situation since 1960:

   A. Number of adoptions: _____

   B. Number of deaths in the immediate family: _____

      Relationship of person(s) to you:

      _____

      _____

   C. Number of serious illnesses in the immediate family: _____

      1. Type of illness(es): _____

      2. Duration of illness(es): _____

      3. Relationship of person(s) to you:

      _____

      _____

   D. Description of financial situation:

      1. Have you had any serious financial reverses since 1960?_____. If "yes," please explain:

      _____

2. Have you had any appreciable financial gains? _____. If "yes," please explain:

_____

E. Has anything happened to your children that has caused you great concern?____. If "yes," please explain: _____

_____

F. Has there been any change in your marital status?__ If so, what?_____

G. Have your changed your place of residence since 1960?____. If "yes," please explain:_____

_____

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
PARENT ATTITUDE SURVEY

Please read each of the statements below. Rate each statement as to whether you strongly agree, mildly agree, mildly disagree or strongly disagree. There are no right or wrong answers, so answer according to your own convictions. Work as rapidly as you can. Draw a circle around the letter that best expresses your feeling.

		Strongly Agree	Mildly Agree	Mildly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
1.	A child should be seen and not heard. .	6	5	4	3	I*
2.	Parents should sacrifice everything for their children.	6	5	3	4	P
3.	Children should be allowed to do as they please	5	5	2	5	P
4.	A child should not plan to enter any occupation his parents don't approve of.	6	6	4	5	D
5.	Children need some of the natural meanness taken out of them.	6	5	3	4	D
6.	A child should have strict discipline in order to develop a fine, strong character	6	4	3	3	D
7.	The mother rather than the father should be responsible for discipline. .	6	4	3	4	I
8.	Children should be "babied" until they are several years old.	6	5	3	4	P
9.	Children have the right to play with whomever they like.	4	3	5	5	D

*Numbers represent assigned values for calculations. Letters represent each of the four subscales: Dominant, Possessive, Ignoring, and Miscellaneous.

10.	Independent and mature children are less lovable than those children who openly and obviously want and need their parents	6	5	4	3 P
11.	Children should be forbidden to play with youngsters whom their parents do not approve of	5	5	3	2 P
12.	A good way to discipline a child is to tell him his parents won't love him anymore if he is bad.	6	3	4	4 I
13.	Severe discipline is essential in the training of children.	6	6	5	3 D
14.	Parents cannot help it if their children are naughty.	6	5	4	3 I
15.	Jealousy among brothers and sisters is a very unhealthy thing	4	5	2	6 M
16.	Children should be allowed to go to any Sunday School their friends go to	5	2	4	5 D
17.	No child should ever set his will against that of his parents	6	6	2	4 D
18.	The Biblical command that children must obey their parents should be completely adhered to	6	4	4	3 D
19.	It is wicked for children to disobey their parents	6	4	4	3 D
20.	A child should feel a deep sense of obligation always to act in accord with the wishes of his parents.	6	5	3	3 P
21.	Children should not be punished for disobedience.	5	6	3	4 P
22.	Children who are gentlemanly or ladylike are preferable to those who are tomboys or "regular guys" . . .	5	5	3	3 P
23.	Strict discipline weakens a child's personality	4	3	4	5 D
24.	Children should always be loyal to their parents above anyone else	6	3	4	3 P

25.	Children should be steered away from the temptations of religious beliefs other than those accepted by the family.	6	6	3	3 D
26.	The weaning of a child from the emotional ties to its parents begins at birth.	5	3	4	5 P
27.	Parents are not entitled to the love of their children unless they earn it	4	3	5	6 P
28.	Parents should never try to break a child's will.	4	2	5	5 D
29.	Children should not be required to take orders from parents.	2	5	4	5 D
30.	Children should be allowed to choose their own religious beliefs	4	3	4	6 D
31.	Children should not interrupt adult conversation.	5	4	2	6 I
32.	The most important consideration in planning the activities of the home should be the needs and interests of the children	4	2	5	6 I
33.	Quiet children are much nicer than little chatterboxes	6	4	3	4 I
34.	It is sometimes necessary for the parent to break the child's will. . . .	6	5	4	3 D
35.	Children usually know ahead of time whether or not parents will punish them for their actions.	5	3	3	4 M
36.	Children resent discipline.	5	4	3	5 D
37.	Children should not be permitted to play with youngsters from the "wrong side of the tracks"	6	5	3	4 P
38.	When the parent speaks, the child should obey	5	5	3	2 D
39.	Mild discipline is best	4	3	5	6 D

40.	The best child is one who shows lots of affection for his mother.	6	5	3	4 P
41.	A child should be taught that his parents always know what is best. . . .	5	5	3	3 D
42.	It is better for children to play at home than to visit other children . . .	6	4	4	3 P
43.	Most children should have more discipline than they get.	6	4	3	2 D
44.	A child should do what he is told to do, without stopping to argue about it.	6	4	3	4 D
45.	Children should fear their parents to some degree	6	5	4	3 D
46.	A child should always love his parents above everyone else	6	4	3	4 P
47.	Children who indulge in sex play become adult sex criminals.	5	6	4	3 M
48.	Children should be allowed to make only minor decisions for themselves . .	5	5	3	3 D
49.	A child should always accept the decision of his parents	5	5	3	3 D
50.	Children who readily accept authority are much nicer than those who try to be dominant themselves.	6	4	3	3 P
51.	Parents should always have complete control over the actions of their children.	5	4	4	3 D
52.	When they can't have their own way, children usually try to bargain or reason with parents	5	3	4	6 I
53.	The shy child is worse off than the one who masturbates	4	3	5	5 M
54.	Children should accept the religion of their parents without question . . .	5	6	4	3 D
55.	The child should not question the commands of his parents	6	4	3	3 D

56.	Children who fight with their brothers and sisters are generally a source of great irritation and annoyance to their parents	6	3	4	6 I
57.	Children should not be punished for doing anything they have seen their parents do.	4	4	3	6 D
58.	Jealousy is just a sign of selfishness	6	3	4	4 I
59.	Children should be taught the value of money early	5	3	3	6 M
60.	A child should be punished for contradicting his parents.	6	5	3	3 D
61.	Children should have lots of parental supervision	5	3	3	4 D
62.	A parent should see to it that his child plays only with the right kind of children	6	4	3	3 P
63.	Babies are more fun for parents than older children are.	6	5	4	3 P
64.	Parents should supervise a child's selection of playmates very carefully	6	4	2	4 P
65.	No one should expect a child to respect parents who nag and scold . . .	5	3	5	2 M
66.	A child should always believe what his parents tell him.	6	4	3	4 D
67.	Children should usually be allowed to have their own way	6	3	3	6 D
68.	A good way to discipline a child is to cut down his allowance.	5	4	3	4 M
69.	Children should not be coaxed or petted into obedience	4	3	6	5 D
70.	A child should be shamed into obedience if he won't listen to reason.	6	3	4	4 D

71.	In the long run it is better, after all, for a child to be kept fairly close to his mother's apron strings.	6	6	3	3 P
72.	A good whipping now and then never hurt any child	6	4	3	2 D
73.	Masturbation is the worst bad habit that a child can form	6	5	4	3 M
74.	A child should never keep a secret from his parents.	7	4	3	4 P
75.	Parents are generally too busy to answer all a child's questions.	6	4	3	3 I
76.	The children who make the best adults are those who obey all the time	6	5	3	4 D
77.	It is important for children to have some kind of religious upbringing . . .	6	3	2	2 M
78.	Children should be allowed to manage their affairs with little supervision from adults	5	3	4	5 I
79.	Parents should never enter a child's room without permission	3	3	3	7 D
80.	It is best to give children the impression that parents have no faults. . . .	6	5	4	3 D
81.	Children should not annoy their parents with their unimportant problems	6	5	3	4 I
82.	Children should give their parents unquestioning obedience	6	4	4	2 D
83.	Sex is one of the greatest problems to be contended with in children. . . .	6	4	3	4 M
84.	Children should have as much freedom as their parents allow themselves . . .	6	4	3	6 I
85.	Children should do nothing without the consent of their parents.	6	5	3	3 D