

## INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this document, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark, it is an indication of either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, duplicate copy, or copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed. For blurred pages, a good image of the page can be found in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted, a target note will appear listing the pages in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed, a definite method of "sectioning" the material has been followed. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For illustrations that cannot be satisfactorily reproduced by xerographic means, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and inserted into your xerographic copy. These prints are available upon request from the Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

University  
Microfilms  
International

300 N. Zeeb Road  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

8401963

**Weisbrot (Livnay), Jack Shaul**

PARENTAL DISCIPLINE IN RELATION TO CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR OF  
KINDERGARTEN CHILDREN

*City University of New York*

PH.D. 1983

University  
Microfilms  
International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

**PLEASE NOTE:**

In all cases this material has been filmed in the best possible way from the available copy. Problems encountered with this document have been identified here with a check mark .

1. Glossy photographs or pages \_\_\_\_\_
2. Colored illustrations, paper or print \_\_\_\_\_
3. Photographs with dark background \_\_\_\_\_
4. Illustrations are poor copy \_\_\_\_\_
5. Pages with black marks, not original copy \_\_\_\_\_
6. Print shows through as there is text on both sides of page \_\_\_\_\_
7. Indistinct, broken or small print on several pages
8. Print exceeds margin requirements \_\_\_\_\_
9. Tightly bound copy with print lost in spine \_\_\_\_\_
10. Computer printout pages with indistinct print \_\_\_\_\_
11. Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ lacking when material received, and not available from school or author.
12. Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ seem to be missing in numbering only as text follows.
13. Two pages numbered \_\_\_\_\_. Text follows.
14. Curling and wrinkled pages \_\_\_\_\_
15. Other \_\_\_\_\_

**University  
Microfilms  
International**

PARENTAL DISCIPLINE IN RELATION TO  
CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR OF KINDERGARTEN CHILDREN

by

JACK S. WEISBROT (LIVNAY)

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

1983

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

6/22/83  
Date

Harold W. Wilensky  
Chairman of Examining Committee

June 22, 1983  
Date

Robert T. ...  
Executive Officer

Harold Wilensky, Ph.D.

Lawrence Gould, Ph.D.

Louis Gerstman, Ph.D.

Examining Committee

The City University of New York

## ABSTRACT

PARENTAL DISCIPLINE IN RELATION TO CLASSROOM  
BEHAVIOR OF KINDERGARTEN CHILDREN

by

Jack S. Weisbrot (Livnay)

Advisor: Prof. H. Wilensky

Clinical work in kindergartens revealed two patterns of maladaptive behavior of children which seemed related to parental disciplinary patterns: disruptiveness and reticence.

30 children out of a graduating class of 280 kindergarten children were rated by teachers as revealing extreme disruptiveness (five boys, five girls), extreme reticence (five boys, five girls) or positive adjustment (five boys, five girls).

The 60 parents were asked to fill out a shortened version of the PARI, F Scale and responded individually and jointly to an eight situation Problem Situations Task involving interactions with children.

Three major hypotheses were formulated based upon Baumrind's (1966, 1971, 1975) investigations of parental control and competence in pre-school children. It was expected that parents of Adjusted children would rely upon an authoritative pattern of solutions in contrast to parents of Disruptive children who would be expected to rely upon authoritarian or permissive patterns; parents of reticent children were expected to rely upon an authoritarian pattern.

The results for the Adjusted group supported the hypothesis in that the parents revealed a primarily authoritative pattern which was clearly in contrast to the patterns of the other groups. The parents revealed interactions characterized by mutual support alongside respect for differences, which tended to be complementary.

The parents of Disruptive children manifested a pattern consisting of equal use of permissive and authoritative solutions, with fewer authoritarian solutions. The pattern, though not as expected, was clearly different from that of the Adjusted group.

The interaction between the parents was marked by competition and undercutting.

The parents of Reticent children revealed an almost identical pattern to that of the Disruptive group. A contrast was revealed in a consistent tendency to modify solutions in an authoritative direction upon exposure to the spouse. The interactions were marked by more acquiescence and acceptance. Both groups showed difficulties in dealing with aggression.

Parental attitudes and interactions accompanying manifestations of maladaptive and adaptive behavior in kindergarten were discussed.

Implications for research and clinical work with parents and teachers was discussed. Further use of the Problem Situations Task was suggested.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
I REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	1
The disruptive child	1
The reticent child	1
Clinical findings	2
Aims of the present investigation	2
A question of values	3
Review of relevant literature	4
Punitiveness and submission or aggression	4
Sex differences	5
Responsible versus irresponsible punishment	6
Dominance, power and control	7
Restrictiveness and control	8
Demands	9
Nurturance and acceptance versus hostility and rejection	9
Dimensions of authority	12
Types of parents	13
Dimensions of parental behavior	15
Hypotheses	15
Techniques of measurement	16

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
II METHODS	19
Subjects	19
Subject selection	19
Sample characteristics	20
Population trends	22
Adjusted children	22
Reticent children	22
Disruptive children	22
Teacher interviews	23
Background data	23
Procedure	24
<u>Problem Situations Task</u>	24
1. Overall score	24
2. Trend score	25
<u>PARI</u>	25
<u>Fascism Scale</u>	25

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
III RESULTS	
Overall score results	27
Parents of <u>Adj</u> children	31
Parents of <u>Dis</u> children	34
Analysis of <u>authoritarian</u> responses	34
Analysis of <u>permissive</u> responses	36
Parents of <u>Ret</u> children	40
Overall comparison of groups	41
Tentative pattern analyses	41
Parents of <u>Adj</u> children	44
Parents of <u>Dis</u> children	44
Parents of <u>Ret</u> children	45
Comparison of group trends	46
Analysis by situations	47
Trend score results	52
<u>Permissive to authoritative</u>	52
<u>Authoritative to permissive</u>	52
<u>Authoritative to authoritarian</u>	52
Parent interaction results	55
Dominance patterns	55
Individual to joint condition	58
<u>F Scale</u> results	61
<u>PARI</u> results	64

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
IV DISCUSSION	69
Parental correlates of children's adjustment	
in kindergarten	69
Parents of <u>Adj</u> children	70
Fathers of <u>Adj</u> children	71
Mothers of <u>Adj</u> children	72
Interaction between mothers and fathers	73
Clinical illustrations	74
Parents of <u>Dis</u> children	77
Fathers of <u>Dis</u> children	79
Mothers of <u>Dis</u> children	79
Interaction between mothers and fathers	80
Clinical illustrations	81
Parents of <u>Ret</u> children	83
Fathers of <u>Ret</u> children	85
Mothers of <u>Ret</u> children	85
Interaction between mothers and fathers	86
Clinical illustrations	87
Comparisons and contrasts between groups	89
Factors associated with disruptiveness	
in kindergarten	91
Factors associated with reticence	
in kindergarten	92

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
Maladjustment in kindergarten in relation to parental discipline	92
Factors associated with adjustment in kindergarten	94
Methodological considerations	95
Selection of the sample	95
Variations in teacher ratings	95
Assessment of reticence	95
Teacher effects upon children's behavior	96
Distance between variables investigated	97
Experimenter as interviewer	98
Interviewing	98
Scoring	98
The measurement of parental disciplinary styles	99
Gender of characters	99
Reported solutions versus actual behavior	100
Saliency of situations	100
Effectiveness of situations in groups and parent differentiation	101
Fathers	101
Mothers	101
Both parents	103
Effective content	104

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
Questions for future investigations	104
Interaction between parents	104
Individual trends	105
Parent-child interaction	105
Teacher-child interaction	105
Implications for clinical work	105
Potential for authoritativeness	106
The <u>Problem Situations Task</u> as a paradigm for work with parents	107
Safe distance	107
Combined format	107
Variable content	107
Concreteness	107
Psychological intervention in kindergarten	108
Discrimination of types	108
Assessment of teacher style	108
Focus of intervention	109
Enhancing authoritativeness	109
Dealing with team support	110

## LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
1. Means and standard deviations of the <u>Teachers Rating Scale</u> for total population and selected subgroups.	21
2. Percentage of parents using overall <u>permissive</u> , <u>authoritative</u> , or <u>authoritarian</u> solutions to the <u>Problem Situations Task</u> by groups.	28
3. ANOVA of <u>authoritative</u> solutions for groups by gender of child for mothers and fathers.	32
4. Mean scores of number of <u>authoritative</u> responses to the <u>Problem Situations Task</u> for <u>Adj</u> , <u>Ret</u> and <u>Dis</u> groups.	33
5. ANOVA of <u>authoritarian</u> solutions to the <u>Problem Situations Task</u> for <u>Adj</u> , <u>Ret</u> and <u>Dis</u> groups for boys and girls and fathers and mothers.	35
6. Mean numbers of <u>authoritarian</u> solutions to the <u>Problem Situations Task</u> for <u>Adj</u> , <u>Ret</u> and <u>Dis</u> groups.	37
7. ANOVA of <u>permissive</u> solutions to the <u>Problem Situations Task</u> for <u>Adj</u> , <u>Ret</u> and <u>Dis</u> groups.	38
8. Mean numbers of <u>permissive</u> solutions to the <u>Problem Situations Task</u> for <u>Adj</u> , <u>Ret</u> and <u>Dis</u> groups.	39
9. Mean weighted scores for fathers and mothers and for both parents of <u>Adj</u> , <u>Ret</u> and <u>Dis</u> groups for rank comparisons.	42

	<u>Page</u>
10. Mean ranks and Mann-Whitney <u>U</u> comparisons for fathers, mothers and both parents of <u>Adj</u> , <u>Ret</u> and <u>Dis</u> groups.	43
11. List of the eight situations composing the <u>Problem Situations Task</u> .	48
12. Analysis of significant comparisons by individual situations of the <u>Problem Situations Task</u> .	49
13. Comparisons of trend responses of <u>Adj</u> , <u>Ret</u> , and <u>Dis</u> groups to the <u>Problem Situations Task</u> by <u>t</u> tests and Fisher's Exact Test.	53
14. Frequencies of dominance, compliance, agreement and disagreement displayed by parents on the joint condition of the <u>Problem Situations Task</u> .	56
15. Comparisons of distributions of responses to the <u>Problem Situations Task</u> for fathers and mothers of <u>Adj</u> , <u>Ret</u> and <u>Dis</u> children on the individual versus joint conditions by Chi Square Test.	60
16. ANOVA of <u>F Scale</u> scores of <u>Adj</u> , <u>Ret</u> and <u>Dis</u> children with <u>PARI</u> total scores as covariant.	63
17. ANCOVA of <u>F Scale</u> for parents of <u>Adj</u> , <u>Ret</u> and <u>Dis</u> children with <u>PARI</u> total scores as covariant.	65
18. Mean scores on the nine <u>PARI</u> subscales for fathers and mothers of <u>Adj</u> , <u>Ret</u> and <u>Dis</u> children.	67

## LIST OF APPENDICES

	<u>Page</u>
A. <u>Teachers Rating Scale: Special Phenomena</u>	112
B. Letter form to prospective subjects.	113
C. Overall-score rating guide for <u>Problem Situations Task</u> .	114
D. Inter-judge agreement scores.	122
E. <u>PARI</u> .	124
F. Background data scores.	129
G. Solutions to <u>Problem Situations Task</u> by individual situations.	130
H. Distribution of Trend Scores.	136
I. Comparisons of individual and joint conditions scores.	138
J. Intercorrelations of <u>PARI</u> subscales and <u>F Scale</u> .	141
 BIBLIOGRAPHY	 142
 REFERENCE NOTES	 145

## CHAPTER I

## REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE

Kindergarten teachers in Israel, as in other countries state that the children who cause them the most difficulty are the disruptive, unruly and aggressive children, and the reticent children. I discovered, in the course of my daily consultative and clinical work with pre-schoolers in Israel, the two aforementioned types of children to be the reason for most teachers' referrals to psychologists servicing the kindergartens.

The disruptive child.

The disruptive child commands the teacher's immediate attention by detracting from the latter's efforts to teach or to relate to the other children in an orderly and organized manner. Many teachers tend to get drawn into negative interactions with such children in an attempt to control them. This in itself is often the aim of the child and is quite rewarding for him. The disruptive child often poses a challenge to the teacher's authority in the kindergarten.

The reticent child.

The reticent child, on the other hand, often does not arouse the teacher's attention from the outset. He provides the teacher with an obstacle when she attempts to elicit the child's complete participation in the various class activities. At a certain point in the year, the reticent child becomes a challenge to the teacher's ingenuity and sometimes to her authority as well, and the cause of considerable

frustration to the conscientious teacher. Many such children are often taken to be intellectually deficient as the teacher receives no feedback from them as to how much they comprehend or grasp the different materials presented to them.

#### Clinical findings.

As I, in the course of my work, attempted to clarify the basis for the various disruptive and reticent children's behavior, most often the relevant factors went beyond the immediate classroom situation, to the child's relationship with his parents. A typical constellation appeared to emerge consisting of a weak, insecure, at times rejecting mother, alongside an authoritarian, strict yet erratic disciplinarian, fear-evoking father. As there seemed to be a definite indication that the parents' modes of discipline and attitudes towards childrearing were related to the children's problems in the classroom, the area warranted more systematic investigation.

#### Aims of the present investigation.

The present investigation was designed to study the parents of disruptive, reticent as well as well-adjusted five to six year old children with the aim of delineating patterns of childrearing, discipline and parent-child interaction which would be associated with dysfunctional behavior of the children in the classroom: disruptive or reticent, as opposed to patterns which tended to foster positive adjustment to the classroom at that age. It was hoped that by identifying "successful" and "unsuccessful" patterns of parenting, it

would be possible to set up relevant means to work with parents at becoming more effective, once the results of dysfunctional modes were clarified. Furthermore, once the family constellations and interactions were clarified, a further basis for setting up modifications in the child's environment outside the home (primarily the classroom) would be achieved.

#### A question of values.

The literature on parenting is full of value statements made by the different investigators as to what in their opinion constitutes "good" parenting. Levy-Schiff (1978) actually classified two of her four types of paternal behavior as good or bad.

Kohn (1963) attempted to account for the differences in parental styles according to social class and resulting values relevant to that culture. He noticed that working class parents tended to value the child's conforming to externally imposed standards, and to utilize physical punishment in reaction to the child's actions. The middle class parents' concern was with the internal dynamics and motivation of the child rather than with the consequences of his actions. The latter valued self-control and self-direction, and utilized punitive methods consisting of reasoning, loss of love, and inducing guilt, on the basis of their interpretation of the child's intent in a given action. Kohn related these differences to the occupational difference of the two groups and emphasized the point that each parent was preparing his child to deal with the demands of his culture, which required different emphasis. The working class were more authoritarian

while the middle class were more reasoning, supportive and psychologically minded. The essence of Kohn's findings indicates that one must evaluate a parent's style in reference to the adaptiveness to the cultural reality within which the child will have to cope.

It may be that maladaptive behavior for a kindergarten classroom may be highly adaptive and relevant to the ghetto street or to the streets of a development town in Israel of working class North African immigrants from which the present sample was drawn. Aggressive behavior in the classroom may actually be only assertive behavior for the street. If the conscious aim of the parent is to prepare the child to cope with the social environment, then methods designed to toughen him up would be successful for the street, but ineffective for the classroom if the child was unable to discriminate the "ground rules" of each situation.

#### Review of the Literature

The literature tends to support my observation that authoritarian fathers tend to be associated with both disruptive and reticent children.

#### Punitiveness and submission or aggression.

The research on punitiveness has tended to show results in two directions. Several investigators have found parental punitiveness, especially paternal punitiveness, to lead to a frightened, submissive and constricted child who seems to inhibit his or her aggression (Becker et al, 1962; Becker & Krug, 1964; Rosenthal et al, 1962).

Others have found punitiveness to be associated with aggressiveness in the child (Bandura, 1960; Becker & Krug, 1964; Hess & Handel, 1956; Levy-Schiff, 1978; Sears et al, 1953).

#### Sex differences.

Results have at times been different for boys than for girls, as well as for mothers and fathers.

Becker & Krug (1964) found boys to be aggressive in school when mothers were hostile and punitive, while girls were not found to be so. On the other hand, the results were in the opposite direction, though less extreme for fathers (punitive father and aggressive girl, not boy). Their findings confirmed those of Sears et al (1953) for mothers. Sears found the least aggressive girls to have low or high punitive mothers, while boys were found to be linearly related to the mothers' punitiveness (high punitive - high aggressive, etc.). The foregoing studies are especially relevant as they both included interview and questionnaire data for parents as well as measurements of the behavior of pre-school children both in the home and in the classroom.

The varying results have been explained in learning theory terms. Bandura (1960) emphasized the modelling effect a father has when he utilizes aggressive means to deal with his sons, or with other situations in front of his son. This, however, does not explain the findings of both Sears and Becker that a linear correlation between parental and child aggression only held across sex (boys with mothers, girls with fathers). Becker et al (1962) concluded that punishment by

the same sex parent was experienced as more severe and therefore cause higher anxiety about the manifestation of aggressive behavior by the child.

It would seem, furthermore, that whether counter aggression would be manifested by the child, or whether the child would inhibit the aggressive behavior, would depend (for a situation outside the home, such as the classroom) upon how similar the atmosphere was, and how similarly the object of the aggressive behavior behaved towards the child. This shows only how complex the relationships are, and how difficult it becomes to make precise predictions about a child's behavior outside the home on the basis of the relationships within the home.

#### Responsible vs. irresponsible punishment.

A further qualification to the relationship between parental punitiveness and the child's aggressiveness or submissiveness has been raised by Baumrind's research on parental disciplinary patterns (Baumrind, 1966; Baumrind & Black, 1967; Baumrind, 1971), which will be discussed in greater detail below.

Baumrind differentiated between authoritarian parents, who were punitive, strict as well as restrictive with their children in an absolute and arbitrary way, and between authoritative parents who were no less strict or demanding, but who combined their punitiveness with reasoning and a sharing of the rationale for the punishment with the child, alongside considerable emphasis on positive reinforcement of the child's non-conflicting (with the parents) actions. She discovered the

former to have children who were withdrawn and lacking assertiveness, while the latter had the most competent and most adjusted children in the sample (Baumrind & Black, 1967). She concluded that while authority and physical punitiveness were important and in place for the pre-school child, these would have to be presented to the child in a rational form in order for the latter to benefit from the parents' control. Baumrind's work has shown that punitiveness need not be seen ("valued") as a purely negative and deleterious quality in parents. Rather, it must be adequately and precisely assessed as to its positive or negative effects. The negative results have been shown to be in two directions: children become disruptive and aggressive, or reticent and withdrawn. The direction of the effects depends upon the family configuration, the sex of the child, and the situation wherein the child is observed.

#### Dominance, power and control.

Another related area which has come under much scrutiny is that of parental control, power and dominance as opposed to submissiveness and permissiveness and their relation to autonomy, competence and submissiveness in the children.

At a time when libertarian and permissive attitudes were highly valued, Dubin & Dubin (1963) took a position counter to that trend by contending that the first six years of life were the authority inception period wherein it was necessary for the child to experience the parents' authority in order to foster the legitimization of authority in the mind of the child. The child feels reassurance and

respect if he perceives the parent to possess the power to protect and provide for the gratification of his needs (Baumrind, 1975).

Several investigators have emphasized the necessity of the parent and especially the father to be experienced as powerful, dominant and effective in order to be accepted as a model for identification (Baumrind, 1971; Biller, 1974; Radin, 1976). On the other hand, weak parents have been found to provide inadequate models, and not to enable the children to develop self-controls for their behavior (Becker & Krug, 1964; Lynn, 1974). Lynn (1974) contended that parental dominance was curvi linearly related to a child's adjustment and to his competence, where extreme use of power and dominance would dampen motivation and generate anxiety and the rejection of the parents by the children, whereas extremely weak parents could not provide adequate models. Baumrind (1971) found permissive parents to have aimless, immature and unsocialized children, the effect being especially powerful for boys.

The evidence points to the necessity of parents of preschoolers utilizing effective yet moderate power in handling their children. When the parents are too lax or permissive, whether this be out of weakness or ideology, the children do not learn adequate self control, nor do they attain the capacities for social adjustment. Over-control seems, on the other hand, to lead to constriction and resentment in the child.

#### Restrictiveness and control.

Levy-Schiff (1978) found controlling fathers to be associated with lowered personal adjustment and heightened aggressiveness in their

children. Becker & Krug (1964) found some relationship between parental restrictiveness and aggressiveness in their children. Rosenthal et al (1962) found their controlling and rigid fathers to have over conforming, submissive and indirectly aggressive children. Over-control seems, like punitiveness, to lead at times to aggression in the children while at other times to submission, lack of autonomy, and inhibited and indirect aggression in the children.

#### Demands.

Baumrind (1971) stressed the beneficial effects of having parents make demands for mature behavior of their children. Radin (1976) confirmed these findings in a review of studies of paternal behavior and children's cognitive adjustment. On the other hand, deleterious effects have been discovered when parents "push" their children by burdening them with inordinate demands for achievement. Livnay (1974) distinguished between the differential effects of parental expectations and demands of their children according to congruence with the child's abilities, amplitude, consistency and relation to the parents' own frustrations. Both Rosenthal et al (1962) and Jordan et al (1975) confirmed that high and unrealistic demands on the part of parents for children's achievement had a negative effect upon the latter.

#### Nurturance and acceptance vs. hostility and rejection.

Most of the aforementioned researchers have usually qualified their results by adding the dimension of acceptance/rejection of the child by the parent as being significant.

Levy-Schiff (1978) found the combination of a controlling and rejecting parent to be most harmful for the child, even when compared to a father-absent group, in terms of aggressiveness, cooperation, discipline, emotional and cognitive adjustment. This group of fathers was contrasted with a group who were both accepting and conducive to the autonomy of their children. The children of the latter fathers displayed the least aggressiveness, the highest cooperativeness and the highest adjustment in all areas. Though Baumrind (1971) did not find parental "warmth" (nurturance and acceptance) itself to be a significant predictor of child behavior, she did find the combination of high responsiveness and acceptance along with high demands and controls to lead to the most competent and adjusted children in her sample (1980).

Radin (1976) emphasized that a warm and nurturant, accepting father will be most conducive to be imitated by his children. Lamb (1976) found father nurturance rather than masculinity or punitiveness to be the most relevant variable in fostering masculine identity in sons. Several other investigators found the extent of the father's early participation and interest in the child's upbringing was salient for the child's late adjustment and well-being (Lynn, 1974; Pederson et al, 1973; Levy-Schiff, 1978). Levy-Schiff (1978) found furthermore the extent to which the father was a gratifying figure and identified as a source of praise and positive reinforcement increased his effectiveness as a father.

Becker & Krug (1964) found hostility and rejection by the parents

to elicit attention-seeking behavior in the children (akin to disruptive behavior), and for some children, to patterns of inhibited hostility for fear of the consequences of aggressive behavior. The latter thereby contributed to inhibited withdrawal behavior. On the other hand, they found maternal warmth to be most highly correlated with emotional stability.

There have been indications, however, that too much interest and involvement sometimes is confining for the children, especially for girls when the interest is on the part of fathers (Baumrind, 1980; Crandall et al, 1964). The former picked up on indications that there seemed to be sexual tension and sexual teasing in the fathers' approach to their daughters. If the age of the children studied is considered (four to six), then one realizes that both father and daughter are in the midst of what Freud called the Electra Complex, wherein the daughter is swamped by ambivalent feelings of attraction and fear of her attraction for the father (Freud, 1910).

It would seem, therefore, that there are indications that nurturance and acceptance of the child by his parents are vital for his well-being, when there are given in response to the child's needs and are not turned into intrusiveness on the part of the parent. As the child grows, parents have to learn to decrease their presence and participation in order to enable the child to try himself out outside the home (Baumrind, 1980). Though hostility and rejection have been shown to be deleterious, moderately critical attitudes are at times motivating and conducive to intellectual performance (Radin, 1976).

### Dimensions of authority.

Baumrind (1975) reviewed the results of an extended series of investigations (already referred to above) which concerned themselves with identifying patterns of parenting associated with the development of competence in children. She attempted to clarify the complex findings which had emerged in the literature (the complexity of which has already emerged in this review!) by suggesting three patterns of parental behavior: permissive, authoritarian and authoritative.

Baumrind initially studied pre-school children's behavior from which she identified the three different patterns of parenting (Baumrind, . 1966).

Mature children had parents who were both controlling and warm, communicated more clearly with their children; their homes lacked discord and disciplinary friction. The parents used corporal punishment but usually used positive reinforcement to obtain compliance. She designated such parents as authoritative.

Dysphoric and disaffiliative children had parents who were less nurturant and sympathetic with their children; they were inclined to explain the reason for their demands as respect for parental authority and religious belief. They did not attempt to convince the child through the use of reason, to obey a directive. They admitted to frightening the child, were detached, controlling and somewhat cool. These parents were designated authoritarian.

Immature children had parents who were much less controlling, making few demands for mature behavior. Fathers were especially lax,

engaging in less independence training and more babying. They used withdrawal of love and ridicule to obtain compliance. They were designated as permissive.

The next attempted to investigate directly the foregoing patterns through home observations, interviews and attitude questionnaires, and then assessed the behavior of the children upon seven empirical clusters: hostile-friendly; resistive-cooperative; domineering-tractable; dominant-submissive; purposive-aimless; achievement-oriented - non-achievement-oriented; independent-suggestible.

#### Types of parents.

The permissive type of parent emphasizes a benign acceptance of the child's behavior, avoids the exercise of control, gives no encouragement to obeying externally defined standards. The parent is available as a resource but but will not intervene unless asked. Maximum freedom (which is seen as absence of restraint) is granted. The child is consulted about policy decisions.

Daughters in kindergarten were not much affected being somewhat aimless and suggestible. At age nine, they were passive and retiring, cooperative, submissive and conforming. Sons were not achievement-oriented, were hostile with peers, resistant with adults, aimless and unsocialized. At age nine, they were lacking in social responsibility and independence.

Authoritarian parents are physically punitive, demanding obedience, stressing their word without allowing verbal give and take;

the parents go by tradition and a strict moral code - an absolute standard of conduct derived from a higher authority. They are punitive when the child's actions or beliefs conflict with "correct" conduct.

Daughters were well socialized, submissive, aimless and not achievement-oriented in kindergarten. At nine, the girls were distinguishable only in that they challenged themselves cognitively. The sons were like the sons of permissive parents (hostile with peers, resistant with adults, aimless and unsocialized), only more achievement-oriented in kindergarten. At nine, their only distinguishing characteristic was aimlessness.

Authoritative parents direct their children in a rational, issue-oriented manner. They encourage verbal give and take and show respect for the child, but take responsibility for decisions. Both autonomous self-will as well as disciplined conformity are valued. They will assert firm control when in conflict without over-restricting the child.

Daughters were dominant, purposive and achievement-oriented (actually furthest from the feminine stereotype) in kindergarten. At nine, they were domineering, creative, differentiated and socially confident. Sons were friendly, cooperative, tractable, achievement-oriented, yet not as dominant or purposive as would be expected in kindergarten. At nine, they were altruistic and cooperative. Baumrind felt that the latter type with its firm control tended to produce very assertive and dominant girls, and meeker boys, where the firm control seemed to be impairing independent action.

### Dimensions of parental behavior.

Baumrind (1980) classified her three types along two dimensions of responsiveness and demandingness, which she saw also akin to Parsons' (1955) dichotomy of expressive-instrumental. She saw the permissive parent as being moderate to high upon responsiveness, but low on demandingness. The authoritarian was low on responsiveness and high on demands. The authoritative parents were high on both. She also discovered a fourth type in her followup (1980) which she classified as non-conforming or democratic, which was high on responsive but only moderate on demands.

The foregoing research points to significant and complex relationships between parental patterns of discipline, control, and responsiveness, and the social, personal and intellectual adjustment of their offspring. Furthermore, specific effects depend upon the sex of the parent and child.

### Hypotheses

On the basis of the literature, it would be expected that the parents of well-adjusted children (those not manifesting any problem in social adjustment nor manifesting symptoms of personal maladjustment) would display attitudes of moderate to high responsiveness to the needs of their children, along with a display of moderate to high control or punitiveness. This would reflect an authoritative pattern of parenting.

The parents of disruptive children would be expected to display

two possible patterns: a. attitudes of low responsiveness alongside high control/punitiveness, reflecting an authoritarian orientation; or b. attitudes of moderate to high responsiveness alongside low control reflecting a permissive pattern of parenting.

The parents of reticent children would be expected to display attitudes of low responsiveness alongside high control as reflecting an authoritarian pattern of parenting.

#### Techniques of measurement.

Most of the above investigators included teacher ratings in order to assess the children's behavior in kindergarten (Becker et al, 1962; Levy-Schiff, 1978; Sears et al, 1953).

The assessment of parental behavior and attitudes has most often been achieved through a combination of interviews and paper and pencil attitude questionnaires (Baumrind, 1971; Becker et al, 1962; Levy-Schiff, 1978). The most widely used parental attitude questionnaire has been the Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI) first developed by Schaefer & Bell (1955) and translated into Hebrew by Levy-Schiff (1978), the latter having corresponding versions for fathers and mothers. The most widely used measure of authoritarianism has been the Fascism Scale (F Scale), developed by Adorno et al (1950). Baumrind supplemented the above techniques by an extensive set of home observations of the parents over a large number of hours spread over many visits. Others, however, have found a viable and more economic alternative in presenting parents with problem situations which they are requested to solve in front of experimenter (Farina & Holzberg,

1968; Ferreira & Winter, 1966; Jackson, 1956). The latter method has most often been presented to each parent alone, and subsequently to both together with a request to come to mutual agreement according to the procedure developed by Strodbeck (1951).

Hypothesis 1: The parents of well-adjusted children would reveal an authoritative pattern of parenting.

A - Well-adjusted children would have parents who would give responses rated higher upon authoritativeness to the Problem Situation Task than would the parents of disruptive or reticent children

B - Well-adjusted children would have parents who would achieve moderate scores of authoritarianism on the F Scale, as measured by low deviation scores from the mean scores of the study population.

Hypothesis 2: The parents of disruptive children would reveal either authoritarian or permissive patterns of parenting.

A - Disruptive children would have parents who would give responses rated either higher on permissiveness or authoritarianism to the Problem Situations Task than would the parents of well-adjusted children. By definition, permissiveness and authoritarianism are inversely related.

B - Disruptive children would have parents who would achieve either high or low scores of authoritarianism on the F Scale, as measured by high deviation from the mean scores.

Hypothesis 3: Reticent children would have parents revealing

authoritarian patterns of parenting.

A - Reticent children would have parents who would give responses rated higher on authoritarianism to the Problem Situations Task than would the parents of well-adjusted children.

B - Reticent children would have parents who would achieve high scores of authoritarianism on the F Scale as measured by high deviation from the mean scores.

At this point, there is insufficient basis and rationale to offer specific hypotheses dealing with the interaction between each mother and father. The data was examined clinically to determine if trends exist which would warrant future investigation.

## CHAPTER II

## METHOD

The study was conducted in Beit Shemesh, Israel, a development town of 14,000 inhabitants, predominantly of North African origin. Most of the inhabitants are working class, while recently there has been a slight rise of middle class professionals moving into the town.

Subjects:

The subjects consisted of three groups of ten children each (five boys, five girls) identified as disruptive, reticent, or 'adjusted, and their respective 60 parents. The subjects were drawn from the total population of 270 children who attended compulsory kindergartens in Beit Shemesh during the 1970-1980 academic year. Those children with significant physical defects, or mental defectives were eliminated from consideration.

Subject Selection:

All of the children completing kindergarten in Beit Shemesh were assessed by their teachers as to their readiness to undertake Elementary School studies. To that end, in June of 1980, all of the kindergarten teachers (13) filled out a comprehensive questionnaire for each child (Teachers Rating Scale - Appendix A).

The five boys and the five girls rated highest upon the disruptiveness cluster were chosen to compose the Disruptives group (Dis). Likewise, the five boys and the five girls rated highest on the reticence cluster were chosen to compose the Reticents group (Ret).

Extreme scores were chosen on the basis of at least one standard deviation above the population mean. As an additional check of the fact that those children rated as being extreme on either scale actually manifested the two behaviors, it was decided to interview the 13 teachers in September of 1980. Each teacher was requested to rate those children in their former class who had manifested extreme disruptiveness or reticence. Only those children who had obtained high ratings from both the interview and questionnaire were chosen to compose the experimental groups. The Adjusted group (Adj) was chosen by taking the five boys and the five girls who were most problem-free (lowest scores on the total questionnaire as well as symptom-free on the two specific clusters) and who manifested high participation in social and cognitive activities within the kindergarten. As 24 children met the above criteria, the ten adjusted children were chosen using a random numbers table.

#### Sample Characteristics:

The data for the children completing kindergarten in June, 1980 were collected by the Psychologists of the Psychological Service. Teachers' ratings were received for 251 children (out of 270 children attending First Grade in Fall, 1980).

The mean scores and standard deviations for the total population, and for the three groups on the disruptiveness and reticence clusters, are shown in Table 1.

The teacher's ratings were given on a scale ranging from 1 (no display of the phenomenon) to 4 (frequent display of the phenomenon).

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations of the Teacher's Rating Scale for the total kindergarten population and for the selected subgroups.

Group		Reticence Score			Disruptiveness Score	
		N	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
<u>Adj</u>	Boys + Girls	10	4.8	.9	5.8	.9
	Boys	5	4.4	.8	5.6	.8
	Girls	5	5.2	.8	6.0	.9
<u>Ret</u>	Boys + Girls	10	10.3	1.3	8.4	2.1
	Boys	5	11.0	1.6	9.3	1.3
	Girls	5	9.8	.8	7.8	2.3
<u>Dis</u>	Boys + Girls	10	7.1	1.8	15.9	2.3
	Boys	5	7.4	2.4	17.6	.8
	Girls	5	6.8	.8	14.2	2.1
General	Boys	132 <sup>a</sup>	7.1	4.4	10.0	3.9
Population	Girls	115 <sup>b</sup>	6.8	2.1	8.1	2.8

Note. a - N for disruptiveness was 135.  
b - N for disruptiveness was 116.

Population trends. The data indicated that boys on the whole were found to be rated higher on disruptiveness than girls in the population ( $t = 4.44$ ;  $p < .001$ ). The latter finding was to be expected considering the higher activity level and greater aggressiveness of boys at this age. In contrast, no significant differences were noted on reticence ratings between boys and girls. It might have been expected that girls would display more reticence than boys. The question of the validity of the reticence cluster will be discussed further below.

Adjusted children. As is shown in Table 1, Adj children received ratings lower than the general population upon both clusters. Two points are noteworthy. First of all, none of the Adj were totally "problem-free". Second of all, girls obtained slightly higher ratings than did boys, contrary to the trend for the population in general.

Reticent children. Ret children were rated slightly lower than the population in general on disruptiveness: 9.25 for boys and 7.8 for girls, though both ratings were higher than those for Adj children. In contrast, Ret children obtained much higher ratings on reticence than the population in general: 11 for boys and 9.8 for girls.

Disruptive children. Table 1 indicates that Dis children were rated similarly to the general population for reticence: girls obtained a rating of 6.8, almost identical to the mean general rating, while boys were rated a bit higher (7.4). In vivid contrast, the ratings for disruptiveness were much higher: 17.4 for boys and 14.2 for girls.

### Teacher interviews.

The retrospective ratings of the teachers in the September interviews gave added confirmation of the reticence of disruptiveness of the various children. Of further note was the trend for several teachers to indicate that those children who were most disruptive in their classes had shown signs of considerable reticence as well. On the whole, the latter (usually boys) would be usually quiet and withdrawn, and suddenly would strike out and disrupt. This phenomenon will be discussed further below. In terms of the two experimental samples, all of the boys who were chosen for the Ret group were reticent without signs of disruptiveness. On the other hand, some of the boys in the Dis group manifested some signs of reticence besides their obvious pattern of disruptiveness.

### Background data.

An inspection of the following background variables of the children and their parents was undertaken in order to control for extraneous variance. No significant differences were found between the Adj, Ret, and Dis groups in a series of ANOVA's applied to the variables of Father Education ( $F(2,27) = 2.24$ ); Mother Education ( $F(2,27) = .147$ ); Birth Order of children ( $F(2,27) = .59$ ); Number of Siblings ( $F(2,27) = .147$ ). It can therefore be concluded that the groups could not be distinguished on the basis of birth order or number of siblings, or of education of the parents. (See Appendix F for a listing of the means of the groups upon the above variables).

Procedure:

Each family was contacted first by letter (letter form, Appendix B) explaining the study, and subsequently by phone or in person (for those without phones). Out of the 33 families contacted, 31 families agreed to participate in the study. One family was dropped as it was impossible to find a mutually acceptable time. Each family was interviewed in their home in the evening, at a time when the younger children were already in bed. The interview data were recorded on audiotape. Each parent was given the following tasks separately, the sequence of presentation being balanced between mothers and fathers:

Problem Situations Task. (see Table 11) A series of 8 situations involving children in various problematic settings, wherein the parent was asked to reveal how he or she would react to the child's actions in order to resolve the situation. All the responses were recorded on audiotape and subsequently reviewed and scored according to the Rating Guide (Appendix C) as to the style utilized by the parent for each situation (permissive, authoritative or authoritarian). An initial perusal of the data indicated that in contrast to Baumrind's (1980) findings that different parents use different styles. They may initially react permissively, yet continue and shift to a more authoritarian style, etc. It was therefore decided to give two separate scores for each situation:

1. An overall score reflecting a clinical judgement of the global impression elicited by the parent's total response, which consisted for each situation one of the three styles (permissive,

authoritative or authoritarian). Each parent, thus received a total score over the eight situations which reflected the combination of the three styles utilized by the latter (i.e. permissive - 3; authoritative - 4; authoritarian - 1).

2. A trend score reflecting the sequence of one or more of the styles used for each situation (i.e. permissive - 1 authoritative - 2 permissive - 3 - begins with a permissive style, as continues, reflects a more authoritative style, yet completes the situation by returning to being more permissive).

The Rating Guide was elaborated on the basis of Baumrind's (1971) delineation of the different patterns of parental discipline orientations. A judgement reliability rating was obtained by having a second rater (D.W., an experienced Psychiatrist) score the data of six families (randomly selected, one from each group). The comparison between the two raters yielded 90% agreement 85% for the 48 pairs of scores. The ratings for the two judges are shown in Appendix D.

Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI): (See Appendix E) A shortened and modified 38 item version of Levy-Schiff's (1978) Hebrew modification of the original PARI (Schaefer & Bell, 1955). The PARI was answered using a six-point likert scale ranging from extreme disagreement to total agreement with each statement.

Fascism Scale (F Scale). (Adorno et al, 1950) (See Appendix E items 39-68). The Hebrew translation of the 30 item form. While one parent responded to the Problem Situations Task in my presence, the other parent filled out the PARI and the F Scale in a separate room to

insure independent responses. Each parent, upon completion of the first task, switched with the other parent and proceeded to the second task. When each parent had completed both the Problem Situations Task as well as the questionnaires, both were brought together before me and requested to respond to the Problem Situations Task for a second time, with instructions to arrive at a response which reflected each situation as if they were together before the child's behavior; "Imagine this time that you are witnessing the identical situation as before, yet this time, you are together. How would you react?"

## CHAPTER III

## RESULTS

Overall Score Results

The 60 parents studied responded to eight situations each on the Problem Situations Task, yielding a total of 480 responses. The distribution of permissive, authoritative, and authoritarian responses (in percentage scores) by groups, sex of children, sex of parent are shown in Table 2.

Before undertaking a test of the hypotheses, an examination of the extent to which the three types of responses were unitized by all of the parents was deemed fruitful.

Examination of the distribution of the scores for both parents combined indicates that almost half (46%) of all responses were rated as authoritative, 36% were rated permissive, while only 18% were rated authoritarian. Inspection of the data for fathers indicates an almost equal distribution between authoritative (42%) and permissive (39%) responses, with lesser use of authoritarian responses (19%). The data for mothers indicates a somewhat different distribution, with a preponderance of authoritative responses (51%) over permissive (33%) or authoritarian (16%) responses.

The fact that the eight situation of the Problem Situations Task did not elicit an equal distribution of the three responses complicates somewhat the testing of the hypotheses. The subsequent results will have to be assessed in light of the unequal overall distributions. The distributions and their ramifications will be discussed in further

Table 2

Percentage of parents using overall permissive, authoritative or authoritarian solutions to the Problem Situations Task by groups.

Responses in Percentages				
	N	<u>permissive</u>	<u>authoritative</u>	<u>authoritarian</u>
<u>Both parents</u>	60	36	46	18
<u>Adj</u>				
Boys + Girls	20	28	59	13
Boys	10	29	56	15
Girls	10	26	62	12
<u>Ret</u>				
Boys + Girls	20	41	41	18
Boys	10	43	32	25
Girls	10	39	49	12
<u>Dis</u>				
Boys + Girls	20	39	39	22
Boys	10	36	37	27
Girls	10	41	41	18

Table 2 (continued)

Responses in Percentages				
	N	<u>permissive</u>	<u>authoritative</u>	<u>authoritarian</u>
<u>Fathers only</u>	30	39	42	19
<u>Adj</u>				
Boys + Girls	10	37	51	12
Boys	5	37	50	13
Girls	5	35	52	13
<u>Ret</u>				
Boys + Girls	10	41	36	23
Boys	5	38	35	27
Girls	5	45	37	18
<u>Dis</u>				
Boys + Girls	10	40	37	23
Boys	5	38	35	27
Girls	5	42	40	18

Table 2 (continued)

Responses in Percentages				
	N	<u>permissive</u>	<u>authoritative</u>	<u>authoritarian</u>
<u>Mothers only</u>	30	33	51	16
<u>Adj</u>				
Boys + Girls	10	19	67	14
Boys	5	20	62	18
Girls	5	17	73	10
<u>Ret</u>				
Boys + Girls	10	40	45	15
Boys	5	47	30	23
Girls	5	33	60	7
<u>Dis</u>				
Boys + Girls	10	38	41	21
Boys	5	35	40	25
Girls	5	40	42	18

detail below.

The subsequent analyses will be using the actual number of the different responses for each group and subgroup.

Parents of Adj. children.

Hypothesis 1A stated that the parents of Adj. children would give responses rated more frequently as authoritative than would parents of Ret or Dis children. The results of an ANOVA (three way design with repeated measures) applied to the distribution of authoritative responses for the three groups by gender of children and parents are reported in Table 3.

The results indicate a significant difference between groups (Adj - Ret - Dis) ( $p < .05$ ; two tailed test). On the other hand, no significant differences were found for gender of children or parents.

The results of t tests for difference between the means of authoritative responses given by Adj., Ret., and Dis groups to the Problem Situations Task are listed in Table 4. The results for both parents indicate that parents of Adj children gave a significantly higher number of authoritative responses to the situations than did parents of Ret children ( $t(18) = 2.29$ ;  $p < .025$ ; one tail test). Likewise, the parents of Dis children gave much fewer authoritative responses to the situations than the Adj group ( $t(18) = 3.13$ ;  $p < .005$ ). In contrast, the differences between Dis and Ret groups were not demonstrated to differ from chance.

The results for fathers indicated differences in the expected direction which barely reached significance. Fathers of Adj children

Table 3

ANOVA of authoritative solutions for groups by gender of child  
for mothers and fathers.

Source of Variation	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Between Children</u>	127.9	29		
Groups	32.1	2	16.1	4.51 <sup>a</sup>
Gender	7.4	1	7.4	2.06 ns
Groups x Gender	2.8	2	1.4	-
Children Within Groups	85.4	24	3.6	
<u>Within Children</u>	96.5	30		
Parents	8.8	1	8.8	2.69
Groups x Parents	2.5	2	1.3	-
Gender x Parents	2.8	1	2.8	-
Groups x Parents x Gender	3.7	2	1.9	-
Parents x Children Within Groups	78.6	24	3.3	

Note. <sup>a</sup>  $F(2,24)=3.40$ ;  $p<.05$

Table 4

Mean scores of number of authoritative responses to the Problem Situation Task for Adj, Ret and Dis groups.

	<u>Adj</u>	<u>Ret</u>	<u>Dis</u>	<u>t (18 df) 1 tail test</u>		
				<u>Adj-Ret</u>	<u>Adj-Dis</u>	<u>Ret-Dis</u>
Both Parents	9.5	6.5	6.3	2.3 <sup>c</sup>	3.13 <sup>e</sup>	<u>a</u>
Fathers	4.1	2.9	3.0	1.9 <sup>b</sup>	1.69ns	<u>a</u>
Mothers	5.4	3.6	3.3	1.8 <sup>b</sup>	2.76 <sup>d</sup>	<u>a</u>

Notes

- a - t values <.5 are not listed.  
b - t(18)=1.73; p<.05  
c - t(18)=2.14; p<.025  
d - t(18)=2.55; p<.01  
e - t(18)=2.88; p<.005

gave more authoritative responses than both fathers of Ret children ( $p < .05$ ), and Dis children, though the latter differences just failed to be demonstrated to differ from chance ( $t(18) = 1.69$ ).

The results for mothers indicated that mothers of Adj children gave a much greater number of authoritative responses to the situations than either mothers of Dis children ( $p < .01$ ) or of Ret children ( $p < .05$ ).

On the whole, the results lend considerable support for hypothesis 1A in that parents of Adj children gave much more authoritative responses to the Problem Situations Task than parents of Ret and Dis children.

#### Parents of Dis children.

Hypothesis 2A stipulated that Dis children would have parents who would give more permissive or authoritarian responses to the Problem Situations Task than parents of Adj children.

Analysis of authoritarian responses. The results of ANOVA (three way design with repeated measures) applied to the distribution of authoritarian responses for groups by gender of children and parents are shown in Table 5.

The results reveal the absence of differences between groups in the use of authoritarian responses in the situations. On the other hand, a significant effect emerged for boys vs. girls ( $p < .05$ ). Examination of the percentage distributions listed in Table 2 indicated that the differences reflected a greater use of authoritarian responses among parents of boys as opposed to girls, irrespective of groups or gender of parent.

Table 5

ANOVA of authoritarian solutions to the Problem Situations Task  
for Adj, Ret and Dis groups, for mothers and fathers.

Source of Variation	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Between Children</u>	41.7	29		
Groups	5.0	2	2.5	2.1 ns
Gender	6.7	1	6.7	5.55 <sup>a</sup>
Groups x Gender	1.2	2	0.6	-
Children Within Groups	28.8	24	1.2	
<u>Within Children</u>	31.0	30		
Parents	0.6	1	0.6	-
Groups x Parents	1.3	2	0.7	-
Gender x Parents	0.3	1	0.3	-
Groups x Parents x Gender	0.4	2	0.2	-
Parents x Children Within Groups	78.6	24	3.3	

Note. <sup>a</sup>  $F(1,24)=4.26; p<.05$

The results of t tests for the difference between the means of authoritarian responses to the situations for Adj, Ret, and Dis groups are listed in Table 6.

The data for both parents revealed that parents of Dis children gave a higher number of authoritarian responses to the situations than did the parents of Adj children ( $t(18)=2.19$ ;  $p<.025$ ). The results for fathers were not demonstrated to differ from chance. Likewise, the results for mothers failed to discriminate between Adj and Ret groups though the differences between mothers of Adj and Dis children just missed reaching significance at the .05 level ( $t=1.61$ ).

Analysis of permissive responses. The results of an ANOVA (three way design with repeated measures) applied to the distribution of permissive responses for Adj, Ret and Dis groups for boys and girls and for fathers and mothers are shown in Table 7.

An examination of the results reveals the absence of differences for groups, gender of children and parents.

The results of t test for the difference between the means of permissive responses to the Problem Situations Task for Adj, Ret and Dis groups is shown in Table 8.

The scores for both parents show that parents of Dis children gave more permissive responses to the Problem Situations Task than did parents of Adj children ( $t(18)=2.69$ ;  $p<.01$ ). The results for mothers yielded almost identical differences ( $t(18)=2.68$ ;  $p<.01$ ) on the other hand, no significant differences were revealed for fathers.

In summary, the data tended to lend support for hypothesis 2A in

Table 6

Mean numbers of authoritarian solutions to the Problem Situations  
Task for Adj, Ret and Dis groups.

	<u>Adj</u>	<u>Ret</u>	<u>Dis</u>	t (18 df) 1 tail test		
				<u>Adj-Ret</u>	<u>Adj-Dis</u>	<u>Ret-Dis</u>
Both Parents	2.1	3.0	3.5	1.2 ns	2.19 <sup>b</sup>	.63 ns
Fathers	1.0	1.8	1.8	1.4 ns	1.44 ns	<u>a</u>
Mothers	1.1	1.2	1.7	<u>a</u>	1.62 ns	1.29 ns

Notes

a - t values <.5 are not listed.

b - t(18)=2.1; p<.025

Table 7

ANOVA of permissive responses to the Problem Situations Task for Adj., Ret and Dis groups by gender of child and for mothers and fathers.

---

Source of Variation	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Between Children</u>	76.2	29		
Groups	12.9	2	6.4	2.5 ns
Gender	0.2	1	0.2	-
Groups x Gender	1.4	2	0.7	-
Children Within Groups	61.8	24	2.6	
<u>Within Children</u>	69.5	30		
Parents	4.8	1	4.8	2.09 ns
Groups x Parents	5.2	2	2.6	1.13 ns
Gender x Parents	1.3	1	1.3	-
Groups x Parents x Gender	2.7	2	1.3	-
Parents x Children Within Groups	55.4	24	2.3	

---

Note. \*  $F(2,24)=2.54$ ;  $p<.10$

Table 8

Mean numbers of permissive solutions to the Problem Situations  
Task for Adj, Ret and Dis groups.

	<u>Adj</u>	<u>Ret</u>	<u>Dis</u>	<u>t tests (18 df)</u>		
				<u>Adj-Ret</u>	<u>Adj-Dis</u>	<u>Ret-Dis</u>
Both Parents	4.4	6.5	6.2	1.94 <sup>b</sup>	2.69 <sup>c</sup>	<u>a</u>
Fathers	2.9	3.3	3.2	<u>a</u>	<u>a</u>	<u>a</u>
Mothers	1.5	3.2	3.0	1.98 <sup>b</sup>	2.68 <sup>c</sup>	<u>a</u>

Notes

a - t values < .5 .

b - t(18)=1.7; p<.05

c - t(18)=2.5; p<.01

that, on the whole, parents of Dis children tended to give more authoritarian and permissive responses to the Problem Situations Task than did parents of Adj children.

In general, parents of boys gave more authoritarian responses than parents of girls (irrespective of groups).

#### Parents of Ret children.

Hypothesis 3A stipulated that parents of Ret children would give more authoritarian responses to the Problem Situations Task than would parents of Adj children.

The results listed in Table 6 indicate that none of the differences between Ret and Adj groups were demonstrated to be different from chance, though the differences for both parents, and especially for fathers ( $t = 1.44$ ) were in the expected direction.

The results did not support hypothesis 3A, though the data for the fathers might indicate the feasibility of further investigation.

In light of the rather weak results for authoritarianism, it might be fruitful to examine the findings for permissiveness, though no previous hypotheses were formulated. It would be expected that parents of Ret children reveal a greater use of permissive responses to the Problem Situations Task than would parents of Adj children.

Examination of the results in Table 8 indicates significant differences for both parents ( $t(18) = 1.94$ ;  $p < .05$ ) and for mothers ( $t(18) = 1.98$ ;  $p < .05$ ). In contrast, the data for fathers failed to reveal any differences between the two groups.

### Overall comparison of groups.

In order to test for differences among the three groups' responses in one overall comparison, the three types of responses were ranked and weighted. The authoritative solution was weighted 2, permissive weighted 0, and authoritarian weighted - 2. The mean scores for the three groups are presented in Table 9.

The results of a Mann-Whitney U test run on comparisons between rankings of the weighted scores of the three groups are shown in Table 10.

The analysis yielded results similar to those described above in the separate score tests: there emerged a very significant difference for both parents between the Adj and Dis groups ( $p < .02$ ), and a lesser difference between Adj and Ret groups ( $p < .10$ ) while no differences were revealed between Ret and Dis groups. When scores for fathers and mothers were analyzed separately a significant difference emerged only between mothers of Adj and Dis groups ( $p < .05$ ).

### Tentative pattern analyses.

Of the 60 parents studied only two gave a single type of response to all eight of the situations while 13 gave only two types of responses. The majority of parents (45) used combinations in permissive, authoritative and authoritarian responses to the Problem Situations Task.

Therefore, following separate analyses of permissive, authoritative and authoritarian responses, it would seem warranted to examine the extent to which different combinations of responses were manifested

Table 9

Mean weighted scores for fathers, mothers and for both parents for Adj, Ret and Dis groups for rank comparisons.

---

	Fathers	Mothers	Both Parents
<u>Adj</u>			
Boys + Girls	6.4	8.6	7.7
Boys	6.0	7.2	6.6
Girls	6.8	10.0	8.4
<u>Ret</u>			
Boys + Girls	2.4	5.0	3.7
Boys	1.6	2.0	1.8
Girls	3.2	8.0	5.6
<u>Dis</u>			
Boys + Girls	2.2	3.6	2.9
Boys	1.2	3.2	2.2
Girls	3.2	4.0	3.6

---

Table 10

Mean ranks and Mann-Whitney  $\underline{U}$  comparisons for fathers, mothers and both parents for Adj, Ret and Dis groups.

---

	<u>Adj</u> vs <u>Ret</u>			<u>Adj</u> vs <u>Dis</u>			<u>Adj</u> vs <u>Dis</u>		
			U			U			U
Both parents	13.1	8.0	24.5 <sup>c</sup>	13.9	7.1	16 <sup>a</sup>	11.6	9.5	39.5
Fathers	12.6	8.5	29.5	12.6	8.4	29	10.5	10.6	49.5
Mothers	12.2	8.9	33.5	13.4	7.7	21.5 <sup>b</sup>	11.8	9.3	37.5

---

Notes

- a)  $\underline{U}=19$ ;  $p<.10$ .  
 b)  $\underline{U}=23$ ;  $p<.05$ .  
 c)  $\underline{U}=27$ ;  $p<.10$ .

by each group, by mothers vs. fathers of boys vs. girls.

Parents of Adj children. An examination of the distributions listed in Table 2 revealed that parents of Adj children utilized a pattern composed of a predominance of authoritative responses (59%) with some permissive (27%) and few authoritarian (13%) responses. Mothers of girls exhibited the most pronounced preference for authoritative responses (73%) with only minor use of permissive (17%) and authoritarian (10%) responses. The pattern for mothers of boys was less pronounced but in the same direction with 62% of all responses being authoritative with minor use of permissive (20%) and authoritarian (17.5%). In contrast, the pattern for fathers indicated a smaller yet still considerable preference for authoritative responses (51%) over permissive responses (36%) as opposed to few authoritarian responses (13%), there being no discrimination between boys and girls. The patterns for mothers and fathers of Adj children when compared using a Chi Square Test was found to be different from chance ( $p < .05$ ). In summary, the pattern for parents of Adj children can be described as reflecting a high preference for the use of authoritative responses, with some use of permissive responses and little use of authoritarian responses. Mothers of Adj children reflected the tendency to giving authoritative responses to a greater extent than did fathers.

Parents of Dis children. Inspection of the results for both parents indicated an equal preference for giving permissive or authoritative responses (39%) to the situations, with a lesser reliance upon authoritarian responses (22%). The data for fathers and mothers

reflected the same distribution between responses. The data for boys vs. girls indicated a difference in the direction of a greater use of authoritarian responses for boys (27%) than for girls (18%), for all parents.

Parents of Ret children. The pattern which emerged upon inspection of the results for both parents indicated one identical to that described above for parents of Dis children equal preference for permissive and authoritative responses (41%) alongside lesser use of authoritarian responses (18%). When the data was examined separately for boys vs. girls, two different patterns emerged: parents of boys indicated a preference for permissive responses (43%) over both authoritative (32%) and authoritarian (25%) responses. In contrast, parents of girls showed a preference for the use of authoritative responses (49%) over yet considerable use of permissive (39%) responses while only slight use of authoritarian responses (12%). A comparison of the distributions of responses for parents of Ret boys as opposed to Ret girls by the use of a Chi Square Test revealed them to be different from chance ( $\chi^2(2)=6.24$ ;  $p<.05$ ).

Examination of the data for fathers and mothers separately indicates that the above differences between boys and girls stemmed exclusively from the results for mothers. The data for fathers indicated that the latter used slightly more permissive responses (41%) than authoritative responses (36%) with fewer authoritarian responses (23%). Fathers of girls showed an even greater preference for permissive responses (45%) than authoritative responses (37%) in sharp

contrast to the pattern for girls of both parents described above.

On the other hand, mothers of boys indicated a clear preference to giving permissive responses (47%) vs. lesser use of both authoritative (30%) and authoritarian (23%) responses. In sharp contrast, mothers of girls showed a great preference for authoritative responses (60%) with lesser use of permissive responses (33%) and almost negligible use of authoritarian responses (7%). Comparison of the distribution of scores for mothers boys and girls through a Chi Square Test revealed them to be significantly different from chance ( $\chi^2(2)=8.12$ ;  $p<.02$ ).

The examination of the data of Ret children indicates a greater diversity of trends than for the Adj and Dis groups. This impression was supported as well by the higher variance of scores for the groups.

Comparison of group trends. The foregoing inspections for each group pointed to two different overall patterns: parents of Adj children gave the highest proportion of authoritative responses with less permissive and even fewer authoritarian responses. The alternative pattern was exhibited both by Ret and Dis parents - an equal distribution of permissive and authoritative responses with less authoritarian responses. A comparison between the patterns of the three groups for both parents using a Chi Square Test for three independent samples yielded highly significant differences ( $\chi^2(4)=16.68$ ;  $p<.01$ ). Likewise, a comparison of the patterns for mothers only was also highly significant ( $\chi^2(4)=13.43$ ;  $p<.01$ ). The patterns for fathers however, were not demonstrated to be different

from chance.

Analysis by situations.

To date, the data presented has constituted composite scores overall eight situations of the Problem Situations Task. It might be questioned to what extent the different situations elicited similar responses according to groups, fathers and mothers, for boys and girls? The number of fathers, mothers, as well as both parents choosing permissive, authoritative or authoritarian solutions for each situation is listed in Appendix G, per group and sex of child.

The separate situations are listed in Table 11 and will be further described below. The frequencies of permissive, authoritative and authoritarian responses given by fathers and mothers and both parents for boys and girls of Adj., Ret and Dis groups were compared for each situation using the Fisher Exact Test at the .05 level of Probability. The results of the comparisons are listed in Table 12. The distributions of the three responses were tested as well by use of a Chi Square Test and are listed as well in Table 12. In two cases, the results were compared for permissive and authoritative scores only (wherein authoritarian scores were of a negligible frequency) by use of the Fisher Exact Test. These are listed as well in Table 12.

Examination of the results indicated that four situations (3,4,7 & 8) yielded clear differences between groups, whereas the remaining four (1,2,5,6) yielded inconclusive differences which could not be demonstrated to be different from chance. Those indicating supportive trends will be discussed later.

Table 11

List of the eight situations of the Problem Situations Task

1. While playing a construction game, your five-year old son bangs the hammer on his thumb and loudly releases a chain of curses.
2. You come home to discover that your six-year old daughter has just cut her beautiful locks.
3. After he is served a tasty meal, your six-year old son declares that he isn't hungry!
4. When you tell your four-year old son that he cannot have a candy before supper (one hour before supper-time), he begins to kick and shout.
5. You glance out the window and notice that your five-year old son just pushed the three-year old neighbor's daughter off her bicycle and took the bicycle from her.
6. A gang of boys call your eight-year old son to come out and play. You don't think that it is good for him to play with them, but he starts to go out the door.
7. You bought a new game for your seven-year old daughter for her birthday. After five minutes that she tries to play, she breaks up all that she has done.
8. You are looking out the window and notice the father (mother) of a neighboring child is shouting loudly at your son and even raises his (her) hand at him. Your son begins to cry.

Table 12

Analysis of significant comparisons at the .05 level of probability by individual situations of the Problem Situations Task: Comparisons between boys and girls for frequencies of permissive, authoritative or authoritarian responses, and of distributions of the responses by use of Fisher's Exact Test.

Situation	Type of Response			
	<u>permissive</u>	<u>authoritative</u>	<u>authoritarian</u>	Distribution
1.	ns	ns	ns	ns
2.	ns	ns	ns	ns
3. <u>Both Parents</u>		<u>Adj</u> > <u>Ret</u>		<u>Adj vs Ret</u>
		<u>Adj</u> > <u>Dis</u>		vs <u>Dis</u> <sup>a</sup>
		<u>Adj</u> boys > <u>Ret</u> boys		
	<u>Fathers vs Mothers</u>			
	Fa <u>Adj</u> > Mo <u>Adj</u>	Mo <u>Adj</u> > Fa <u>Adj</u>		
	Fa <u>Adj</u> girls > Mo <u>Adj</u> girls	Mo <u>Adj</u> girls > Fa <u>Adj</u> girls		
	<u>Mothers only</u>			
	<u>Ret</u> > <u>Adj</u>	<u>Adj</u> > <u>Ret</u>		
	<u>Ret</u> girls > <u>Adj</u> girls	<u>Adj</u> boys > <u>Ret</u> boys		
	<u>Dis</u> > <u>Adj</u>	<u>Adj</u> girls > <u>Ret</u> girls		
		<u>Adj</u> > <u>Dis</u>		
		<u>Adj</u> boys > <u>Dis</u> boys		
		<u>Adj</u> girls > <u>Dis</u> girls		
4. <u>Both Parents</u>		<u>Adj</u> boys > <u>Ret</u> boys	<u>Ret</u> > <u>Adj</u> boys	<u>Adj vs Ret</u> <sup>b</sup>
				<u>Adj vs Dis</u> <sup>c</sup>
	<u>Fathers only</u>			
		<u>Adj</u> boys > <u>Ret</u> boys		
5.	ns	ns	ns	ns
6.	ns	ns	ns	ns

Table 12 (continued)

Situation	Type of Response			Distribution
	<u>permissive</u>	<u>authoritative</u>	<u>authoritarian</u>	
7. <u>Both Parents</u>		<u>Adj</u> > <u>Dis</u>		<u>Adj</u> vs <u>Dis</u> <sup>d</sup>
<u>Mothers only</u>		<u>Adj</u> > <u>Dis</u>		<u>Adj</u> vs <u>Dis</u> <sup>d</sup>
8. <u>Both Parents</u>		<u>Adj</u> > <u>Dis</u>		<u>Adj</u> vs <u>Ret</u> vs <u>Dis</u> <sup>e</sup> <u>Adj</u> vs <u>Dis</u> <sup>f</sup> <u>Ret</u> vs <u>Dis</u> <sup>e</sup>

Notes

- a)  $\chi^2(4)$ ;  $p < .001$ .  
 b)  $\chi^2(2)$ ;  $p < .02$ .  
 c)  $\chi^2(2)$ ;  $p < .10$ .  
 d) Fisher Exact Test for distribution of permissive and authoritative responses  $p < .02$ .  
 e)  $\chi^2(4)$ ;  $p < .05$ .  
 f)  $p < .01$ .

Situation 3 dealing with feeding was most discriminative between groups for both parents ( $p < .001$ ) in strong support of Hypothesis 1A and 2A. The sharp contrasts between the groups occurred between mothers. Mothers and fathers of Adj children were likewise discriminated in that fathers gave predominantly permissive responses (in sharp contrast to Hypothesis 1A) while mothers gave mostly authoritative responses, as hypothesized.

Situation 4, dealing with aggression yielded contrasting patterns for both parents between the Adj group and Ret group ( $p < .02$ ) in support of Hypotheses 1A and 3A. To a lesser extent, there was a contrast between the Adj group and the Dis group ( $p < .10$ ) in support of Hypotheses 1A and 2A. The contrasts were sharpest in the data for boys

Situation 7 dealing with disappointment discriminated between the Adj and Dis groups ( $p < .02$ ) in clear support of Hypothesis 2A, the sharpest differences occurring for mothers. Again, as in situation 3, fathers of Adj children did not respond according to Hypothesis 1A.

Situation 8 dealing with adult aggression yielded clear differences between Adj and Dis groups ( $p < .02$ ) in support of hypothesis 1A and 2A. Of note was the lack of distinction between Adj and Ret groups: this was the only situation which yielded a clear difference between Ret and Dis groups ( $p < .02$ ).

In summary, the different issues raised in the various situations yielded differential responses among fathers vs. mothers of the three groups. As a result, only four of the situations gave clear support to the hypotheses.

### Trend Score Results

As was noted previously, all of the 60 parents studied showed a tendency to use more than one specific style in response to various situations. The question arose whether any of the specific trends which were manifested by the parents discriminated between the Adj, Ret and Dis groups?

The frequencies of trend scores according to groups are presented in Appendix H. The results of comparisons by t test between groups fathers and mothers of boys and girls on trend responses to the Problem Situations Task is presented in Table 13.

Examination of the comparisons reveals that three responses yielded differentiations between groups.

Permissive to authoritative responses. Fathers of Adj children gave more such responses than did mothers ( $p < .001$ ). Fathers of Adj girls gave more responses than fathers of Ret girls ( $p < .01$ ). Of note was the fact that mothers of Dis children gave no such responses at all, resulting in significant contrasts with fathers' of Dis girls ( $p < .01$ ), with mothers of Ret and Adj children ( $p < .01$ ).

Authoritative to permissive responses. Fathers of Adj girls gave no such responses yielding a significant contrast with fathers of Ret girls ( $p < .01$ ).

Authoritative to authoritarian responses. Parents of Dis children gave more such responses than both parents of Ret ( $p < .01$ ) and of Adj children ( $p > .05$ ).

Further examination of Table 13 indicates that several other

Table 13

Comparisons of Trend responses of Adj, Ret and Dis groups to the Problem Situations Task by t tests and Fisher's Exact Test

Trend Response	<u>Adj</u> vs <u>Ret</u>	<u>Adj</u> vs <u>Dis</u>	<u>Ret</u> vs <u>Dis</u>	Fathers vs Mothers
<u>permissive to authoritative</u>				
<u>Both Parents</u>		$t=1.43$ ns		
<u>Fathers only</u>	girls: $t=2.17^b$		boys: $t=1.6$ ns	<u>Adj</u> children: $t=4.09^a$ <u>Dis</u> girls: $p<.01^c$
<u>Mothers only</u>		$p=.01^d$	$p<.01^c$	
<u>authoritative to permissive</u>				
<u>Both Parents</u>	$t=1.48$ ns			
<u>Fathers only</u>	girls: $p<.01^c$			<u>Ret</u> girls: $t=1.56$ ns
<u>authoritative to authoritarian</u>				
<u>Both Parents</u>		$t=2.14^d$	$t=3.16^e$	
<u>Fathers only</u>			$t=2.5^d$ girls $t=2.33^d$	

Table 13 (continued)

Trend	<u>Adj vs Ret</u>	<u>Adj vs Dis</u>	<u>Ret vs Dis</u>	Fathers vs Mothers
Response				
<u>authoritarian to</u>				
<u>authoritative</u>				
<u>Both Parents</u>				
		$t=1.52$ ns		
<u>Fathers only</u>				
	Boys: $t=1.63$ ns			
<u>Mothers only</u>				
			boys: $t=1.63$ ns	

Notes

- a)  $t(18)=3.61$ ;  $p<.001$ .
- b)  $t(8)=1.86$ ;  $p<.10$ .
- c) Fisher Exact Test.
- d)  $t(18)=2.10$ ;  $p<.05$ .
- e)  $t(18)=2.88$ ;  $p<.01$ .

contrasts between groups revealed differences which, however, were not demonstrated to be different from chance.

#### Parent Interaction Results

The last question to be raised about the Problem Situations Task data is whether the joint situation wherein fathers and mothers were requested to return to the eight situations, and respond as if they had experienced them together, elicited data which discriminated between the groups?

The questions asked were to what extent and in which direction did each parent maintain or modify his or her original response as a result of exposure to the spouse's response? Did a specific pattern of dominance, compliance or of mutual change emerge over the eight situations as a function of group membership?

#### Dominance patterns.

The frequencies of instances of agreement, approach withdrawal or modification of responses of parents as a result of exposure to the spouse in the joint interaction format to the Problem Situations Task is shown in Table 14.

Scrutiny of the data reveals several interesting contrasts between groups which might be indicative for future investigation though most were not demonstrated to be different from chance.

1. Fathers of Adj children tended to modify their responses in order to come to agreement with their wives to a greater extent (11

Table 14

Frequencies of dominance, compliance, agreement or disagreement displayed by parents of Adj, Ret and Dis children on the joint condition of the Problem Situations Task.

---

Scoring Categories <sup>a</sup>						
Groups	N	Father changes	Father modifies	Father withdraws	Mother changes	Mother modifies
<u>Adj</u>						
Boys + Girls	10	11	1	3	6	3
Boys	5	7	0	2	5	2
Girls	5	4	1	1	1	1
<u>Ret</u>						
Boys + Girls	10	6	2	4	6	4
Boys	5	2	1	1	2	3
Girls	5	4	1	3	4	1
<u>Dis</u>						
Boys + Girls	10	6	4	7	6	1
Boys	5	3	1	5	2	1
Girls	5	3	3	2	4	0

---

Table 14 (continued)

---

	Mother with- draws	Joint approach	Joint with- draws	Joint exchange	Sponta- neous agreement	Disagree- ment
<u>Adj</u>						
Boys + Girls	0	2	2	2	27	18
Boys	0	0	1	1	11	12
Girls	0	2	1	1	16	6
<u>Ret</u>						
Boys + Girls	5	3	0	0	33	11
Boys	3	2	0	0	16	5
Girls	2	1	0	0	17	6
<u>Dis</u>						
Boys + Girls	4	2	1	1	28	13
Boys	2	1	1	1	14	6
Girls	2	1	0	0	14	7

---

Note

a) 8 scores per couple

- instances) than did fathers of either Ret or Dis children (6 each) though the difference was not different from chance ( $t = 1.41$ ). Comparison of the data for boys however, revealed significant differences between Adj and Ret children ( $p < .01$ ).
2. Fathers of Dis children tended to modify their responses in order to distinguish their responses from those of their wives to a greater extent than fathers of Adj or Ret children, though this was not demonstrated to be different from chance ( $t = 1.33$ ).
  3. Similarly, mothers of Dis and Ret children manifested several instances of changing their responses in order to distinguish their responses from those of their husbands whereas mothers of Adj children did not manifest any such responses ( $p < .05$  - Fishers Exact Test).
  4. Parents of Adj boys showed the most instances of disagreement based upon different initial responses as opposed to parents of Dis boys ( $p < .02$ ), or of Ret boys ( $p < .10$ ).

In summary, the parental interaction data raises the suggestion of a tendency parents of Adj children to work towards agreement without denying actual differences. Parents of Dis and to a lesser extent Ret children show more initial agreement yet show a readiness to change responses in order to emphasize differences.

#### Individual to joint condition.

To date, the present analysis has focused upon agreement and disagreement trends of parents in the joint condition. Alternatively, the data may be inspected with respect to changes in the distributions

between use of permissive, authoritative or authoritarian responses as a function of exposure to the spouses opinion. The comparisons of distributions between individual and joint conditions by groups for fathers and mothers are listed in Appendix I. The comparisons were tested using a Chi Square Test and are listed by groups in Table 15.

Examination of the comparisons reveals that parents of Adj and Dis children did not alter their responses when exposed to their spouses to a greater extent than would be expected by chance. The only differences which emerged were for parents of Ret children ( $p < .01$ ), which reflected, primarily differences among parents of Ret boys ( $p < .02$ ). Further inspection isolated the major differences among mothers of Ret boys ( $p < .05$ ). Inspection of the raw data in Appendix I indicated that the changes in responses among parents of Ret children consisted of a tendency to shift from permissive to authoritative responses when exposed to their spouses in the joint condition. As a result of this shift in the preparation of permissive and authoritative responses under the joint condition, the overall distribution of responses for parents of Ret children was shown to be different from that of parents of Dis children ( $\chi^2(2) = 11.48$ ;  $p < .01$ ). Actually the parents of Ret children shifted to the pattern previously described for parents of Adj children under the individual condition (a predominance of authoritative responses as opposed to the pattern of equal distribution of permissive and authoritative responses which was manifested by parents of Dis children). The pattern for parents of Adj children was no longer discriminated from that of the Ret group, as had

Table 15

Comparisons of distributions of responses to the Problem Situations Task for fathers and mothers of Adj, Ret and Dis children on the individual vs joint conditions using a Chi Square Test.

	<u>Adj</u>	<u>Ret</u>	<u>Dis</u>
<u>Both parents</u>			
Boys + Girls	ns	9.26 <sup>a</sup>	ns
Boys	ns	7.84 <sup>b</sup>	ns
Girls	ns	ns	ns
<u>Fathers</u>			
Boys + Girls	ns	ns	ns
Boys	ns	ns	ns
Girls	ns	ns	ns
<u>Mothers</u>			
Boys + Girls	ns	5.76 <sup>d</sup>	ns
Boys	ns	6.18 <sup>c</sup>	ns
Girls	ns	ns	ns

Notesa)  $\chi^2(2)=9.21$ ;  $p<.01$ b)  $\chi^2(2)=7.82$ ;  $p<.02$ c)  $\chi^2(2)=5.99$ ;  $p<.05$ d)  $\chi^2(2)=4.60$ ;  $p<.10$

been shown in the individual condition though parents of Dis children still manifested a discretely different pattern from that of the Adj group ( $\chi^2(2)=22.3$ ;  $p<.001$ ).

In summary, examination of the data for the joint condition indicated that parents of Ret children tended to change their responses to resemble the pattern previously manifested only by parents of Adj children under the individual condition of the Problem Situations Task.

#### F Scale Results

The Hypotheses formulated above were stated in terms of deviation scores from the sample mean (129.25).

Hypothesis 1B stated that parents of Adj children would display moderate F Scale scores in contrast to extreme (high or low) scores of parents of Dis children. An F test for the comparison of homogeneity of variance between the Adj and Dis groups (for both parents, fathers only and mothers only) failed to demonstrate differences from chance ( $F = 1.24$ ).

Support for Hypothesis 1B was only found in the data for fathers of girls in that the variance for Adj children was lower than that of Dis children ( $F(9,9)=2.49$ ;  $p<.10$ ).

Hypothesis 3B stipulated that parents of Ret children would give more extreme F Scale scores than would parents of Adj children.

An F Test for the homogeneity of variance the two groups revealed the variance of F Scale scores for parents of Ret children to be higher than the variance for the Adj groups ( $F(19,19)=2.24$ ;  $p<.10$ ). The

differences were even greater for mothers of Ret children as opposed to mothers of Adj children ( $F(9,9)=3.16$ ;  $p<.05$ ). Thus, the data lends partial support to Hypothesis 3B, in that the F Scale scores for parents of Ret children were considerably more varied than those of parents of Adj children, this being clearest for mothers.

A further question arises at this point. Were there absolute differences between groups and between parents in F Scale scores? Table 16 lists the results of an ANOVA (3 way design with repeated measures) for F Scale scores of fathers and mothers by groups and gender of children.

Inspection of the data revealed the absence of any significant differences for any of the comparisons.

Examination of the group means warranted a comparison of the means of mothers of Dis and Adj children. A t test for the difference between group means revealed that mothers of Dis children achieved much higher scores on the F scale than did mothers of Adj children ( $t(18)=3.14$ ;  $p<.001$ ). On the other hand, means for the mothers of Ret children revealed very low scores for mothers of girls in contrast of high scores for mothers of boys in comparison to mothers of Adj children. As several mothers in the Ret group had manifested difficulties in filling out the questionnaires, it did not seem warranted in considering the data for the group.

In contrast to the mothers, the scores for fathers showed no differences between groups.

A further question becomes relevant at this point. The F Scale was administered as part of the PARI questionnaire. Can the F Scale be

Table 16

ANOVA of F Scale for fathers and mothers of boys and girls of Adj.,  
Ret and Dis groups.

---

Source of Variation	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Between Children</u>	11,257.8	29		
Groups	1,822.8	2	911.4	2.38 ns
Gender	36.8	1	36.8	-
Groups x Gender	198.9	2	99.5	-
Children Within Groups	9,199.2	24	383.3	
<u>Within Children</u>	14,301.5	30		
Parents	14.0	1	14.0	-
Groups x Parents	1,530.3	2	765.1	1.7 ns
Gender x Parents	390.2	1	390.2	-
Groups x Parents x Gender	1,529.2	2	764.6	1.7 ns
Parents x Children Within Groups	10,838.0	24	451.6	

---

Note.  $F(2,24) = 2.54; p < .10$

discriminated from the other questionnaire items? Examination of the individual PARI and F Scale totals indicated similar trends. The two scales yielded a correlation of .72. It would seem that the PARI data would have to be taken into account in the analysis of F Scale scores.

Table 17 shows the results of an ANCOVA for the F Scale results between groups, with the PARI sum scores as covariant. The results show no significant differences between groups.

In summary, the F Scale data did not differentiate between Adj, Ret and Dis groups in terms of absolute scores. There was some support for hypotheses of differences in variation between groups.

#### PARI Results

No hypotheses were initially formulated for the PARI data as the questionnaire was utilized primarily as a time filler. Many mothers displayed difficulties in filling out the questionnaires. In some cases, they were helped by older children, at other times, by me. Many cases (both mothers as well as fathers) impressed me as not fully understanding the items, though they pretended to understand. In consequence, their questionnaires could not be considered fully valid measures of parental attitudes.

The intercorrelations between the same subscales of the PARI and F Scale for mothers and fathers are listed in Appendix I. The individual items of the PARI and F Scale are described in Appendix E.

As the validity of the data was cast in doubt, statistical analysis of the differences between groups will not be undertaken at

Table 17

ANCOVA of F Scale for parents of Adj, Ret and Dis children with PARI total scores as covariant.

---

Source of Variation	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Groups	6.4	2	3.2	- <sup>a</sup> ns
Error	23.7	56	423.9	
<u>Total</u>	23,742.9			

---

Note

<sup>a</sup> F < 1

this point. The mean scores for fathers and mothers of Adj, Ret and Dis children are listed in Table 18.

Table 18

Mean scores on nine PARI subscales for mothers and fathers of Adj,  
Ret and Dis children.

Groups	Subscales <sup>a</sup>									<u>PARI</u> Sum
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
<u>Fathers</u>										
<u>Adj</u>										
Boys + Girls	19.6	25.2	19.1	20.1	24.3	15.6	15.2	20.3	15.8	175.2
Boys	21.8	25.4	18.6	19.4	23.4	15.4	13.6	21.2	16.2	175.4
Girls	17.4	25.0	19.6	20.8	24.8	15.8	17.8	19.4	15.4	175.0
<u>Ret</u>										
Boys + Girls	20.2	25.8	21.8	24.4	26.2	19.2	16.7	21.7	15.8	193.5
Boys	20.4	26.4	19.2	21.2	27.0	17.6	16.4	22.2	16.2	186.6
Girls	20.0	25.2	23.0	27.6	25.4	20.8	17.0	21.2	15.4	200.4
<u>Dis</u>										
Boys + Girls	21.3	24.6	19.9	22.3	24.1	16.6	18.0	19.3	15.5	183.1
Boys	20.2	25.2	19.0	22.6	22.8	14.6	17.4	19.8	14.8	176.4
Girls	22.4	24.0	20.8	22.0	25.4	18.6	18.6	19.6	16.2	189.8

Table 18 (continued)

Groups	Subscales <sup>a</sup>									PARI Sum
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
<u>Mothers</u>										
<u>Adi</u>										
Boys + Girls	18.0	25.6	19.0	21.7	24.0	14.1	16.5	19.8	15.9	174.8
Boys	15.0	26.2	18.6	20.2	24.8	14.2	16.8	17.8	16.2	169.2
Girls	21.0	25.0	19.4	23.2	23.2	14.0	16.2	21.8	15.6	179.8
<u>Ret</u>										
Boys + Girls	21.1	23.7	19.1	21.3	21.7	17.0	16.4	20.8	14.1	174.6
Boys	22.2	26.4	21.6	21.8	24.2	18.0	17.2	23.4	15.0	189.0
Girls	20.0	21.0	16.6	20.8	19.0	16.0	15.6	18.2	13.2	160.2
<u>Dis</u>										
Boys + Girls	23.6	26.9	23.1	22.6	25.2	18.3	20.2	24.4	16.6	199.8
Boys	24.8	26.4	22.4	21.8	25.6	15.2	18.6	24.2	16.6	195.6
Girls	22.4	27.4	23.8	23.4	24.8	21.4	21.8	24.6	16.6	204.0

Note

- <sup>a</sup>Scale 1 - Dependence  
 2 - Independence  
 3 - Permissiveness  
 4 - Strictness  
 5 - Acceptance  
 6 - Deification  
 7 - Authoritarian control  
 8 - Suppression of aggression  
 9 - Egalitarianism

## CHAPTER IV

## DISCUSSION

Parental Correlates of Children's Adjustment in Kindergarten

The present investigation was designed to examine whether three different clusters of 5 to 6 year old children's behavior in kindergarten (disruptiveness, reticence and adjustment), as rated by the children's teachers at the end of the school year, could be related to their parents reported attitudes towards discipline. Three major hypotheses were formulated to attempt to stipulate patterns of parental discipline which would be expected to be associated with the children's behavior in kindergarten. They will shortly be inspected in light of the results.

In the course of the investigation, several methodological limitations were revealed which limited or made the testing of the hypotheses more difficult. These qualifications will be discussed below with the aim of specifying conditions which would facilitate subsequent investigation of the variables under study. The prior research in the area of parental child-rearing variables and attitudes which was reviewed above emphasized the complexity of the variables involved. In consequence, any attempt to reduce such complex relations into simple correlations must be doomed to failure. The time has now come to embark upon the assessment of the hypotheses in light of the results of the present study. This will be undertaken with the foregoing qualification in mind.

Parents of Adj children.

Parents of children rated as displaying well adjusted behavior in kindergarten were expected to reveal a pattern of authoritativeness in their responses to the Problem Situations Task. The hypothesis was tested in three different ways. a) The overall pattern which consisted of the specific distribution of the three possible response styles was found to be predominantly authoritative and was shown to be different than the patterns of both parents of Dis and of Ret children ( $p < .01$ ). b) The three styles were ranked and weighted, permitting an overall comparison which revealed a clear difference between rankings of the parents of Adj children and parents of the Dis children ( $p < .02$ ) with a lesser difference between the rankings of the Adj and Ret groups ( $p < .10$ ). c) The number of individual authoritative responses given by parents of the three groups were compared. The overall comparison between the three groups revealed the groups to be different ( $p < .05$ ), while the individual comparisons revealed a very clear difference between parents of Adj children and parents of Dis children ( $p < .005$ ) and a lesser difference from the parents of Ret children ( $p < .025$ ). Furthermore, inspection of the individual situations revealed that parents responded to seven of the eight situations using an authoritative style, though only four situations successfully discriminated between the parents of Adj children and the parents of Dis children (3,4,7,8) and Ret children (3,4,8).

The different comparisons indicated therefore that an examination of the responses for both parents of Adj children provided a strong

confirmation for Hypothesis 1A. Parents of Adj children when compared with parents of Dis children were rated as giving significantly more authoritative responses to the Problem Situations Task. The comparison with parents of Ret children indicated lesser differences though still significantly different from chance.

Parents of Adj children were furthermore expected to respond to the F Scale in a moderate manner yielding low deviation scores from the sample mean as opposed to parents of the other two groups. Examination of the variances revealed that there were no over all differences between parents of the three groups. A test of differences between total scores likewise did not yield differences between groups. Thus, hypothesis 1B did not receive support from the data for both parents.

Fathers of Adj children. The review of prior research pointed out a lack of clarity between specific patterns for fathers, as opposed to mothers. The present investigation enabled an examination of the separate patterns as well as the interaction between the parents. Fathers of Adj children revealed a pattern which was primarily authoritative but much less so than mothers, the difference being due to a greater tendency on the part of fathers to use permissive responses as well (in contrast to the mothers) ( $p < .05$ ). It should be noted that this contrast did not reflect an overall tendency of fathers, as the data for all 30 fathers was not demonstrated to be different from all 30 mothers.

When fathers of Adj children were compared with fathers of Dis children, they were found to use more authoritative responses ( $p < .05$ )

though comparisons of overall patterns (distributions of permissive, authoritative and authoritarian responses) were not found to be different from chance. Comparisons with fathers of Ret children likewise showed a tendency to use more authoritative responses, the differences being in the predicted direction, though barely failing to be demonstrated to be different from chance ( $t(18)=1.69$ ). Overall comparisons of patterns were not demonstrated to be different from chance.

Inspection of responses by content of situations revealed that fathers responded according to an authoritative pattern on five of the eight situations, though only two of the situations (delay of gratification (4) and external aggression (8)) differentiated between fathers of Adj children and fathers of Ret children (boys, situation 4) or Dis children (situation 8). Fathers responded to two situations with a permissive style (feeding (3) and dealing with frustration (7)) which differentiated them from mothers who clearly used an authoritative style ( $p<.05$ ).

Thus, the data for fathers lent only slight support for hypothesis 1A, although all of the overall differences between groups were in the predicted directions.

Likewise, no F Scale score differences were found for fathers between the three groups, neither when measured for variance nor for raw scores. Thus, hypothesis 1B received no support.

Mothers of Adj children. Mothers of Adj children displayed the clearest pattern of preference for the use of authoritative responses.

They gave more such responses than mothers of Dis children ( $p < .01$ ) and of Ret children ( $p < .05$ ). Overall comparison of the patterns of distribution of the responses differentiated between mothers of Adj children and mothers of Dis children and Ret children ( $p < .01$ ). Overall rank comparisons revealed differences between mothers of Adj and Dis children ( $p < .05$ ). Mothers responded to seven of the eight situations with a clear authoritative style though they were differentiated from mothers of Dis children on four situations (1,3,7,8) and from mothers of Ret children on three situations (1,2,3). Thus, the data for mothers showed clear support for Hypothesis 1A in that mothers of Adj children responded to the Problem Situations Task using a clear authoritative pattern which was differentiated from mothers of the other groups.

Inspection of the F Scale scores revealed that mothers of Adj children tended towards more moderate scores than mothers of Ret children who revealed a great variance in their scores. Furthermore, raw scores of mothers of Dis children were found to be much higher than F Scale scores of mothers of Adj children ( $p < .001$ ). Thus, hypothesis 1B received some limited support.

Interaction between fathers and mothers of Adj children. No prior hypotheses were formulated as to the form of interaction to be expected between fathers and mothers of the different groups during the joint condition. The joint condition data indicated that exposure to the spouses' opinions resulted in a slight amplification of the preference to giving authoritative rather than permissive or authori-

tarian responses to the Problem Situations Task, though the difference was not demonstrated to be greater than chance. A tendency for fathers to modify their responses in order to come to agreement with their wives was revealed (and found to be clearly differentiating for boys of Adj and Ret groups ( $p < .10$ ) in contrast to a tendency to abide by initial differences (again clearly differentiating among parents of Adj boys and both Dis ( $p < .02$ ) and Ret boys ( $p < .10$ )).

Clinical illustrations of trends characterizing parents of Adj children. All of the foregoing analyses were based upon group trends and mean scores. The question arises whether the individual cases reflected the group trends and patterns previously delineated? Examination of the raw scores revealed that 80% of the fathers and mothers manifested a predominantly authoritative pattern of responding. Of special note is the fact that in every family where one parent did not manifest the authoritative pattern, the spouse seemed as if to "compensate" and manifest a very clear authoritative pattern. It would therefore seem, from the results of the present study, that parents of adjusted children tend to deal with problematic situations involving their children in an authoritative manner. This seems clearly so for mothers while fathers at times also tend towards permissive solutions to problems. What seems most characteristic is that in every family, at least one parent manifests a clearly authoritative orientation. Is this parent also the more pertinent and influential parent upon the children's behavior? To what extent are the parents' stated attitudes (especially when conflicting in orientation) translated into action

with the children? Though these questions were not built into the formal design of the study, an examination of the protocols of individual cases might give initial answers until formal investigation is undertaken. Two of the three families that manifested contrasting styles gave clear support to the dominant-pertinent parent "hypothesis". Both families 4 and 6 consisted of a very authoritative mother who was confirmed by the father as the one clearly responsible for and managing competently with the children. In both cases, the father was more lenient and tended to give somewhat more permissive than authoritative solutions to the Problem Situations Task. These mothers were clearly backed in their authoritative approaches with the children. There was no feeling of undercutting or criticism that they were too strict in the joint conditions. Both fathers admitted that they had less to do with the children and were pleased about the mother's handling. It was clear that the mothers' authoritative attitudes were daily translated into action with the children. Family no. 5 was different and not as clear. In this case, the father was the one who tended to utilize more authoritative solutions. He exemplified a calm, reasoning person who took stands but emphasized explaining to the children rather than hitting. The mother on the other hand was a very emotional and excitable type who tended to alternate between authoritarian type solutions emphasizing anger and impulsive punishing, with more permissive and lenient solutions. This family did not emphasize a clearly dominant or pertinent parent who was exclusively in charge of educating and managing the children. It should be noted that

all three families emphasized what was previously observed in the section on parental interaction: all three families showed that the parents differed either in temperament or philosophy, yet they did not tend to be in tension. At times they respected each other's different approaches, at other times the father tended to come to agreement with the mother's approach. One further family which did not provide a contrasting picture will suffice to give a picture of the style of parents of Adj children. Family 2 was characterized by both father and mother giving usually authoritative solutions to the situations. During the joint condition, the parents demonstrated a tendency to alternate taking a stricter, more authoritative role while the partner would balance the picture with a more lenient attitude. It should be noted that again, the impression was of complementary styles which were expressed in an atmosphere of mutual respect wherein authority was emphasized though certain situations warranted also giving in to the child. Baumrind (1971) in her delineation of the authoritative pattern emphasized the balance between making demands, expressing clear authority alongside high responsiveness to the needs of the child. Lewis (1981) attempted to reanalyze several prior investigators of firm parental control in the framework of attribution theory. The former studies (Baumrind 1971, 1975; Lytton 1977, 1980; Coopersmith, 1967) contended that firm control when coupled with warmth fostered effective socialization. This was inconsistent with attribution theory which states that external control fosters compliance rather than internalization (Lepper, 1973). Lewis's reinterpretation of the studies

emphasized the firm parents accepting and fostering of the child's individuality; Lytton (1977) found that children's compliance to mothers was also correlated to the mothers' compliance to their children. The families described above probably resemble Baumrind's (1980) harmonious parents who had clear control over their children without exercising it. The latter were characterized by harmonious atmosphere wherein they developed principles for resolving differences such as has been expounded by Gordon (1970) in his description of a no-win, no-lose method for parents and children to resolve their differences by open honest discussion and exchange of feelings.

In summary, the parents of children rated as well adjusted in kindergarten were characterized by using a style which emphasized taking responsibility, making clear demands upon their children while using reasoning and explanations to explain the demands placed upon the children. On the other hand the parents made an effort to enable the children to explain their actions, and where applicable, modified their demands in order to adjust them to the child's needs, personality and abilities. Often, the parents divided the roles of placing demands and sensitivity to the child's needs between the mother and father. This division was flexible and situation-specific, in an atmosphere of mutual support and respect.

#### Parents of Dis children.

Parents of children rated as displaying disruptive behavior in kindergarten were expected to reveal a pattern of authoritarianism or of permissiveness in their responses to the Problem Situations Task.

The hypothesis was tested as described above for the Adj group. a) The overall pattern of distribution between the three responses was found to be equally distributed between permissive and authoritative responses with lesser use of authoritarian responses, the pattern being different from that displayed by parents of Adj children ( $p < .01$ ), though nearly identical to that displayed by parents of Ret children. b) When measured by ranked comparisons, the scores for parents of Dis children were found to be different from the scores of parents of Adj children ( $p < .02$ ), but indistinguishable from those of parents of Ret children. c) A comparison of the number of authoritarian responses used by parents of Dis children and parents of Adj children revealed that Dis groups gave clearly more authoritarian responses than the Adj group ( $p < .025$ ). d) A significant gender effect emerged in that parents of boys gave more authoritarian responses than parents of girls, irrespective of groups ( $p < .05$ ). e) A comparison of the use of permissive responses revealed that parents of Dis children clearly gave more permissive responses than parents of Adj children ( $p < .01$ ).

Inspection of the individual situations revealed that parents used different combinations of the three styles, according to the situation. No one clear predominant pattern emerged over more than two situations. Of note is the fact that only parents of Dis children showed a predominance for authoritarian solutions on any single situation (8).

In conclusion, the results lent relative support to Hypothesis 2A in that parents of Dis children were demonstrated to display more

authoritarianism or permissiveness when compared to parents of Adj children. On the other hand the former did not display discrete patterns of predominantly authoritarian responses at most, they showed a slight preference for permissive over authoritative responses. No clear differentiation could be discerned between parents of Dis children and Ret children.

Fathers of Dis children. Fathers of Dis children were not demonstrated to respond differently from chance to the Problem Situations Task than fathers of Adj children on any of the above comparisons, though they displayed smaller differences in the predicted directions (clearest for number of authoritarian responses).

On the individual situations, fathers revealed for the most part a tendency to more or less equally divide their responses among the three styles, with some preference for authoritarian responses for boys, vs. permissive responses for girls. This was most vivid in the situation concerning violence from without, where fathers of boys chose a very aggressive solution to the neighboring fathers, threat to the son, whereas fathers of girls chose a more docile and passive solution. This pattern was differentiated from the authoritative pattern chosen by fathers of Ret and Adj children.

All in all, hypotheses 2A did not receive support in the data for fathers.

Mothers of Dis children. Mothers of Dis children displayed a different distribution of responses (equal preference for permissive and authoritative) in contrast to mothers of Adj children ( $p < .01$ ).

Rank comparison also showed differences between mothers of Dis and Adj groups ( $p < .05$ ). Mothers of Dis children made far more use of permissive responses than mothers of Adj children ( $p < .01$ ). Likewise, mothers of Dis children made more use of authoritarian responses than did mothers of Adj children, the differences being in the predicted direction though just failing to be demonstrated to be greater than chance ( $t(18) = 1.62$ ). The scatter over the individual situations was similar to that for fathers and for both parents combined, though with a bit more stress upon authoritative than authoritarian solutions (though the latter was still more frequently given than for mothers of Adj and Ret children). For the most part, considerable support for Hypothesis 2A was gathered, along the limitations described above for both parents. Hypothesis 2B gained partial support from the results for mothers in that the latter received higher F Scale scores than mothers of Adj children ( $p < .001$ ).

Interaction between fathers and mothers of Dis children. The joint condition data for both parents of Dis children was characterized by the following: a) examination of the response totals for distributions highlighted the extent to which the distribution totals (permissive, authoritative and authoritarian) remained almost identical between the individual and joint conditions. On the other hand, examination of the interaction patterns revealed a tendency of fathers to amplify disagreement with their wives by changing their responses in order to distinguish their responses from those of their wives, this being to a greater extent than fathers of Adj or Ret children, though

not different from chance ( $t(18)=1.33$ ). In parallel, mothers showed the same tendency (to distinguish responses from their husbands) to a greater extent than mothers of Adj children ( $p<.05$ ). These trends seem to indicate a tendency towards tension and lack of congruence between parents of Dis children which warrant inspection of the clinical data.

Clinical illustrations. Inspection of the individual data revealed that in seven of the ten families studied, at least one of the parents manifested a clear authoritarian or permissive orientation. The remaining three families manifested the pattern described previously of equal preference for authoritative and permissive or authoritarian responses. The following further characteristics emerged from the clinical data:

1. A sense of conflict and competition where the father took a more permissive position opposite the mothers strict authoritarian style: The fathers of family 21 and 22 both accused their wives of relating to the children like staff sergeants. Both fathers revealed underlying authoritarian orientations, but usually expounded permissive principles. Usually the latter tactics undermined the mothers authority and attempt at order. Family 21 especially exhibited a need to emphasize differences, to contradict and undermine each other.
2. Emphasis upon the child displaying unquestioned respect for the parents was most blatant with Family 23. Both parents emphasized the need for the child to obey the parents, even if the parent

was wrong. "In any case, he has to apologize, even if he was right!"

3. Potential for violence which often seemed to be very rigidly controlled. Some parents seemed to defend against a tendency to explode by being overly permissive, others kept over-emphasizing how they don't hit the children. At times the violent potential came out in over-dramatic responses which did not seem adequate to the situation. The father of Family 22 suggested placing his four year old son in temporary detention (4-5 minutes in a cold shower) for asking for candies before supper. Afterwards, he would give in totally and give him the candy "after he had time to think things over in the shower". The latter is an example of close contiguity between authoritarian and permissive tendencies. Lewis (1981) emphasized the fact that permissive families which offered few rules interspersed them with harsh and unpredictable punishments which were experienced by the children as overpowering outside forces.

It must be emphasized that the expectation on the basis of the review of relevant prior investigations, had been to discover "pure" types of responding to the situations task. On the basis of Baumrind's (1980) delineation of the types of parenting, the authoritarian and permissive styles seemed diametrically opposed. The authoritarian style was characterized by a combination of high demandingness and low responsiveness. The permissive style was characterized by low demandingness and high responsiveness. In contrast to the foregoing

discrete styles, the present investigation revealed several instances of a parent beginning the response with an authoritarian orientation and switching to a permissive solution with elaboration of the response, or vice versa. This tendency was especially pronounced with mothers of Dis children. Furthermore, it was previously remarked that often Dis parents manifested a non-demanding orientation while impressing the interviewer with underlying explosiveness which at times erupted in sudden punitiveness. It should be noted that the non-intervention expounded by these parents did not seem to reflect libertarianism, but rather either a lack of interest or concern with the childrens actions, or a fear of getting involved lest they would be aroused to respond, possibly triggering their underlying aggression.

In summary, the clinical data for parents of Dis children was characterized by combinations of permissive and authoritarian tendencies of one or both parents. The interactions between the parents reflected either total submission of one parent to the dominant partner, or as most often, tension, strife and competition between the partners which led to undercutting of positions with the children. The clinical data tended to lend further support to the initial hypothesis of contingency between authoritarian and permissive tendencies of parents and disruptiveness in their offspring.

#### Parents of Ret children

Parents of children rated as displaying reticent behavior in kindergarten were expected to reveal a pattern of authoritarianism in their responses to the Problem Situations Task. The hypothesis was

tested as previously described for the other two groups. a) The overall pattern of response distribution was revealed to be equally distributed between permissive and authoritative responses with a lesser preference for authoritarian responses. This pattern was identical to that of the Dis group, but clearly differentiated from the pattern displayed by the Adj group ( $p < .01$ ) b) When measured by ranked comparisons, the scores for parents of Ret children showed some difference from the scores of parents of Adj children ( $p < .10$ ) c) A comparison of authoritarian responses indicated that parents of Ret children gave more authoritarian responses than parents of Adj children, though the differences were not greater than chance d) On the other hand, parents of Ret children were shown to use more permissive responses than parents of Adj children ( $p < .05$ ).

Inspection of the individual situations revealed a nearly equal distribution of permissive and authoritative solutions. The situation calling for delay of gratification (4) discriminated most clearly between the parents of Ret children who evenly divided their responses between the three possibilities and between parents of the other two groups, who showed a preference for authoritative solutions ( $p < .02$ ). The difference was clearest for boys, where parents of Adj boys gave almost exclusively authoritative solutions, whereas parents of Ret boys gave equal preference to authoritarian or permissive solutions ( $p < .05$ ).

In summary, the original hypotheses gained no real support from the data though there emerged a differentiated pattern based on a greater use of permissive responses. No clear differentiation from the

Dis group was manifested.

Fathers of Ret children Fathers of Ret children did not reveal any differences upon any of the comparisons which could be demonstrated to differ from chance, when compared to the fathers of Adj children. Only the comparison of authoritarian responses revealed a greater tendency for fathers of Ret children to give such responses in contrast to fathers of Adj children, the differences being in the predicted direction though failing to reach significance ( $t(18)=1.44$ ). The scatter over the individual situations reflected the trend for both parents. Thus, hypothesis 3A received only the slightest support from the data for fathers.

Mothers of Ret children A comparison of the overall pattern of distributions of responses showed that mothers of Ret children utilized a different pattern than did mothers of Adj children ( $p<.01$ ). The differences were based primarily on a greater use of permissive responses by mothers of Ret children in contrast to mothers of Adj children ( $p<.05$ ). Furthermore, a clear distinction emerged between boys and girls based on different proportions of permissive and authoritative responses ( $p<.02$ ). Mothers of girls revealed a pattern similar to that of the Adj group with a preference for authoritative responses while mothers of boys gave somewhat more permissive than authoritative responses. Examination of the individual situations revealed that over most situations, mothers of boys showed a clear preference for permissive solutions, and for some situations (4,5) a preference for authoritarian solutions, this being in clear contrast

with mothers of girls, who showed for most situations a preference for authoritative solutions. Thus, hypothesis 3A did not receive support from the data for mothers, though the mothers did reveal a differentiated pattern which especially discriminated between boys and girls. Examination of the variance of F Scale scores of mothers revealed a very high dispersion of scores as opposed to those of mothers of either Adj or Dis children ( $p < .05$ ). Thus, support was gained for hypothesis 3B.

Interaction between fathers and mothers of Ret children. Examination of the data for the joint condition in contrast to the individual conditions of fathers and mothers of Ret children revealed several interesting observations.

1. Most of the contrasts to date failed to reveal any significant contrasts between parents of Dis and Ret children. In this light, it was very noteworthy to discover upon examination of the joint condition data of the three groups, that parents of Ret children changed their responses during the latter condition away from a permissive-authoritative pattern (during the individual condition, identical to Dis group) to an authoritative prominent pattern which made it indistinguishable from the Adj group. The shift for the group over the two conditions was greater than would be expected by chance ( $p < .01$ ). It must be noted that the most striking shift between the two conditions was revealed among parents of Ret boys ( $p < .02$ ), though the shifts for the group as a whole were considerable ( $p < .01$ ).

2. The interaction data was similar to that of the Dis group described above: high spontaneous agreement upon the individual condition alongside tendencies to withdraw upon the joint condition, especially for Ret mothers (in contrast to Adj mothers;  $p < .05$ ).

Clinical illustrations. Inspection of the individual data reveals three general tendencies:

1. A majority of the parents revealed patterns consisting of a preference to permissive or authoritarian responses. In many cases the parents manifested an underlying authoritarian orientation marked by much volatile aggression and emphasis on respect. This tendency was however kept under rigid control. The result in most cases was a resultant permissive attitude and orientation which was interspersed by sudden explosive outbursts of anger and punitiveness. Thus, what in many cases looked like leniency and permissiveness seemed to be actually disinterest and taking distance from the children's actions, as a defense against over-excitement and resulting loss of control. Several parents admitted (both fathers and mothers) having beaten their children rather brutally. Most of the mothers seemed to have mixed feelings about their aggressiveness. The fathers were less open. Family 14 seemed to compete as to who was most lenient. The mother manifested (towards children who were still awake during the interview) strictness and rigidity with much shouting while giving mostly permissive responses to the situations task. She

interview (till 11:00 at night).

2. Most parents revealed a tendency to accommodate differences during the joint condition and to strive to come to some kind of agreement. As previously remarked, this resulted in a tendency to alter permissive responses (and to a lesser extent authoritarian responses) to authoritative responses. This interactive behavior was in sharp contrast to that of the Dis group.
3. Three of the mothers of girls manifested a clear preference for authoritative responses. Further examination of the protocols revealed that one case (Family 19) reflected the trends described in (1) above. The mother, though answering authoritatively, seemed to deliberate between strictness and understanding of the children. Her husband exuberated violence and apathy. She in turn was ambivalent about his instilling fear in the children. It clearly seemed that the father was the dominant force in the family. In contrast, the other two families were characterized by clear authoritative orientations on the part of the mothers, alongside mixed patterns on the part of the fathers, which did not detract from the former. The latter observations pointed up the fact that mothers of Ret children showed a greater tendency towards varied responding to the Problem Situations Task than did the mothers of the Adj and Dis groups. The variability in the use of permissive responses was much greater than that of mothers of Dis children ( $F(9,9)=4.15; p<.05$ ), and greater than that of

mothers of Adj children, though just barely failing to be demonstrated to be different from chance. Likewise, the mothers showed greater variability in the use of authoritative responses than mothers of Dis children, also just barely failing to be different from chance. These observations raised the question of the homogeneity of the Ret group, which will be shortly discussed in the section on methodological limitation.

In summary, parents of children who displayed reticent behavior in kindergarten tended to, when interviewed separately, give primarily permissive and authoritarian solutions to the situations task, while a minority (primarily mothers of girls) tended to give primarily authoritative solutions. When interviewed together, the parents tended to shift to a predominantly authoritative style.

#### Comparisons and contrasts between groups.

The results of the present investigation showed that if one asked a kindergarten teacher to point to those children who manifested social and personal adjustment to the kindergarten, as opposed to those children who manifested disruptive or reticent behavior, one could discriminate between the adjusted and maladjusted children on the basis of their parents' reported disciplinary orientations, as reflected by the styles the parents utilized in an attempt to solve hypothetical problematic situations involving themselves and their children. Specifically, the delinations formulated by Baumrind in her series of investigations (1967,1971,1978,1980) were shown, at least in combinations, to differentiate between the groups: Parents of Adj children

tended to give more authoritative solutions than permissive and to a lesser extent, authoritarian solutions to the problem presented them. On the other hand, both parents of Ret as well as Dis children tended to give permissive as well as authoritative solutions, and only to a lesser extent, authoritarian solutions to the problems presented. On the whole, parents of Ret and Dis children, when interviewed individually, were not differentiated in the manner in which they preferred the three different solutions. The Ret and Dis groups could be differentiated on the basis of the interactions between mothers and fathers when the two were brought together for the joint interview condition: Parents of Dis children did not alter their solutions between the individual and joint conditions and thereby retained the same distribution patterns between the three solutions. Parents of Ret children changed many of their permissive and some of their authoritarian responses from the individual condition to authoritative responses in the joint condition to form an authoritative pattern resembling that of the Adj group. Parents of Dis children revealed a lot of tension, dissension and undermining of the spouses' position during the joint condition whereas parents of Ret children showed support for each other's positions. Fathers of Dis boys revealed many instances of altering initial responses in order to distinguish them from wives' responses in the joint condition whereas this hardly ever occurred with fathers of Ret boys. On the basis of the contrasts which emerged between the three groups, a delineation of the specific parental factors associated with each behavior cluster in kindergarten can be

undertaken at this point.

Factors associated with disruptiveness in kindergarten. Parents of children displaying disruptiveness in kindergarten manifested a tendency to deal with problematic situations involving themselves and their children (wherein the latter displayed signs of aggressive or defiant behavior, determination in opposition to the parents, difficulties in overcoming hardships, or conflicts with neighbors) with the following emphases:

1. Leaving the child to fend his own solution or giving in to the child, or shying away from confrontation with the child, when in many instances, this permissive emphasis seemed to cover up an opposing tendency to burst out in great anger and rage, with a resulting loss of control.
2. Alternatively, taking rigid stands based upon a moral code without investigating the child's reasons for his actions, and without explaining the reasoning for the parents stand.
3. When confronted with each others orientations, mothers and fathers tended to undermine each other's attempts to solve problems or to follow blindly the dominant parent's lead.  
Parents of boys manifested a greater use of the authoritarian style described in (2) whereas parents of girls relied more upon the permissive style described in (1).
4. When mothers were asked to state opinions about child rearing and general outlook, they tended to give answers correlated with a high authoritarian outlook (high F Scale scores).

Factors associated with reticence in kindergarten. Parents of children displaying reticence in kindergarten manifested a tendency to deal with problematic situations involving themselves and their children (wherein the latter displayed self destructive, aggressive or defiant behavior, determination in opposition to the parents, difficulties with other children, or difficulties with in overcoming hardships) with the following emphases:

1. Permissive or authoritarian orientations or most often alternation between the two identical to styles (1) and (2) described for parents of Dis children, when interviewed individually.
2. When interviewed jointly, a tendency to alter the foregoing permissive or authoritarian solutions to solutions emphasizing clear demands with explanation of the reasoning alongside responsiveness and respect for the child's needs and abilities.
3. A clear difference between parents of boys and girls in that (a) parents of boys emphasized more authoritarian solutions than parents of girls (b) mothers of boys emphasized primarily a permissive orientation whereas mothers of girls emphasized primarily an authoritative orientation.

Maladjustment in kindergarten in relation to parental discipline.

The foregoing delineations of parental factors associated with disruptiveness and reticence highlighted the major common factor which was associated in the present investigation with children's maladjusted behavior in kindergarten: the combination of permissiveness with

authoritarianism (either within the same parent or between the two parents). When a child is exposed to a set of rigid demands which are not explained or legitimized in the eyes of the child, the parents authority is undermined (Dubin and Dubin, 1963; Baumrind, 1975).

Furthermore, if demands are made upon the child, but are not adhered to (trend of authoritarian to permissive solution) or are made only sporadically interspersed by an attitude of letting the child fend for himself, it becomes difficult for the child to benefit from the parents limit setting and structuring of the child's experience. Coopersmith (1967) emphasized that consistently enforced standards for behavior enhanced the formation of effective inner controls and fostered confidence in the definition of situations.

If the ambivalence expressed by the defensive stance described above of permissiveness as a result of negation of underlying aggressiveness is taken into account, the child is exposed to conflicting messages. The manifest, verbal message emphasizes either giving freedom or disinterest in the child's activities. The underlying message tells the child to beware of the parent's sudden, explosive potential. Neither message indicates genuine acceptance or support of the child. It seems clear that the foregoing factors are certainly not conducive to fostering competence and ability to adjust to situations outside of the home (such as kindergarten).

When the conflicting demands are accentuated by undermining and undercutting of one parent or the attempts by the other parent to educate and attempt to solve problems with the child, the result seems

to be a lack of respect for authority and an inability to develop inner controls, as was manifested by disruptive children in the present study.

The same complex combination of permissive and underlying authoritarian styles, combined with authoritarian attitudes which are abandoned when confronted by a spouse's differing opinion for more authoritative orientations seems to instill in the child a lack of confidence and an inability to develop self assertiveness as was manifested by reticent children in the present study.

Factors associated with adjustment in kindergarten. Parents of children displaying positive adjustment in kindergarten manifested a tendency to deal with problematic situations involving themselves and their children in a way which emphasized:

1. For each problem situation, at least one parent emphasized clear demands which were rationally explained alongside interest in discovering the child's reasoning for his actions.
2. A tendency towards complementary functions of demand and support between parents in an atmosphere of tolerance and respect for differences of opinion or orientation.
3. Those parents who differed from the group trend were usually the parents least directly involved in day to day managing of the children's education. Despite their differences of approach they accepted and passively supported the dominant parent's more authoritative approach.

### Methodological Considerations

During the course of the present study several limitations and sources of extraneous variance were revealed. Their examination and assessment will give useful indications for future investigation.

#### Selection of the sample.

The manner in which the three groups were chosen revealed the following difficulties.

Variations in teacher ratings. The kindergarten teachers revealed much variance in the manner in which they rated the three categories of disruptiveness, reticence and adjustment. Although it would have been expected that the ratings for absence of symptomatology (adjustment) and disruptiveness would be self evident, several teachers manifested tendencies to over or under rate the various phenomena (it should be noted that nevertheless, the ratings revealed the expected three types). One teacher was very sensitive to a rather large group of disruptive boys in her class. In general, she tended to give high scores upon all of the phenomena. On the other hand, three teachers tended to minimize the manifestation of phenomena and as a result, gave many low ratings in general. It would seem that the addition of objective behavioral ratings by independent observers, would insure the necessary corroboration in order to offset any teacher rating bias.

Assessment of reticence. The ratings of reticence in general aroused questions as to whether they tapped actual manifestations of reticence or whether they related more to general neuroticism. It

should be noted as was suggested at the outset that it was rather obvious and clearcut to the teachers as to which children were disruptive in their classes. Not so as to reticence. This became clear during the post interviews of teachers (as noted above) wherein the latter remarked that in several cases they felt that boys manifested both disruptiveness as well as signs of reticence. It seems that in a society which is so keyed to war and violence (both on the military and vehicular fronts) in which aggressiveness is such a necessary tool for survival, it becomes especially difficult to notice reticence. An inspection of the population studied indicated that very few of the 280 children manifested stable and consistent signs of reticence. It was therefore not surprising to discover a greater variance in the responses of mothers of Ret children (both to the Problem Situations Task and to the F Scale) as opposed to the mothers of Adj and Dis children, as described above.

#### Teacher effects upon childrens' behavior.

The starting point of the present study was the child's behavior in kindergarten. It is most conceivable that the child's behavior was in part situational: in response to the atmosphere created by the specific kindergarten teacher. Specific types of teachers would be expected to elicit different proportions of the gamut of behavior specific to that age. In terms of the variables studied here, the disciplinary style of the teacher, whether authoritative, permissive or authoritarian, would be expected to elicit different behaviors in the children. It would have been interesting and helpful to be able to

specify which style did the teachers manifest in order to obtain interaction ratings with the parents' styles. Thereby, it would be possible to account for a greater proportion of the variance in the childrens' behavior.

"Distance" between variables investigated.

The present study attempted to relate the behavior of the child as rated by the teacher with the parents report of their attitudes towards child rearing and their report as to how they would react to hypothetical situations with the child. No attempt was undertaken to obtain a rating (whether objective or by parental report) of the child's behavior at home. Furthermore, the parent's actual behavior with the child was as well not elicited. No attempt was made to directly observe the interaction between children and their parents. These points are being raised to highlight the extent of the "distance" between the measurement of the dependent variable the child's behavior as rated by the teacher and the measurement of the independent variables of parental attitudes and report of hypothetical mode of disciplinary behavior. It is clear that the addition of all the aforementioned measurements (teacher's style, objective observation of child in kindergarten and in the home, direct observation of parent-child relation) would considerably reduce the extraneous variance inherent in such a great distance between the two major behaviors in the study.

### Experimenter as interviewer.

The present investigation was planned, carried out and analyzed by myself. Classical experimental design would demand a separation between design, analysis and actual interviewing of subjects in order to eliminate bias in the actual interviews on the basis of knowledge of the hypotheses and variables involved. A second source of possible bias concerned the fact that I was known to some of the families involved in the study, through my work in the kindergartens as their psychologist.

In order to minimize potential sources of bias, strict notes of all my impressions were taken, and all of the interviews were recorded on audiotape.

Interviewing. My previous experimental and clinical experience enabled me to maintain a neutral stance during the interviews. Furthermore, in terms of my familiarity to some of the subjects, I stressed the scientific nature of the study and its separation from my standard work. On the whole, none of the families indicated that the combination hindered them. On the contrary, each family indicated that they were able to respond freely to all of the tasks involved.

Scoring. All of the protocols were scored initially from the notes taken, and checked by listening to the tapes, which enabled taking some distance and scoring more objectively. The reliability of the ratings was checked, as noted above, by obtaining parallel ratings from a second rater, a psychiatrist who was not informed as to the hypotheses, nor of the group membership of the families which he was

requested to rate.

The measurement of parental disciplinary styles.

The Problem Situations Task was for the most part highly successful in eliciting open and spontaneous responses from the parents. Of special significance was the fact that each parent was not pressed to reveal exactly how he or she had reacted to the child in the past. Most defensive reactions and resistance were bypassed by the "paradoxical" technique of stopping each parent who began to respond to the situation by relating a story of an actual incident with the child and requesting the parent just to relate to this present hypothetical situation. My experience during the Problem Situations Task interviews was refreshing in contrast to numerous parental interviews in the course of my standard clinical work which often put the parent on the defensive and in a one-down position. The present framework placed the parent in a helping position in relation to myself. The joint parental condition and the post-study session (wherein the parents were able to consult openly with me as to any question which they might have had about child rearing) gave several checks as to the validity and genuineness of each parent's response. Out of the 30 families investigated, only three or four families left the impression that they had not been totally open and frank. On the contrary, most of the families surprised me in the extent to which they opened up and spoke about the most intimate personal as well as familial matters.

Gender of characters. All parents were given the same situations irrespective of the gender of their child. One might question whether

it might not have been better to present each parent with situations involving only children of the same gender as the child under investigation? On the other hand, the present framework often encouraged projection onto a figure of the opposite sex. In many instances, parents tended to alter the gender of the child in specific situations to correspond to their child.

Reported solutions vs. actual behavior. In several families the question emerged during the joint condition as to the degree to which the attitudes reflected in the responses were translated into actual behavior with the child. In several instances mothers expressed anger towards fathers in that they were only expressing theoretical positions in that they were hardly ever at home and as a result, seldom interacted with the child.

It would be useful to obtain a measure frequency and intensity of interaction of each parent with the child in order to place the attitudes expressed in their proper perspective. Which spouse is the one to translate the attitudes expressed into actual interaction with the child?

Saliency of situations. The analysis of the individual situations which was undertaken above indicated that the different situations elicited different responses among the various groups, and among fathers and mothers. It might be useful to gauge for each parent which of the situations seemed relevant and most represented actual interaction with the child. In this manner, it might be possible to isolate those actual situations which elicited the style to which

the child was actually exposed. It would be hoped that the latter would be more predictive of adjustment in the kindergarten.

Effectiveness of situations in group and parent differentiation.

Fathers. Three situations revealed differences between groups for fathers though these were not demonstrated to differ from chance. Situation 2, relating to the daughter's cutting her beautiful locks elicited a preference for authoritative responses from fathers of Adj girls, whereas the other (Ret and Dis) fathers distributed their responses equally between the three categories. Apparently, the gender choice was more relevant for fathers of Adj girls, and therefore more representative of their authoritative approach. Likewise, situation 4 relating to delay of gratification of the small son elicited a relatively more authoritative pattern from fathers of Adj boys as opposed to other fathers who equally distributed their responses. Situation 8 dealing with violence towards the son from without, discriminated between fathers of Adj and Ret children who responded primarily with authoritative styles, and fathers of Dis children who preferred permissive styles for girls and authoritarian styles for boys.

The remaining five situations revealed no differences between groups of fathers.

Mothers. Six of the situations elicited differentiated response patterns from at least two of the groups. It must be noted that while mothers of Adj children responded to all eight situations according to the predicted pattern, this tendency did not discriminate them from

mothers of the other two groups upon four situations. Two situations yielded differences which were greater than expected by chance: situation 3, dealing with the son's refusal to eat was the most discriminative. Mothers of Adj children almost exclusively with an authoritative style, while mothers of Ret and Dis children gave mostly permissive answers with a few authoritarian (for boys) solutions. This situation was usually reported by most families to be highly relevant and representative of what actually occurred in the family. Of further significance was the fact that this situation yielded as well a significantly different pattern between fathers and mothers of Adj children, yet did not discriminate between fathers and mothers of the other two groups. Fathers of Adj children (clearest for girls) utilized a predominantly permissive style. Situation 7 dealing with the daughter's tolerance of frustration elicited a permissive pattern for mothers of Dis children which was differentiated from the authoritative pattern of the mothers of Adj children. Several other situations yielded differences in the predicted directions which were not demonstrated to be different from chance: Situation 1 dealing with the son's handling of his frustration by cursing, yielded the same difference between Adj and Dis mothers as did Situation 7. Of special note was the fact that examination of the data for boys only revealed a tendency of mothers of Adj boys to give many authoritarian solutions. In contrast to the permissive pattern which exemplified mothers of Ret and Dis boys. This reflects the fact that mothers of Adj boys related more exclusively to the son's cursing in that situation, whereas

mothers of the other two groups ignored the cursing. Situations 2 and 4 differentiated between mothers of Adj and Ret boys. While mothers of the Adj group relied on authoritative solutions, mothers of the Ret group gave predominantly permissive solutions to Situation 2 and authoritarian solutions to Situation 4. Whereas the Adj mothers showed a consistent authoritative pattern throughout, the mothers of Ret boys were lenient with the daughters who cut their hair (2) and overly strict (4) with the boys who kicked when not receiving the candy they demanded. Situation 5 dealt with the son's aggressive behavior towards a neighboring child. Situation 7 and situation 8 yielded some differences between mothers of Dis and Ret children. Mothers of Dis boys (5) were exclusively authoritative, and girls (7) were primarily permissive while mothers of the Ret group divided their responses between the three possibilities. Situation 8 yielded more authoritarian responses from mothers of Dis children than from mothers of Ret children. Again, it seemed that the Dis mothers responded in a clearer manner than did the mothers of the Ret group.

Both parents. As previously described situations 3,4,7 and 8 were most successful in clearly discriminating between the responses of parents of Adj children, and parents of the Ret and Dis groups. It should be added, however, that situations 1, (Adj vs. Ret and Dis), 2, (Adj vs. Ret), and to a lesser extent 5, (Adj vs. Ret), yielded differences in the predicted directions, although these were not demonstrated to be different from chance.

Effective content. In summary, it would seem that four situations were especially efficient in pointing out different approaches to discipline on the part of parents of Adj as opposed to Ret and Dis children. Situations calling upon the parents to make demands upon the children in a situation wherein the child would rather do otherwise (not to eat (3), not to wait to eat (4), not to make effort and overcome a temporary difficulty (7)) were effective in eliciting more extreme (lenient or strict) stands on the part of parents of Dis and Ret children, in contrast to the clear and sensitive position taken by the parents of Adj children. The situation which called upon parents to deal with an external threat upon the child (8) elicited a clear distinction between parents of Dis children who were most willing to "go to war" as opposed to the firm though "diplomatic-educational" solutions of parents of the Adj and Ret groups.

Questions for future investigations.

The present study has raised several questions which warrant further investigation.

Interaction between parents. The results reviewed above pointed to several trends in parental interaction which seemed related to the children's adjustment outside the home. a) Some families revealed one parent almost exclusively responsible for education of and interaction with the children. It was indicated that the behavior of the secondary figure as to support or undermining of the dominant figure was relevant to the child's functioning. b) Is there a clear relation between the amount of sharing of the parental role and the child's functioning?

All three of the present groups included both kinds (shared vs. dominant). c) What is the effect of a parent's holding specific individual views and changing them as a result of interaction with the spouse as was so blatant with the Ret group?

Individual trends. The present results pointed to combinations of parental disciplinary styles and even to combined responses to specific situations. the preliminary attempt made here to code and score for trends did not show any clear results. A more precise examination of the sequences involved in the response process would enable a better understanding of the defensiveness involved in the parent's reaction to the child.

Parent-child interaction. How does the child's actual behavior at home compare to behavior in kindergarten? How does the interaction between parent and child compare to the parent's report of disciplinary approach to the child?

Teacher-child interaction. How does the child's actual behavior in kindergarten as obtained by objective observation compare to the teachers report? Can the teacher's disciplinary approach to the child, and her style in general be related to the parents' approach?

#### Implications for Clinical Work.

The present study has given added support to the work of previous investigators (Baumrind, Coopersmith) who attempted to relate dimensions of parental discipline to the offspring's personal and social adjustment outside of the home. Despite the distance between

the measurements of the dependent and independent variables, and the methodological limitations inherent in the present design, it was possible to discriminate between parental attitudes and practices which fostered adjustment or maladjustment in kindergarten.

Potential for authoritativeness.

In contrast to previously reported findings almost all of the parents studied revealed different combinations of the possible response styles. No "pure" approaches were revealed in most cases. In other words, every parent revealed that, depending upon the situation involving the child, he or she could respond in a variety of manners. If we return to the contention that the combination of demandingness and responsiveness fosters adjustment in young children, then it was shown in the present study that almost every parent had the potential to relate in an authoritative way to the child. As a consequence, if the potential is present in most parents it would seem an easier task to endeavor to strengthen and reinforce a potential which the parent has present in his or her repertoire than to endeavor to teach a totally new approach. Thus, it has been demonstrated that most parents have shown the ability to relate in an authoritative manner to their children depending upon the situation. Intervention with parents in directions of modifying approaches can therefore start off with identifying those situations wherein the parent is capable of relating in an authoritative way and working at expanding that potential.

The Problem Situation Task as a paradigm for work with parents.

The Problem Situations Task as used in this study has proved to be a very satisfactory tool in initial work with parents.

Safe distance. The use of "hypothetical" situations introduces a certain distance from threatening, problem areas which under standard clinical techniques, arouse defensiveness on the part of the parent. Inducing the parent to take a step back from the usual encounters with the child, and to relate to a future situation has proven to evoke very candid answers.

Combined format. The format of individual sessions followed by a joint session wherein the parents attempt to solve the problems together provides rich clinical data about individual positions and problem solving, and consequently important interactional data. The joint condition provided an important validity check in those cases where one parent was not totally discrete. The spouse usually tends to place the responses in perspective.

Variable content. The situations format does not limit the clinician as to scope of problem areas. The situation can be formulated according to the problems that seem relevant to the case. As suggested above, the situations might be chosen as to the sex of the child or crossed as to sex as to allow for more projection. The age of the child in the situation allows to check for the sensitivity to the developmental dimension, and the awareness of age-relevant needs, conflicts and behaviors.

Concreteness. The concrete nature of the situations was

especially effective in eliciting responses from the population studied, which was mostly working class to lower-middle class, including some illiterate parents who were unable to express themselves in the questionnaire format. In an action and reality oriented society such as the Israeli society, dealing with concrete issues is seen as relevant and therefore especially attractive to fathers. On the other hand, the concreteness was used by more imaginative and verbose parents as merely a taking off point to expound upon their personal philosophies, etc.

#### Psychological intervention in kindergartens.

The impetus for the present study stemmed from my observations of children manifesting the two patterns of maladjustment (disruptive and reticent) in Beit Shemesh kindergartens.

Discrimination of types. The teachers ratings and later descriptions emphasized the need for finer discrimination of the patterns of maladjustment. The ratings revealed that several of the most disruptive children seemed to manifest just as much if not more reticent behavior. They were easily labelled disruptive, as the latter behavior was the most impinging upon the teacher. These "mixed" types should be differentiated from the purer disruptive and reticent children.

Assessment of teacher style. It would seem relevant to pay attention to the teacher's style of discipline in order to assess the extent of the latter's role in eliciting and or reinforcing the child's maladjusted behavior in the kindergarten.

Focus of intervention. The psychologist who is presented the case of a certain child's disruptiveness or reticent behavior in kindergarten seeks to attain as full a picture as possible as to the extent of and reasons for the maladjustment. One of the initial questions revolves around the situational conditions eliciting the maladjusted behavior: To what extent are the teacher and the general atmosphere in the kindergarten related to the child's behavior, and to what extent is the family contributing to the behavior? Success can be maximized by including as many relevant factors as possible in the intervention program. Thus, if the teacher and the parents are enlisted while the child himself is made aware of the effort to help him and is invited to "pitch in" as well, chances are most problems will be ameliorated within a short time. In many cases, not all the parties listed above will fully cooperate. In such cases, one party (parents, teacher, or child) will compensate for the others in taking the burden of the intervention effort.

The question then arises whether common principles can guide the intervention with teachers as well as parents? The results point to the effectiveness of an authoritative approach when presented to the child in a supportive atmosphere wherein the spouse does not negate or undercut the authoritative position, but rather supports or complements. This then points to two necessary components of intervention.

Enhancing authoritativeness. As has been mentioned above most parents reveal a potential for authoritativeness depending upon the

situation. Therefore, the first step would include discovering the specific areas wherein the parent or teacher displays authoritativeness and gradually expanding the style to other areas, through reinforcement and explanation.

One major stumbling block to authoritative functioning is the person's dealing with aggression. Any intervention program has to assess the person's ability to own up to and deal with his aggression especially to the extent that the latter is elicited by the child. Different clinicians will deal differently with the problem, whether through assertiveness training or through analytical techniques. What is crucial to realize is that if pure counseling and training techniques are not successful then therapeutic exploration is indicated.

Dealing with team support. The interaction between parents was indicated to be related to the mode of maladjustment. It is not enough that one parent deals with the child in an authoritative manner. The spouse, or teachers and in the kindergarten has to actively help.

The help can be in the form of support if the agreement is genuine. Or, the help can come in the form of complementing the style as shown in the example of parents of adjusted children wherein one parent emphasized more the controlling functions including making the demands (based on reasoning and explanation) whereas the other parent emphasized the responsiveness to the child's needs.

The basic point here is that the child can benefit from an authoritative approach if the latter is presented within a consistent

and supportive atmosphere based upon trust, respect and clear expression of emotions and beliefs. It is not enough for parents to parrot each others' positions before the child (pseudo mutuality (Wynne et al, 1958)) whereas exposure to constant bickering and undercutting (schism (Lidz et al 1965)) does not enable the child to benefit from the authoritative parent.

Therefore, the pair has to be worked with along the foregoing principles of reinforcing mutual openness, trust, respect and support. In those cases where the couple is not able to benefit from counseling, therapeutic working through of the conflicts have to be considered, though this is a much more sensitive area in work with the kindergarten team.

It is clear that more specific delineation of therapeutic interventions are beyond the scope of the present investigation.

## APPENDIX A

Teacher's Rating Scale.

Special Phenomena Displayed by Children (during school year)  
Each item is scored on a scale from 1 to 4

1. no display of phenomenon
2. infrequent display of phenomenon
3. moderate display of phenomenon
4. frequent display of phenomenon

<u>Items</u>	<u>Scale</u>
1. Hits	Disruptiveness
2. Cries	Reticence
3. Lacks quiet	Dis
4. Bites nails	Neuroticism
5. Sucks thumb	Neu
6. Steals	Neu
7. Defecates	Neu
8. Displays fears	Ret
9. Changes moods	Dis
10. Enuretic - kindergarten	Neu
11.                   night	Neu
12. Lacks control	Dis
13. Sad	Ret
14. Makes odd movements	Neu
15. Facial movements (ticks)	Neu
16. Masturbates	Neu
17. Hungry	Neu
18. Daydreams	Ret
19. Erupts in rage	Dis
20. Stutters	Neu
21. Pronunciation problems	Neu

## APPENDIX B

## Letter form to prospective subjects.

To

---

---

---

Dear Parents,

I am writing to you in order to request your participation in a study which I am doing this year on parental attitudes on child rearing. I am turning to parents whose children have just completed kindergarten.

Your participation entails my visiting you in your home at a time convenient to you (afternoon or evening) at an hour that you will be able to be free to sit with me.

As I would like to be able to reimburse you for your time that you place at my disposal (and as I have no funds to pay you for your time), I will be pleased to avail myself at the end of the meeting to answer any questions you might have concerning the subject of child rearing.

I will be in contact with you (by phone or letter) in the near future in order to make an appointment. In case that you have questions prior to my contacting you, I will be pleased to answer. I can be reached during the day at 913-389 or after 21:00 at 668-963.

Thanking you in advance for your cooperation,

Shaul Livnay  
Psychologist

## APPENDIX C

Problem Situations Task rating guide.General guidelines:

Permissiveness: Emphasis upon responsiveness to the child; support and encouragement without making demands. Relaxes but does not educate; "consultant"; if makes demands, withdraws them at first sign of protest of difficulty.

Libertarian: the child should learn by himself. Emphasis upon not taking responsibility for the child. He will find out by himself.

Authoritative: Responsiveness, support, sensitivity to the needs of the child alongside a willingness to make demands; to help but to also to learn a lesson from the experience. Main emphasis upon explaining to the child so that the latter is able to learn from the situation: why are the demands made of him and what were his motives for his actions.

Authoritarian: Main emphasis upon demands upon the child for correct behavior based upon morals and principles: that's how it must be! Aggressive demands without accompanying explanations; willingness towards severe discipline, hard punishment (usually physical).

First Situation

While playing with his building set, your 5 year old son hits his thumb with a hammer and begins cursing loudly with fairly vile language!

Permissive:

ignores cursing or states that doesn't bother or matter.  
relates to curse but emphasizes non-intervention.  
accepts because only a child; or belittles significance.  
relates to being careful without actual explanation.

identification with the child's reaction ("If I were ....., I'd also react that way!")  
relates to construction frustration with consolation and show of support. without any other intervention  
allows child to continue to play: doesn't prevent nor actively encourage.

Authoritative:

relates to cursing: if disapproves, explains, expresses disapproval anger, shouts; a clear statement of disapproval without insult, with explanation why.  
 relate to carelessness, need for safety.  
 emphasis on educative experience: strengthen for next time.

relates to frustration from the construction game; with consolation and encouragement to try again (with emphasis on careful).  
 support for constructive activity  
 support and relaxation along with constructive explanation.

Authoritarian:

concentrates on the cursing: moral statements, physical punishment e.g. slaps mouth.

no significant relating to construction or frustration

Second Situation

You return from a shopping trip one afternoon to discover that your 6 year old daughter has cut off her beautiful curls.

Permissive:

expression of helplessness; nothing to be done, over with, etc.  
 if disappointment, non-intervention.  
 shift responsibility to spouse  
 playing down of meaningfulness  
 accept because of age

Authoritative:

expression of sorrow, loss, disappointment, anger with reasoning and explanation why sees as wrong  
 moderate to strong emotional reaction  
 relates to scissors with relevance to developmental stage:  
 is child ready to use scissors by himself?

investigates the background, reason for action  
 emphasis on educational experience which will prevent reoccurrence

Authoritarian:

relates to infringement of authority  
 punishment without reasoning  
 anger over use of scissors without explanation of dangers

may react to danger but without relating worry or fright to  
 child if reacts to loss or sorrow, moral inductions

Third Situation

After a delicious dinner is placed before him, your 6 year old son says  
 that he is not hungry.

Permissive:

acceptance  
 or slight resentment, but no action  
 philosophy of non-coercion  
 if attempt to persuade, bribery or emphasis upon how hard  
 worked, importance of food

give other food in order to please/prevent confrontation

Authoritative:

explanation of non-acceptance of bothered by behavior  
 clear statement of principles e.g. prefer you to eat with us,  
 not between meals; next time, not allowed  
 emphasis upon regularity, rules  
 try to urge, persuade but not force (if not this food, that's  
 what there is.... next time you will eat.

relates to taste: accepts child's right to taste vs.  
 statement of mother's effort at preparation.  
 differentiation between child having eaten earlier or having  
 empty stomach exploration of child's reasons for not eating

Authoritarian:

non-acceptance  
 order to eat  
 banishment from table, other punishment, deprivation

no inquiry as to why doesn't want to eat

#### Fourth Situation

You tell your 4 year old son that he cannot have any candy before supper (it's one hour before supper time). He says I want some and begins to shout and kick you with his feet.

##### Permissive:

giving in - give candy; clear feeling of giving in  
no reaction or relating to kicking

he's hungry, not so important, an hour is a long time.  
pity; inability to withstand the child's protest; I know that  
it's better not to give in, but I can't stand to hear him  
cry!

##### Authoritative:

firm handling; no giving candy while no over-reaction to  
kicking expression of disapproval  
clear statement of assertion of authority

understanding of the child's frustration - clear  
strengthening of ability to delay gratification (give candy  
to hold but to eat only after dinner)

##### Authoritarian:

anger and punishment: relating primarily to kicking and  
shouting, not to candy  
child must obey, respect; disgrace at being kicked  
no explanation with punishment

very rigid style: nothing will help him!

#### Fifth Situation

Your 5 year old son pushed the neighbor's 3 year old daughter off her bicycle and starts riding on it himself. You observe the scene from your window.

Permissive:

non-intervention in matters between children; child should solve his own problems.

mild reprimand yet statement of some acceptance. Very slight statement or doubt whether would really react

wanting to get out of confrontation

externalization: show for other parents

compensation: asks other child to give him ride or promise to buy bike emphasis on child's frustration, fact that has no bike.

Authoritative:

disapproval of action; statement of principle: non use of force

exploration of event: what led up, ask for explanation

encouragement of reparation; guidance and support in that direction

Authoritarian:

physical punishment

shame, moral stricture

intervention and reparation by the parent

Sixth Situation

A gang of boys calls your 8 year old to come out to play. You don't think it good for him to play with them, but he starts to go out the door...

Permissive:

indifference

concern yet statement of helplessness; nothing to do, already going out.

weak statement not to leave or next time...

fear of hurting child's feelings or status

child has a right to do what thinks is right; learn from own experience

emphasis upon role as consultant: take it or leave it

Authoritative:

clear statement of concern and worry; firm order to stay if  
 less concern, request to be last time with the gang  
 if allows this time, judge and discuss when gets back  
 confidence in ability to persuade child  
 control through observation; are there really negative  
 consequences?

request for child's reasoning

Authoritarian:

show of force till physical prevention  
 emphasis on spoiling of the child, fear of the consequences  
 of bad company  
 fear of loss of control or influence over the child  
 strong reaction - explosion

no show of concern for child's feelings vs. the others

Seventh Situation

You bought your 7 year old daughter a game for her birthday. After 5 minutes of attempting to play with it, she gets upset and takes apart all that she did.

Permissive:

non-intervention: nature of kids, OK to break  
 self-blaming: mistaken in choice of present  
 no reaction to manner of play

support and help to play again

Authoritative:

relating to style - non-acceptance of destructiveness

alongside consoling over frustration but urging to try again  
 suggest cooperation - let's try it together, next time easier

Authoritarian:

anger at disorder, strong reaction to destruction of property  
 threats of never giving more presents  
 hurt respect

intervention in direction of solving situation for child

Eighth Situation

You are looking out the window and notice the parent of a neighboring child to be yelling rather loudly at your son and then even to begin to strike him.

Permissive:

non-intervention  
 expression of concern or dismay but helplessness or fear of  
 confrontation with the neighbors  
 relating just to son, not to neighbor

Authoritative:

clear anger and concern; firm expression of disapproval of  
 neighbor's behavior  
 emphasis on tell me and I'll handle my own son.

exploration of reasons for the neighbor's action

Authoritarian:

indignation  
 direct confrontation with the neighbor (physical, loss of  
 control)  
 extreme reprimanding of child  
 ignoring of neighbor - displacement of authoritarian reaction  
 to son

General scoring guidelines

Each section of the parent's answer is to be rated for style (N,V or P) in proper sequence (i.e.: P<sub>1</sub> N<sub>2</sub> P<sub>3</sub>). Following the sequence, an overall rating must be given to reflect the overall tone of the answer (i.e.: P<sub>1</sub> N<sub>2</sub> P<sub>3</sub>). Scores in red indicate the global rating for the situation, scores in blue the trend ratings.



## APPENDIX D (continued)

Situation	<u>Adj</u> Boy 1		<u>Dis</u> Girl 3		<u>Ret</u> Boy 3		<u>Ret</u> Girl 5		<u>Dis</u> Boy 4		<u>Adj</u> Girl 4		Agree- ment scores
	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	
8 Fa	V	V	P	P	V	V	V	V	N	N	V	V	1.0
Mo	V	V	N	N	P	V	N	N	N	N	V	V	.83
Fa	.88		.75		.88		1.0		1.0		.9		.9
Mo	.75		.88		.75		1.0		.88		.63		.81
FM	.81		.81		.81		1.0		.94		.75		.85

Note

- a) P - permissive
- b) V - authoritative
- c) N - authoritarian

**PLEASE NOTE:**

**Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.**

**These consist of pages:**

**Appendix E, pages 124-128 (Parental Attitude Research**

---

**Instrument PARI)**

---

---

---

---

---

---

**University  
Microfilms  
International**

**300 N Zeeb Rd., Ann Arbor, MI 48106 (313) 761-4700**

## APPENDIX F

Means of fathers, mothers and children of Adj, Ret  
and Dis groups for background variables.

	F Education	M Education	Birth Order	No. Siblings
<u>Adj</u>				
Boys & Girls	8.6	9.3	2.9	3.5
Boys	8.4	8.0	3.4	3.8
Girls	8.8	10.6	2.4	3.2
<u>Ret</u>				
Boys & Girls	8.6	8.6	3.0	3.2
Boys	9.0	10.4	4.0	4.2
Girls	8.2	7.0	2.0	2.2
<u>Dis</u>				
Boys & Girls	10.8	8.7	3.9	3.7
Boys	11.0	9.0	4.2	4.0
Girls	10.6	8.4	3.6	3.4

ANOVAS: Father Ed.  $F = 2.24$  ns  
 Mother Ed.  $F = .142$  ns  
 Birth Order  $F = .59$  ns  
 No. Siblings  $F = .147$  ns

## APPENDIX G

The number of parents choosing Permissive, Authoritative and Authoritarian solutions to each of the Problem Situations Task, listed by parents sex of child and groups.

Situation Number	Group	Solutions		
		Permissive	Authoritative	Authoritarian
1	<u>Both Parents</u>			
	All Groups	24	22	14
	Adj			
	Boys & Girls	6	9	5
	Boys	2	5	3
	Girls	4	4	2
	Ret			
	Boys & Girls	5	7	4
	Boys	5	4	1
	Girls	4	3	3
	Dis			
	Boys & Girls	9	6	5
	Boys	4	3	3
	Girls	5	3	2
	<u>Fathers only</u>			
	All Groups	11	12	7
	Adj			
	Boys & Girls	4	4	2
	Boys	2	3	0
	Girls	2	1	2
	Ret			
	Boys & Girls	4	4	2
	Boys	2	3	0
	Girls	2	1	2
	Dis			
	Boys & Girls	3	4	3
	Boys	1	2	2
	Girls	2	2	1
	<u>Mothers only</u>			
	All Groups	13	10	7
Adj				
Boys & Girls	2	5	3	
Boys	0	2	3	
Girls	2	3	0	
Ret				
Boys & Girls	5	3	2	
Boys	3	1	1	
Girls	2	2	1	
Dis				
Boys & Girls	6	2	2	
Boys	3	1	1	
Girls	3	1	1	
2	<u>Both Parents</u>			
	All Groups	15	30	15
	Adj			
	Boys & Girls	2	12	6
	Boys	2	5	3
	Girls	0	7	3
	Ret			
	Boys & Girls	7	8	5
	Boys	4	3	3
	Girls	3	5	2
	Dis			
	Boys & Girls	6	10	4
Boys	4	4	2	
Girls	2	6	2	

## APPENDIX G (continued)

Situation Number	Group	Solutions		
		Permissive	Authoritative	Authoritarian
(2)	<u>Fathers only</u>			
	All Groups	7	14	9
	<u>Adj</u>			
	Boys & Girls	1	6	3
	Boys	1	2	2
	Girls	0	4	1
	<u>Ret</u>			
	Boys & Girls	3	4	3
	Boys	1	2	2
	Girls	2	2	1
	<u>Dis</u>			
	Boys & Girls	3	4	3
	Boys	2	2	1
	Girls	1	2	2
	<u>Mothers only</u>			
	All Groups	8	16	6
	<u>Adj</u>			
	Boys & Girls	1	6	3
	Boys	1	3	1
	Girls	0	3	2
	<u>Ret</u>			
Boys & Girls	4	4	2	
Boys	3	1	1	
Girls	1	3	1	
<u>Dis</u>				
Boys & Girls	3	6	1	
Boys	2	2	1	
Girls	1	4	0	
3	<u>Both parents</u>			
	All groups	36	18	6
	<u>Adj</u>			
	Boys & Girls	8	12	0
	Boys	4	6	0
	Girls	4	6	0
	<u>Ret</u>			
	Boys & Girls	13	3	4
	Boys	6	0	4
	Girls	7	3	0
	<u>Dis</u>			
	Boys & Girls	15	3	2
	Boys	6	2	2
	Girls	9	1	0
	<u>Fathers only</u>			
	All Groups	20	8	2
	<u>Adj</u>			
	Boys & Girls	7	3	0
	Boys	3	2	0
	Girls	4	1	0
	<u>Ret</u>			
Boys & Girls	6	2	2	
Boys	3	0	2	
Girls	3	2	0	
<u>Dis</u>				
Boys & Girls	7	3	0	
Boys	3	2	0	
Girls	4	1	0	

## APPENDIX G (continued)

Situation Number	Group	Solutions		
		Permissive	Authoritative	Authoritarian
(3)	<u>Mothers only</u>			
	<u>All Groups</u>	16	10	4
	<u>Adj</u>			
	Boys & Girls	1	9	0
	Boys	1	4	0
	Girls	0	5	0
	<u>Ret</u>			
	Boys & Girls	7	1	2
	Boys	3	0	2
	Girls	4	1	0
	<u>Dis</u>			
	Boys & Girls	8	0	2
	Boys	3	0	2
	Girls	5	0	0
4	<u>Both Parents</u>			
	<u>All Groups</u>	16	31	11
	<u>Adj</u>			
	Boys & Girls	6	14	0
	Boys	2	8	0
	Girls	4	6	0
	<u>Ret</u>			
	Boys & Girls	7	7	6
	Boys	4	1	5
	Girls	3	6	1
	<u>Dis</u>			
	Boys & Girls	7	7	6
	Boys	4	1	5
	Girls	3	6	1
	<u>Ret</u>			
	Boys & Girls	2	5	3
	Boys	1	1	3
	Girls	1	4	0
	<u>Dis</u>			
	Boys & Girls	2	6	2
	Boys	1	2	2
	Girls	1	4	0
4	<u>Both Parents</u>			
	<u>All Groups</u>	16	31	11
	<u>Adj</u>			
	Boys & Girls	6	14	0
	Boys	2	8	0
	Girls	4	6	0
	<u>Ret</u>			
	Boys & Girls	7	7	6
	Boys	4	1	5
	Girls	3	6	1
	<u>Dis</u>			
	Boys & Girls	2	5	3
	Boys	1	1	3
	Girls	1	4	0
	<u>Ret</u>			
	Boys & Girls	2	6	2
	Boys	1	2	2
	Girls	1	4	0

## APPENDIX G (continued)

Situation Number	Group	Solutions		
		Permissive	Authoritative	Authoritarian
5	<u>Both parents</u>			
	All groups	8	37	15
	<u>Adj</u>			
	Boys & Girls	2	14	4
	Boys	0	6	4
	Girls	2	8	0
	<u>Ret</u>			
	Boys & Girls	4	10	6
	Boys	1	4	5
	Girls	3	6	1
	<u>Dis</u>			
	Boys & Girls	2	13	5
	Boys	1	7	2
	Girls	1	6	3
	All Groups	5	16	9
	<u>Adj</u>			
	Boys & Girls	1	7	2
	Boys	0	3	2
	Girls	1	4	0
	<u>Ret</u>			
	Boys & Girls	2	4	4
	Boys	0	3	2
	Girls	2	1	2
	<u>Dis</u>			
	Boys & Girls	2	5	3
	Boys	1	2	2
	Girls	1	3	1
	<u>Mothers only</u>			
	All Groups	3	21	6
	<u>Adj</u>			
	Boys & Girls	1	7	2
	Boys	0	3	2
	Girls	1	4	0
<u>Ret</u>				
Boys & Girls	2	6	2	
Boys	1	2	2	
Girls	1	4	0	
<u>Dis</u>				
Boys & Girls	0	8	2	
Boys	0	5	0	
Girls	0	3	2	
6	<u>Both Parents</u>			
	All Groups	15	37	8
	<u>Adj</u>			
	Boys & Girls	5	13	2
	Boys	4	5	1
	Girls	1	8	1
	<u>Ret</u>			
	Boys & Girls	6	12	2
	Boys	2	7	1
	Girls	4	5	1
	<u>Dis</u>			
	Boys & Girls	4	12	4
	Boys	2	5	3
	Girls	2	7	1
	<u>Fathers only</u>			
All Groups	7	18	5	
<u>Adj</u>				
Boys & Girls	3	6	1	
Boys	3	2	0	
Girls	0	4	1	

Situation Number	Group	Solutions		
		Permissive	Authoritative	Authoritarian
(6)		(Fathers Only)		
	<u>Ret</u>			
	Boys & Girls	3	5	2
	Boys	1	3	1
	Girls	2	2	1
	<u>Dis</u>			
	Boys & Girls	1	7	2
	Boys	1	2	2
	Girls	0	5	0
	<u>Mothers only</u>			
	All Groups	8	19	3
	<u>Adj</u>			
	Boys & Girls	2	7	1
	Boys	1	3	1
	Girls	1	4	0
	<u>Ret</u>			
	Boys & Girls	3	7	0
	Boys	1	4	0
	Girls	2	3	0
	<u>Dis</u>			
	Boys & Girls	3	5	2
	Boys	1	3	1
	Girls	2	2	1
7	<u>Both Parents</u>			
	All Groups	39	16	5
	<u>Adj</u>			
	Boys & Girls	10	6	2
	Boys	5	5	0
	Girls	5	3	2
	<u>Ret</u>			
	Boys & Girls	13	6	1
	Boys	7	3	0
	Girls	6	3	1
	<u>Dis</u>			
	Boys & Girls	16	2	2
	Boys	7	1	2
	Girls	9	1	0
	<u>Fathers only</u>			
	All Groups	24	5	1
	<u>Adj</u>			
	Boys & Girls	7	2	1
	Boys	4	1	0
	Girls	3	1	1
	<u>Ret</u>			
	Boys & Girls	8	2	0
	Boys	4	1	0
	Girls	4	1	0
	<u>Dis</u>			
	Boys & Girls	9	1	0
	Boys	4	1	0
	Girls	5	0	0
	<u>Mothers only</u>			
	All Groups	15	11	4
	<u>Adj</u>			
	Boys & Girls	3	6	1
	Boys	1	4	0
	Girls	2	2	1
	<u>Ret</u>			
	Boys & Girls	5	4	1
	Boys	3	2	0
	Girls	2	2	1
	<u>Dis</u>			
	Boys & Girls	7	1	2
	Boys	3	1	1
	Girls	4	0	1

## APPENDIX G (continued)

Situation Number	Group	Solutions		
		Permissive	Authoritative	Authoritarian
8	<u>Both Parents</u>			
	All Groups	17	32	11
	Adj			
	Boys & Girls	5	14	1
	Boys	4	6	0
	Girls	1	8	1
	Ret			
	Boys & Girls	6	12	2
	Boys	5	4	1
	Girls	1	8	1
	Dis			
	Boys & Girls	6	6	8
	Boys	2	3	5
	Girls	4	3	3
	<u>Fathers only</u>			
	All Groups	8	16	6
	Adj			
	Boys & Girls	2	8	0
	Boys	1	4	0
	Girls	1	4	0
	Ret			
	Boys & Girls	2	6	2
	Boys	1	3	1
	Girls	1	3	1
	Dis			
	Boys & Girls	4	2	4
	Boys	1	1	3
	Girls	3	1	1
	<u>Mothers only</u>			
	All Groups	9	16	5
	Adj			
	Boys & Girls	3	6	1
	Boys	3	2	0
Girls	0	4	1	
Ret				
Boys & Girls	4	6	0	
Boys	4	1	0	
Girls	0	5	0	
Dis				
Boys & Girls	2	4	4	
Boys	1	2	2	
Girls	1	2	2	

Appendix H  
Distribution of Trend Scores by groups.

Groups	Trend Scores <sup>a</sup>												
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
<u>Both parents</u>													
All groups	55	8	29	33	13	35	1	4	1	1	1	1	2
<u>Adj</u> Boys & Girls	23	3	7	9	3	9	0	2	0	1	0	0	0
Boys	8	1	7	4	1	5	0	2	0	1	0	0	0
Girls	15	2	0	5	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<u>Ret</u> Boys & Girls	21	2	14	6	4	10	0	2	1	0	0	1	0
Boys	17	1	4	5	1	5	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
Girls	4	1	10	1	3	5	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
<u>Dis</u> Boys & Girls	11	3	8	18	6	16	1	0	0	0	1	0	2
Boys	3	1	4	9	4	9	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Girls	8	2	4	9	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
<u>Fathers only</u>													
All groups	39	3	16	20	4	19	1	2	1	0	1	1	0
<u>Adj</u> Boys & Girls	16	2	5	8	2	4	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
Boys	5	1	5	2	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
Girls	11	1	0	6	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<u>Ret</u> Boys & Girls	12	1	8	3	1	7	0	1	1	0	0	1	0
Boys	10	0	1	2	1	5	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
Girls	2	1	7	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
<u>Dis</u> Boys & Girls	11	0	3	11	1	8	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Boys	3	0	1	5	1	4	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Girls	8	0	2	6	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

## APPENDIX H (continued)

Groups	Trend Scores <sup>a</sup>												
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
<b>Mothers only</b>													
All groups	16	5	13	13	9	16	0	2	0	1	0	0	2
<u>Adj</u> Boys & Girls	7	1	2	3	1	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Boys	3	0	2	2	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Girls	4	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<u>Ret</u> Boys & Girls	9	1	6	3	3	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Boys	7	1	3	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Girls	2	0	3	0	3	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
<u>Dis</u> Boys & Girls	0	3	5	7	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Boys	0	1	3	4	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Girls	0	2	2	3	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

**Note**

- <sup>a</sup> - Trend Score categories
1. permissive to authoritative
  2. permissive to authoritarian
  3. authoritative to permissive
  4. authoritative to authoritarian
  5. authoritarian to permissive
  6. authoritarian to authoritative
  7. permissive to authoritative to authoritarian
  8. permissive to authoritarian to authoritative
  9. authoritative to permissive to authoritarian
  10. permissive to authoritative to permissive
  11. authoritative to permissive to authoritative
  12. permissive to authoritarian to permissive
  13. authoritarian to permissive to authoritative

## APPENDIX I

Comparison of responses to the Problem Situations Task  
under individual and joint conditions for fathers  
and mothers of Adj, Ret and Dis Groups.

---

Groups	<u>Responses</u>		
	Permissive	Authoritative	Authoritarian
<u>Both Parents</u>			
<u>Adj</u>			
<u>Boys &amp; Girls</u>			
Individual	44	95	21
Joint	36.5	109	14.5
Boys	I 23 J 16.5	45 55	12 8.5
Girls	I 21 J 20	50 54	9 6
<u>Ret</u>			
<u>Boys &amp; Girls</u>			
Boys	I 65 J 48.5	65 92	30 19.5
Girls	I 34 J 26	26 43	20 11
Boys	I 31 J 22.5	39 49	10 8.5
<u>Dis</u>			
<u>Boys &amp; Girls</u>			
Boys	I 62 J 59	63 64	35 37
Girls	I 29 J 28	30 29	21 23
Boys	I 33 J 31	33 35	14 14
Girls	I 33 J 31	33 35	14 14

## APPENDIX I (continued)

---

Groups	<u>Responses</u>		
	Permissive	Authoritative	Authoritarian
<u>Fathers only</u>			
<u>Adj</u>			
Boys & Girls	I 29 J 19.5	41 52	10 8.5
Boys	I 15 J 10.5	20 25	5 4.5
Girls	I 14 J 9	21 27	5 4
<u>Ret</u>			
Boys & Girls	I 33 J 28.5	29 41	18 10.5
Boys	I 15 J 15	14 20	11 5
Girls	I 18 J 13.5	15 21	7 5.5
<u>Dis</u>			
Boys & Girls	I 32 J 31	30 35	18 14
Boys	I 15 J 17	14 14	11 9
Girls	I 17 J 14	16 21	7 5
<u>Mothers only</u>			
<u>Adj</u>			
Boys & Girls	I 15 J 17	54 57	11 6
Boys	I 8 J 6	25 30	7 4

## APPENDIX I (continued)

---

Groups	<u>Responses</u>		
	Permissive	Authoritative	Authoritarian
Girls	I 7	29	4
	J 11	27	2
<u>Ret</u> Boys & Girls	I 32	36	12
	J 20	51	9
Boys	I 19	12	9
	J 11	23	6
Girls	I 13	24	3
	J 9	28	3
<u>Dis</u> Boys & Girls	I 30	33	17
	J 28	29	23
Boys	I 14	16	10
	J 11	15	14
Girls	I 16	17	7
	J 17	14	9

## APPENDIX J

Intercorrelations of F Scale and PARI subscales  
for mothers and fathers.

Fathers			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	<u>F Scale</u>										
<u>F Scale</u>		.39	.20	.47	.39	.12	.41	.42	.51	.21	
1	.39	---	.10	.42	.67	.29	.55	.47	.49	-.06	
2	.20	.10	---	.09	.21	.34	.15	.26	.27	.46	
3	.47	.42	.09	---	.39	.08	.71	.50	.47	-.30	
4	.39	.67	.21	.39	---	.26	.47	.39	.53	.02	
5	.12	.29	.34	.08	.26	---	.31	.39	.30	.34	
6	.41	.55	.15	.71	.47	.31	---	.44	.45	-.06	
7	.42	.47	.26	.50	.39	.39	.44	---	.45	.19	
8	.5	.49	.27	.47	.53	.30	.45	.45	---	.06	
9	-.2	-.06	.46	-.30	.02	.34	-.06	.19	.06	---	

Mothers			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	<u>F Scale</u>										
<u>F Scale</u>		.46	.50	.62	.41	.34	.60	.57	.58	.37	
1	.46	---	.07	.48	.42	.12	.22	.24	.50	-.19	
2	.50	.07	---	.55	.06	.26	.16	.42	.29	.54	
3	.62	.48	.55	---	.37	.29	.43	.67	.55	.36	
4	.41	.42	.06	.37	---	.22	.30	.37	.39	-.17	
5	.34	.12	.26	.29	.22	---	.22	.55	.25	.20	
6	.60	.22	.16	.43	.30	.22	---	.52	.57	.10	
7	.57	.24	.42	.67	.37	.55	.52	---	.34	.34	
8	.58	.50	.29	.55	.39	.25	.57	.34	---	.16	
9	.37	-.19	.54	-.36	-.17	.20	.10	.34	.16	---	

## Note

- a - PARI Subscales
- 1 Dependence
  - 2 Independence
  - 3 Punitiveness
  - 4 Strictness
  - 5 Acceptance
  - 6 Defication
  - 7 Authoritarian
  - 8 Suppression of Aggression
  - 9 Egalitarianism

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adorno T.W., Frenkel-Brunswik C., Levinson D.J., & Sanford R.N. The authoritarian personality. New York: Harper, 1950.

Baumrind D. Effects of authoritative parental control on child behavior. Child Development, 1966, 37, (4), 887-907.

Baumrind D. Current patterns of parental authority Developmental Psychology monographs 1971, 4, (1), part 2, 1-103.

Baumrind D. The contributions of the family to the development of competence in children. Schizophrenia Bulletin, 1975, 14, 12-37.

Baumrind D., & Black A. Socialization practices associated with dimensions of competence in pre-school boys and girls. Child Development, 1967, 38, 291-327.

Becker W.C., Peterson D.R., Luria Z., Shoemaker D.J., & Hillmer A. Relation of factors derived from parent interview ratings to behavior problems of 5-year olds. Child Development, 1962, 33, 509-535.

Becker W.C. & Krug R.S. A circumplex model for social behavior in children. Child Development, 1964, 35, 371-396.

Biller H.B. Paternal deprivation: family, school, sexuality and society. Lexington Mass.: Heath & Co., 1974.

Coopersmith S. The antecedents of self esteem. San Francisco: Freeman, 1967.

Crandall V.C., Good S., & Crandall V.J. The reinforcement effects of adult reactions and nonreactions on childrens' achievement expectations: a replication. Child Development, 1964, 35, 485-497.

Dubin E.R. & Dubin R. The authority inception period in socialization. Child Development, 1963, 34, 885-898.

Farina A. & Holzberg J.D. Interaction patterns of parents of hospitalized sons diagnosed as schizophrenic or non-schizophrenic. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1968, 73, (2), 114-118.

Ferreira A.J. & Winter W.D. Stability of international variables in family decision making. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1966, 14, 352-355.

Freud S. Three contributions to the theory of sex. New York: NMD Pub. Co., 1910.

Gordon T. PET parent effectiveness training: the tested way to raise responsible children. New York: PH Wyden 1970.

Hess R.D. & Handel G. Patterns of aggression in parents and their children. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1956, 89, 199-212.

Jackson P.W. Verbal solutions to parent-child problems and reports of experience with punishment. Child Development, 1956, 27, 339-343.

Jordan B.E., Raden N. & Epstein A. Paternal behavior and intellectual functioning in pre-school boys and girls. Developmental Psychology, 1975, 11, 407-408.

Kohn M.L. Parent-child relations: an interpretation American Journal of Sociology, 1963, 68, 471-480.

Lamb M.E. (Ed) Role of the father in child development. New York: Wiley & Sons, 1976.

Tepper M.R. Dissonance, self perception and honesty in children. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 25, 65-74.

Lewis C.C. The effects of parental firm control: a reinterpretation of findings. Psychological Bulletin, 1981, 90, (3), 547-563.

Lidz T., Fleck S., & Cornelison A.R. Schizophrenia and the family. New York: International Universities Press, 1965.

Lynn D.B. The father: his role in child development. Monterey Calif.: Brooks/Cole, 1974.

Lytton H. Correlates of compliance and the rudiments of conscience in two-year old boys. Canadian Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 1977, 9, 242-251.

Lytton H. Parent-child interaction: the socialization process observed in twin and singleton families. New York: Plenum Press, 1980.

Parsons T. A longitudinal approach to the study of cultural growth Social Forces, 1955, 34, 34-41.

Radin N. Role of the father in cognitive, academic and intellectual development. in Lamb M.E. (Ed) Role of the father in child development New York: Wiley & Sons, 1976, 237-277.

Rosenthal M.J., Ni E., Finkelstein M., & Berkowits G. Father-child relations and childrens problems. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1962, 7, 360-373.

Sears R.R., Whiting F.W.M., Nowlis V., & Sears P.S. Some child rearing antecedents of aggression and dependency in young children. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1953, 47, 135-234.

Strodbeck F.L. Husband and wife interaction over revealed differences. American Sociological Review, 1951, 16, 468-473.

Wynne L.L., Ryckoff I.M., Day J., & Hirsch S.I. Pseudomutuality in the family relations of schizophrenics. Psychiatry, 1958, 21, 205-220.

## REFERENCE NOTES

Bandura A. Relationship of family patterns to child behavior disorders. Stanford University: Progress report, USPHS Project no. M1734, 1960.

Baumrind D. Personal communication, 1980.

Levy-Schiff R. The role of the father in early childhood. The Hebrew University, Jerusalem: unpublished Dissertation, 1978.

Livnay (Weisbrot) J.S. The presentation of the self in mental illness: a reassessment and extension of the hypothesis. The City College of New York: unpublished M.A. Thesis, 1974.

Pederson F.A., Rubenstein O.L. & Yarrow L.J. Father absence in infancy. Philadelphia: Paper presented at the Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, March 1973.

Schaefer E.S. & Bell R.Q. Parental attitude research instrument (PARI) Normative data. Bethesda Md.: Unpublished manuscript. Library, National Institutes of Mental Health, 1955.