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The purpose of this study was to investigate the birth order differences in perception of parental child-rearing practices in one- and two-sibling families. The two-sibling families were separated into all the possible sex permutations (male-male, female-female, male-female, female-male) to assess the influence of sex of sibling in viewing the parents' child-rearing practices. Separate statistical analysis was made for each parent. The Roe-Siegelman Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire (PCR) was employed to obtain retrospective perceptions of the parents' child-rearing practices from the viewpoint of the offspring.

The following hypotheses were made: (1) The second-borns of both sexes would evaluate their parents as significantly more loving and less rejecting than first-borns of both sexes. (2) When sex was controlled, only children would perceive their parents as significantly more loving and less rejecting than would either the older of two or the second of two. (3) Females would see their parents as significantly more loving and less rejecting than would males. (4) When sex was controlled, only children would perceive their parents as significantly more protecting than would either the older of two or the second of two. (5) When sex was controlled, first-borns and only children
would view their parents as significantly more demanding than the second of two. (6) The parent who was the same sex as the child would be viewed as significantly more demanding than the parent of the opposite sex.

The Ss consisted of 160 college students who were either only children or from two-sibling families. Only those Ss who had completed both the mother and father forms of the PCR were employed in the final statistical analysis.

The major findings of the study were the following:
(1) Females evaluated both fathers and mothers as significantly more loving, less rejecting, and more protecting than males. (2) Second-borns saw their fathers and mothers as more loving and less rejecting than did first-borns, although only the data for mothers reached statistical significance. (3) Second-borns saw their fathers as significantly more protecting than did first-borns. (4) Only males and males who were the older of two viewed their mothers as significantly more demanding than did males who were the second of two. (5) The parent who was the same sex as his child was not viewed as any more demanding than the parent of the opposite sex.

A limitation of the study was the lack of precision in determining which father, biological or step-father, was evaluated on the father form of the PCR. Important implications for future birth order research were noted. Separation of the sexes who occupy the same birth order position should
be taken into consideration. In addition, sex of the sib-
lings in the family is an important variable which influences
the way a sibling sees his parents. Separation of only
children and first-borns is indicated because of the dif-
ferent perceptions they have of their parents.
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Statement of the Problem and Review of the Literature

Statement of the Problem

The topic of birth order has long been of interest to both laymen and scientists. Often differences in personality (McArthur, 1956), achievement (Sampson, 1962), social behavior (Warren, 1966), and other dimensions among people have been attributed to birth order. One area of inquiry into analyzing these birth order differences has been child-rearing practices.

The problem selected for investigation in this study was the birth order differences in perception of parental child-rearing practices in one-and two-sibling families. The data were analyzed separately for each parent. In addition, all the possible sex permutations in a two-sibling family were examined in order to assess the influence of sex of sibling in viewing the parents' child-rearing practices.

Certain very important methodological weaknesses have existed in many of the studies on birth order. Despite warnings that size of family has been an important variable (Koch, 1956; MacDonald, 1969b, 1971; Warren, 1966) and that sex and birth order have often interacted (Gerard & Rabbie, 1961; MacDonald, 1969b, 1970), most researchers (MacDonald,
1971; Sampson, 1965) have continued to lump together only children and first-borns. Furthermore, they have frequently not separated the sexes who have occupied the same ordinal position (MacDonald, 1971; Sampson, 1965).

Because of the effects of family size on birth order research, this study has been limited to two different family sizes: only children and two-sibling families. The two-sibling families have been broken into all the possible permutations: male-male, male-female, female-female, and female-male.

Numerous researchers (Becker, 1964; Bronfenbrenner, 1961; Droppleman & Schaefer, 1963; Kagan & Lemkin, 1960; Sears, Maccoby, & Levin, 1957) have stressed the importance of separating sex of the child and sex of the parent. For that reason separate analysis has been made on males and females. In addition, data on mothers and fathers have also been separated.

Bronfenbrenner (1961) has especially emphasized the separation of sex of parent and child in understanding parent-child relations. His data indicated that, with few exceptions, mothers were more involved than fathers in all areas of child-rearing. Fathers employed more physical punishment, and they were more involved in activities that dealt with skill, competition, and aggression.

The main point of Bronfenbrenner's research was that the sexes were treated differently: girls received more
affection, attention, and praise than did boys. Boys received greater pressure and discipline. Also, Bronfenbrenner (1961) noted the following: "A tendency existed for each parent to be somewhat more active, firm and demanding with the child of the same sex, and more lenient and indulgent with a child of the opposite sex [p. 249]."

Bronfenbrenner also stressed different outcomes for males and females when the same child-rearing practices were used. The relationship between strong paternal authority and responsibility very accurately exemplified this point. Tentative findings from Bronfenbrenner suggested: "Firm paternal authority is associated with high responsibility in boys but lower responsibility in girls [p. 266]." Because of these results, it should be clear that for a more accurate understanding of child-rearing practices, sex of parent and child must definitely be separated.

Throughout the literature, the importance of social class (Bayley, 1960; Davis, 1943; Dolger, 1946; Maccoby & Gibbs, 1954; Sears, Maccoby, & Levin, 1957) in comprehending child-rearing practices has been repeatedly mentioned; however, few studies on birth order and parent-child relations have controlled for the effects of social class. Davis (1943) clearly conceptualized the relationship between child-rearing and social class in the following:
Class training of the child ranges all the way from the control of the manner and ritual by which he eats his food to the control of his choice of playmates and of his educational and occupational goals. The times and places for his recreations, the chores required of him by his family, the rooms and articles in the house which he may use, the wearing of certain clothes at certain times, the amount of studying required of him, the economic control to which he is subjected by his parents, indeed his very conceptions of right and wrong, vary according to the social class of the child in question [p. 609].

The majority of evidence has suggested that middle-class mothers have been warmer, more demonstrative of their affection, and less punitive than lower-class mothers (Bayley, 1960; Burton & Whiting, 1961; Jersild, A. T., Markey, & Jersild, C. L., 1933). Also, when conflict has arisen, the middle-class mother has reasoned with her child more and has used less physical punishment, deprivation of privileges, and ridicule than lower-class mothers (Maccoby & Gibbs, 1954). To comprehend more fully the effects of birth order and perceived parent-child relations, analysis has also been made with social class controlled.

Review of the Literature

The most commonly cited model for studying parent-child relations and birth order has come from Schachter (1959). In his Psychology of Affiliation, Schachter provided a theoretical framework for understanding why first-borns and only children were more affiliative than later-born siblings. Basically, he suggested that while the first child has been
given much attention, the parents' own insecurities about child-rearing have caused them to frustrate the child's dependency needs.

Another apparent outcome of parents' inexperience with their first child has been their expecting too much from the child. Rosen (1961) and Sampson (1962) have suggested this as a source of high need achievement and responsibility training in the first-borns. This has been given some tacit support because of the preponderance of only children and first-borns in obtaining eminence (Campbell, 1971; Galton, 1874; and Schachter, 1963).

Sears, Maccoby, & Levin (1957) examined the effects of ordinal position as it related to parent-child relations. Concomitant with the inexperience manifested by the parents, these researchers noted that parents were typically more punitive toward the first child, and more conflicts surrounded disciplining him than later-born siblings. This result was consistent with Lasko's findings (1954) that the second child was treated more permissively.

The only difference Sears et al. noted in only children, as compared with all other ordinal positions, was in restrictions placed on their movements in the neighborhood. They were more restricted than children from multi-sibling families. This is also consistent with the popular stereotype of the only child as being overly protected.
According to Adler (1945), the first child has felt "dethroned" with the arrival of the second child. The first child has previously held a position of receiving the undivided attention of the parents; then he has had to learn to share his parents with another sibling. He has, therefore, experienced a deprivation of attention and affection from the parents. From the viewpoint of the child, the first-born would have seen himself as being treated less affectionately and warmly than when he was an only child. The second child in a two-sibling family would never have experienced the "dethronement" that the first child experienced.

Research by Lasko (1954) supported this hypothesis. Using the Fels Institute group data, she found that the parents behaved more warmly toward the second child than they did to the first child. Also, she discovered that the parents' control was more permissive towards the second child. It should be noted that the experimental data of Conners (1963) has contradicted Lasko's findings. Based on verbal reports from college students, Conners found an increase in deprivation of affection existing from the only child through the first-born to the second-born.

Bossard (1955) studied the influence of birth order on the family from a sociological perspective. He emphasized that the family can be thought of as a group, with different siblings taking on different roles in the family
constellation. With the increase in family size, the later-born siblings would have fewer choices in selecting a role. More typically, the first-born child has become the most responsible sibling in the family (McArthur, 1956; Rosen, 1961; and Sampson, 1962). Adler (1945) referred to the first child as the "foreman of the parents."

The social learning model of Bandura & Walters (1963) has suggested another theoretical position for examining the relationship between ordinal position in a two-sibling family and parent-child relations. The older child has his parents as models of behavior. Both the older sibling and the parents serve as models for the younger sibling.

Much research (Harris, 1964; McArthur, 1956; Palmer, 1966; Rosen, 1961; Sutton-Smith, Roberts, & Rosenberg, 1964) has suggested the adult-like behavior of the first-born. Palmer (1966) studied the relationship between birth order and identification with the parents. His results indicated that the first-born was more adult-oriented than later-borns. Using Slater's (1955) Parental Role Patterns Questionnaire, Palmer found that first-borns saw themselves as having more similar values with their parents than later-borns with respect to inhibitory-disciplinarian behaviors. Palmer (1966) concluded, "The first-born would appear, then, to be identifying most particularly with authority, discipline, and parental prohibitions and moral values [than later-born
siblings [p. 133]." The first-borns' "superego" was more internalized; the second-borns', more externalized. This led to the hypothesis that first-borns and only children would view their parents as significantly more demanding than would the second of two.

Two studies (Oberlander, 1970; Sutton-Smith, Roberts, & Rosenberg, 1964) have suggested a relationship between birth order and occupational preference. Oberlander's findings (1970) have supported this. First-borns preferred more intellectual activities, while second-borns manifested more interest in social occupations. Going on the premise that the first-born has been more adult-oriented and has been given more responsibility training, Sutton-Smith et al. (1964) predicted that first-borns would be more likely to prefer parental surrogate positions, especially teaching. His hypothesis was confirmed. Many more first-borns wanted to teach than did later-born siblings.

Evidence has begun to accumulate (MacDonald, 1967, 1969a, 1969b, 1970) that first-borns and only children have been more highly socialized than later-born siblings. MacDonald (1969) explored the relationship between ordinal position and volunteering for an experiment. First-borns were more responsible about keeping their experimental appointments, and they were less likely to indicate suspicion that the experiment was not as the experimenter had presented it. Consistent with the highly-socialized hypothesis was the
finding that first-borns and only children were more in agreement with the statement "I believe that promptness is a very important personality characteristic" than were later-borns.

Touhey (1971) has studied the relationship between premarital sex and birth order. His results indicated that first-borns, in comparison with later-borns, were less likely to be virgins. He interpreted this finding as being another example of the first-borns' adopting adult-like behavior sooner than later-borns.

One of the most fruitful areas of inquiry into the nature of parent-child relations and ordinal position has been the examination of adult personality differences. As part of a larger study of adult development at Harvard University, McArthur (1956) examined the relationship between birth order and personality across two generations. McArthur's initial research made an assessment of 250 "normal" Harvard men studied during the late 1930's. In the 1950's he conducted a follow-up study of these men and their families.

McArthur gathered data from several different observers. For a complete description of their comments, the reader is referred to McArthur's article (1956). It should be noted, however, that they all produced similar findings. For the sake of brevity, only the observations of the participants' children by the original Harvard Ss have been included:
First children are more fond of adult company, serious, sensitive, conscientious, good, studious, shy, fearful, self-reliant, and undemonstrative.

Second children are more often placid, friendly, cheerful, stubborn, rebellious, easy to take care of, unstudious, and make no effort to please [pp. 48-49].

Dean (1947) investigated the relationship between personality and ordinal position by the use of a forced-choice questionnaire, which was completed by the mothers. She limited her study to two-sibling families with children less than seven years old. Her results indicated that the first ordinal position was judged by the mothers to be more worried, more excitable, to have their feelings hurt more easily, to be less demonstratively affectionate, and to be less effective in protecting themselves from verbal or physical attack.

Several different models (Roe & Siegelman, 1963; Roff, 1949; Schaefer, 1961; Sears, Maccoby, & Levin, 1957) have been proposed to investigate the nature of parent-child relations. Although the previous models used different techniques to examine the relationship between parent-child relations, one very important dimension has emerged: loving behavior versus rejecting behavior. Research has suggested that loving and rejecting behavior of the parents has been related to the following conditions: delinquency (McCord, McCord, and Howard, 1963), inadequate self-concept (Medinnus, 1965), school achievement (Morrow & Wilson, 1961), and anxiety (Siegelman, 1965).
The above-cited models employed different methods to investigate parent-child relations. Sears, Maccoby, & Levin (1957) used parental interviews; Schaefer (1961), questionnaires completed by the parents; Roe & Siegelman (1963), questionnaires filled out by the offspring themselves.

Schaefer (1965) has suggested that "a child's perception of his parents' behavior may be more [closely] related to his adjustment than is the actual behavior of his parents [p. 413]." Cox (1970) investigated this hypothesis. He related the child's extra-familial behavior with parents' perception of child-rearing and child's perception of the parents' child-rearing behavior. Cox's research (1970) concluded the following:

Measures based on independent observations of the child's behavior are more highly related to the child's perception of each parent's affectional behavior than to that parent's own report of affectional behavior toward the child [pp. 444-446].

Roe & Siegelman (1963) developed the Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire (PCR). In their initial survey of the PCR they found no differences with ordinal position and perceived parent-child relations with regard to the mother; however, two differences were noted for fathers. Younger children, as opposed to the oldest and only children, perceived their fathers as more loving and more attentive.
Roe & Siegelman (1963) did not control for family size and no female Ss were used. In addition, they did not differentiate between only children and the oldest sibling. The present study has attempted to delineate more clearly the relationship between birth order and parent-child relations.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses, each pertaining to the mother and father, were made on the basis of previous research findings:

1. The second-borns of both sexes would evaluate their parents as significantly (p< .05) more loving and less rejecting than the first-borns of both sexes.

2. When sex was controlled, only children would perceive their parents as significantly (p< .05) more loving and less rejecting than either the older of two, or the second of two.

3. Females would see their parents as significantly (p< .05) more loving and less rejecting than males.

4. When sex was controlled, only children would perceive their parents as significantly (p< .05) more protecting than either the older of two, or the second of two.

5. When sex was controlled, first-borns and only children would view their parents as significantly (p< .05) more demanding than the second of two.
6. The parent who was the same sex as the child would be viewed as significantly (p< .05) more demanding than the parent of the opposite sex.

Method

Subjects

Approximately 550 students at North Texas State University completed the PCR; however, only those who were only children or from two-sibling families were employed in the final tabulation of data. These students were either fulfilling their research requirements or they were completing the questionnaires for extra credit in their psychology courses. From this initial sample, 222 students were either only children or from two-sibling families. Complete data were unavailable for 41 Ss. These Ss were deleted. Complete information was available on 171 Ss. The ten different birth order cells contained 16 to 19 Ss. For statistical purposes Ss were randomly removed from cells with more than 16 Ss, providing an equal number (16 Ss) in each cell. Table 1 shows the birth order categories and the number of Ss in each cell.

Personal history information was also obtained from each S. The S was asked to indicate on an IBM answer sheet the following information: his sex, age, ethnic group, parent's educational level, and marital status of his parents. The biographical data sheet is included in the appendix.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Only Children</th>
<th>Older of two is a ... , with a younger male sibling</th>
<th>Older of two is a ... , with a younger female sibling</th>
<th>Younger of two is a ... , with an older male sibling</th>
<th>Younger of two is a ... , with an older female sibling</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It was previously noted that college students were employed as Ss. This has resulted in a somewhat homogenous sample with regard to age and ethnic membership.

Information was requested of each S concerning his age. Table 2 shows the ages of the Ss.

**TABLE 2**

Age Distribution by Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years:</th>
<th>17-18</th>
<th>19-20</th>
<th>21-21</th>
<th>23-24</th>
<th>25+</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The vast majority (93 per cent) of the Ss were Caucasians. Table 3 shows the ethnic distribution of Ss by sex.

**TABLE 3**

Ethnic Distribution by Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caucasian</th>
<th>Oriental</th>
<th>Negro</th>
<th>Other/Prefer</th>
<th>Not to Say</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>148(93%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>8(5%)</td>
<td>4(2%)</td>
<td>160(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Information was also obtained on the marital status of the informers' parents. As can be seen from Table 4, 120 pairs (75 per cent) of parents of the Ss were still living together.

**TABLE 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status of the Ss' Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Living Together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instruments**

The Roe-Siegelman Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire (PCR) (Roe & Siegelman, 1963) was employed to assess parent-child behavior from the viewpoint of the child. It was devised "... to obtain a measure of the characteristic behavior of parents toward their young children [p. 355]." This instrument has been used with adolescents and adults who responded to the items with regard to their own childhood. There are separate questionnaires dealing with the behavior of the father and the mother.

The PCR consists of 10 scales. Six scales (Loving, Rejecting, Protecting, Demanding, Neglecting, and Casual)
have 15 items each; four scales (Symbolic-Love Reward, Direct-Object Reward, Symbolic-Love Punishment, and Direct-Object Punishment), 10 items each.

Many of the items were derived from the literature and others were constructed by the authors to fit the categories. Independent judges were asked to assign each item to a category or discard it. If an item was not assigned to the same category by all the judges, it was deleted. The items refer to behavior, not attitudes. This was done in hopes of reducing some of the difficulties derived from using retrospective data.

The responses are scored on a continuum from "very true" (scored one point) to "very untrue" (scored five points). The following shows this continuum:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very true</th>
<th>Tended to be true</th>
<th>Tended to be neither true nor untrue</th>
<th>Tended to be untrue</th>
<th>Very untrue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three scales (Loving, Rejecting, and Neglecting) were employed to construct a Loving-Rejecting dimension. The distributions of scores on Loving, Rejecting, and Neglecting were transformed to $z$ scores and the distributions of $z$ scores on Rejecting and Neglecting were reflected and added to the Loving score to provide a composite score on L-R. Separate scores were computed for the father form
and the mother form. A complete description of the ten scales is contained in the Appendix.

Each S marked his responses to the PCR on a standard IBM answer sheet (IBM 1230 Document No. 505). Having a mother and father form for the PCR necessitated the use of two IBM answer sheets for each S.

Procedure

The PCR questionnaires and biographical data sheets were completed by each S in one session. The questionnaires were filled out under group conditions. Group size varied between 5 and 25 Ss. The Ss were told that the questionnaires were to be used in a master's thesis and that anonymity would be insured.

Each S began by completing the biographical information sheet. The examiner went over each item with the Ss and answered any questions. Occasional problems arose because the Ss were unsure of the correct responses. The most common questions dealt with birth order position (a sibling had died or step-siblings were in the home), or which father (biological or step-father) to evaluate. If a S's birth order was in question, he was not used in the final data analysis. In the case of broken families, the S was requested to answer the questionnaire about the father who had spent the greatest amount of time with S before his twelfth year. As was previously noted, only
those Ss who had completed both mother and father forms were used in the final tabulation of data.

After completing the biographical answer sheet, the Ss were instructed to read the directions to the PCR and fill out the father form. Upon completion of the father form, the Ss were given the mother form to complete.

PCRs were scored by computer. Also, means, standard deviations, t tests, analyses of variances, and analyses of covariances were computed.

Social class information was obtained from the Ss in the form of requesting information concerning the highest grade level completed by each parent. The level of education finished by each parent was the index of social class. The five educational classes were the following: (1) grade school, (2) high school, (3) some college, (4) college graduate, and (5) advanced degree. Table 5 shows the educational levels of the Ss' parents.

Results

For purposes of this study, the following statistics were employed: 2 x 5 analyses of variances, 2 x 5 analyses of covariances, and t tests. All t tests were one-tailed t tests, and all obtained t values were evaluated as significant at the p<.05 level.
### TABLE 5

**Educational Level of Parents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grade School</th>
<th>High School</th>
<th>Some College</th>
<th>College Graduate</th>
<th>Advanced Degree</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fathers of males</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers of females</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers of males</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers of females</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>116</strong></td>
<td><strong>68</strong></td>
<td><strong>67</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>320</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A 2 x 5 analysis of variance was employed for each parent to assess any sex or birth order differences on a dimension of L-R. Table 6 contains the analysis of variance for the perception of the father's loving-rejecting behavior.

Inspection of Table 6 indicates that the main effect of sex was significant (p<.05). In addition, the interaction of Sex x Birth Order was also significant (p<.05).

TABLE 6
Analysis of Variance for Sex and Birth Order on a Dimension of Loving-Rejecting:
For Fathers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (Sex)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32.24</td>
<td>4.51*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (Birth Order)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.69</td>
<td>2.47*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within cell</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

A 2 x 5 analysis of variance for the perception of the mothers' loving-rejecting behavior was used to ascertain any sex or birth order differences. Table 7 shows the significant main effect for sex.
### TABLE 7

**Analysis of Variance for Sex and Birth Order on a Dimension of Loving-Rejecting:**

For Mothers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (Sex)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80.60</td>
<td>11.74***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (Birth Order)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.99</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.65</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within cell</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p<.001

The most significant findings from Tables 6 and 7 were the sex differences in viewing the fathers and mothers on a dimension of Loving-Rejecting. Hypothesis 3 was confirmed. Females saw both parents as significantly more loving and less rejecting than males. Table 8 contains the means, standard deviations, and t ratios that show the sex differences by sex of parent. It should be noted that low scores on a dimension of Loving-Rejecting are associated with a view of the parent as more loving and less rejecting.
TABLE 8

Sex Differences in Perceived Loving-Rejecting Behavior by Sex of Parent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05
***p<.001

A 2 x 5 analysis of covariance was employed to ascertain any sex or birth order differences on a dimension of L-R, when social class was controlled. The findings were consistent with the above results. Females saw their fathers (p<.05) and mothers (p<.001) as significantly more loving and less rejecting than did males.

The hypothesis was made that second-borns would have seen both parents as significantly more loving and less rejecting than first-borns. This hypothesis was supported in part. Second-borns saw their mothers as significantly (p<.05) more loving than first-borns. A similar trend was noted for fathers, but it did not reach statistical significance. Table 9 shows the relationship between birth order and L-R behavior.
TABLE 9
Birth Order and Loving-Rejecting Behavior
by Sex of Parent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent</th>
<th>First-borns</th>
<th>Second-borns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

It was hypothesized that when sex was controlled, only children would have seen both parents as more loving than either first-borns or second-borns. Observation of means, standard deviations, and t ratios in Table 10 reveals that the results were in the predicted direction, but none reached statistical significance.

TABLE 10
Comparison of Only Children with the Older and Younger of Two Siblings on a Dimension of Loving-Rejecting Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fathers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Further investigation indicated that males in a male-female family saw their mothers as significantly (p<.05) less loving and more rejecting than males in a female-male family. Antithetically, females in a male-female family saw their mothers as significantly (p<.05) more loving than females in a female-male family. This important cross-sexed family difference is seen in Table 11.
TABLE 11
Cross-Sexed Siblings Views of Their Mothers' Loving-Rejecting Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Male-Female Families</th>
<th>Female-Male Families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loving-Rejecting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male-Female</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female-Male</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-1.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

The second scale examined in this study was the perception of the parents' protecting behavior. In order to assess sex or birth order differences on the Protecting scale, a 2 x 5 analysis of variance was employed for each parent. Inspection of Table 12 reveals that a significant sex difference was present for fathers on the Protecting scale.

TABLE 12
Analysis of Variance for Fathers on a Scale of Protecting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (Sex)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>465.81</td>
<td>8.90**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (Birth Order)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>53.52</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27.93</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within cell</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>52.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.05
A 2 x 5 analysis of variance was used to ascertain sex or birth order differences in viewing mothers on the Protecting scale. Again there was a significant main effect for sex as can be seen in Table 13.

**TABLE 13**

Analysis of Variance for Mothers on a Scale of Protecting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (Sex)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>245.02</td>
<td>4.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (Birth Order)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41.15</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>76.67</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within cell</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>57.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

A t test was employed to evaluate the sex differences found on the Protecting scale. Table 14 contains the sex differences by sex of parent. It should be noted that low scores are associated with a view of the parent as more protecting.
TABLE 14
Sex Differences on a Scale of Protecting
by Sex of Parent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th></th>
<th>Females</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>47.37</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>43.82</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05  
**p<.01

Inspection of Table 14 indicates that females saw both parents as significantly more protecting than males. When the previous data were further analyzed with social class controlled, the identical results were obtained. Females again perceived their fathers (p<.01) and mothers (p<.05) as significantly more protecting than did males.

The hypothesis was made that with sex controlled, only children would have seen their mothers and fathers as significantly more protecting than either the older or younger of two. This hypothesis was completely rejected.

No differences between first-borns and second-borns were hypothesized on the Protecting scale; however, second-borns saw their fathers as significantly (p<.05) more protecting than first-borns. A similar trend was noted for second-borns to perceive their mothers as more protecting than did first-borns, but this difference did not reach
statistical significance. Also not hypothesized, but significant \((F = 1.56, p<.05)\), was the finding that females were more variable than males in how protecting they perceived their fathers to be.

The third scale investigated in this study was Demanding. To evaluate sex and birth order differences, a 2 x 5 analysis of variance was used. Table 15 indicates that no main effects for sex or birth order were found for fathers on this scale.

**TABLE 15**

Analysis of Variance for Fathers on a Scale of Demanding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (Sex)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45.16</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (Birth Order)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>53.63</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>56.77</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within cell</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>93.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To check for sex or birth order differences on the Demanding scale for mothers, a 2 x 5 analysis of variance was computed. Table 16 indicates no significant main effects for either sex or birth order; however, a strong trend existed for a significant sex difference \((p<.06)\).
TABLE 16

Analysis of Variance for Mothers on a Scale of Demanding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (Sex)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>299.76</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (Birth Order)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>128.98</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39.77</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within cell</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>77.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An assessment of the direction of the sex differences was made by a t test. Table 17 contains the means, standard deviations, and t ratios by sex of child and sex of parent. It should be noted that low scores on the Demanding scale are associated with a view of the parent as more demanding.

Males saw their mothers and fathers as more demanding than did females, although only the data for mothers reached statistical significance (p<.05). When social class was controlled, the same trend emerged, but none of the results were significant. In addition, females evaluated their fathers as significantly (F = 2.1221, p<.001) more variable on the Demanding scale than did males.
TABLE 17
Sex Differences on a Scale of Demanding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N   Mean   SD</td>
<td>N   Mean   SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>80  43.61   7.66</td>
<td>80  44.68   11.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>80  43.05   9.27</td>
<td>80  45.79   8.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

The hypothesis was made that with sex controlled, only children and the older of two would have seen their fathers and mothers as significantly more demanding than the second of two. This hypothesis was rejected for fathers, but true for mothers of males. Males who were only children and the older of two viewed their mothers as significantly more demanding than males who were the second of two. Table 18 contains the means, standard deviations, and t ratios.

The observation was made earlier that males in a male-female family significantly differed from males in a female-male family on a dimension of Loving-Rejecting behavior. Likewise, the males in a female-male family perceived their mothers as more loving and less rejecting than did males in a male-female family. A similar difference was found on the Demanding scale. Males in a male-female family saw
TABLE 18
Birth Order Differences on a Scale of Demanding
by Sex of Parent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Only and Older of Two</th>
<th>Second of Two</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>7.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>11.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>9.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>8.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05
their mothers as significantly more demanding than did males in a female-male family.

The hypothesis was made that the parent who was the same sex as the child would have been viewed as more demanding than the parent of the opposite sex. This hypothesis was completely rejected.

Discussion

Adler (1945) hypothesized that the first-born child was "dethroned" with the advent of a new sibling in the family. This led to the first hypothesis of this study: second-borns would perceive both parents as significantly more loving and less rejecting than first-borns. This hypothesis was supported in part. Second-borns saw both their mothers and fathers as more loving and less rejecting than first-borns, although only the data for mothers reached statistical significance (p<.05).

Roe & Siegelman (1963) obtained similar results. "Later-borns" saw both mothers and fathers as more loving than did the "oldest," but significance was reached only for fathers. It should be noted that Roe & Siegelman combined only children and the oldest into a category named "oldest." All other birth order positions were called "others," or "later-borns." No controls were made for family size, nor were females included in their sample.
Lasko (1954) studied two-sibling families by means of home visits by psychologists. After observing the home interaction, the psychologists completed the Fels Parent Behavior Rating Scales. Lasko's data indicated the following: "Parent behavior toward first children as contrasted to second is on the average less warm emotionally and more restrictive and coercive [p. 133]." The present study was consistent with Lasko's results.

Sears, Maccoby, & Levin (1957) reported that the oldest child was likely to be more disciplined and to receive less open expression of affection than later-borns; however, they noted that this trend was not true in two-sibling families. Their results indicated that second children in a two-sibling family were not shown any greater warmth than first-borns. The present study contradicted their findings. It should be remembered that the children in the study by Sears et al. were all less than five years old.

The most dramatic support for Adler's "dethronement" hypothesis came in opposite-sex dyads. Males in a female-male constellation perceived their mothers as significantly (p<.05) more loving and less rejecting than did males in a male-female family. Likewise, females in a male-female family perceived their mothers as significantly (p<.05) more loving and less rejecting than did females in a female-male family. When both siblings were the same sex, neither sibling saw his parents as differing significantly in their loving-rejecting behavior.
The hypothesis was made that females would see both parents as significantly more loving than did males. This hypothesis was completely supported. Females saw their fathers (p<.05) and mothers (p<.001) as significantly more loving than males. When social class was controlled, the same results were obtained. These results were consistent with previous findings (Bronfenbrenner, 1961; Droppleman & Schaefer, 1963).

Research by Roe & Siegelman (1963) indicated that adult females evaluated their fathers as significantly more loving and less rejecting than did males; however, no sex differences were observed in viewing the mothers' loving-rejecting behavior. Possibly the differences between this study and Roe & Siegelman could be explained in terms of the different populations. The present study employed college students who were either only children or in two-sibling families; Roe & Siegelman, adults in their 30's who were either engineers or social workers.

The hypothesis was made that when sex was controlled, only children would evaluate their parents as more loving and less rejecting than would either the older of two or the second of two. The results were in the predicted direction, but none reached statistical significance. Sibling rivalry may, in part, explain these differences. Only children have the undivided attention of their parents.
In a two-sibling family, the children must share their parents' love and attention.

Common in the folklore of child-rearing has been the statement that only children are overly protected by their parents. This led to the hypothesis that when sex was controlled, only children would perceive their parents as significantly more protecting than would either the older of two or the second of two. This hypothesis was rejected for both parents; however, it should be noted that only children tended to see their parents as more protecting than did the older of two.

Sears, Maccoby, & Levin (1957) noted the only difference between only children and other birth order positions was in the restrictions placed on their movements in the neighborhood. The results of the present study were in partial agreement with these investigations. Only children tended to evaluate their parents as more protecting than did first-borns.

No hypothesized differences were made between first-borns and second-borns on the Protecting scale; nevertheless, second-borns saw their fathers (p<.05) as significantly more protecting than did first-borns. A similar trend was noted for second-borns to perceive their mothers as more protecting than for first-borns. This result was consistent with Lasko's findings (1954). Mothers stated in their interviews with Lasko that they worried more about their
first child and took greater precautions for his safety and well-being. The ratings did not bear out the mothers' comments. Lasko said the following:

It may be that the mothers coped with anxieties better and exhibited more competent behavior than they realize or remember, or which is more likely, it may be that the visitor was unable to detect the subtle nuances by which these internal feelings might have been conveyed to the child [p. 131].

The present study was consistent with Lasko's findings, but not with her personal views.

There were significant sex differences on the Protecting scale. Females saw both their fathers (p<.01) and mothers (p<.05) as significantly more protecting than did males. When social class was controlled, the same results were obtained. These findings were consistent with those of Droppleman & Schaefer (1963). Moreover, they were consistent with the stereotype of the female as more protected by her parents than males. In addition, it should be noted that females saw their fathers as significantly (F = 1.56, p<.05) more variable than males on a scale of Protecting.

The third scale investigated in this study was Demanding. It was hypothesized that when sex was controlled, first-borns and only children would see their parents as more demanding than would the second of two. This hypothesis was rejected for fathers, but not for mothers of males. Only males and males who were the older of two viewed their mothers as significantly (p<.05) more demanding than did males who were the second of two.
This finding could have important ramifications in understanding the preponderance of only children and first-borns in obtaining eminence. It is well known in the literature that a disproportionate number of men of great accomplishments (Altus, 1966; Bayer, 1967; Galton, 1874; Schachter, 1963; Terman, 1925) have been only children and first-borns. Also, these birth order positions have been found to be overly represented among students in universities, medical schools, and graduate schools (Altus, 1965; Capra & Dittes, 1962; Danskin, 1964; Hall & Barger, 1964; Warren, 1963, 1964). This excess of only children and first-borns attaining eminence may be largely the result of their internalizing the demands made by their parents. Previous research has suggested that only children and first-borns are more highly socialized (MacDonald, 1967, 1969a, 1969b, 1970), and more adult-oriented (McArthu, 1956; Palmer, 1966) than later-borns. Furthermore, Rosen (1961) and Sampson (1962) have suggested that parents frequently expect too much from their first child. Research by Winterbottom (1958) on need achievement indicated that high need achievement males, in comparison with low achievement males, had mothers who expected more independence demands to be met earlier than did the mothers of low need achievement males.

Significant sex differences were observed on the Demanding scale. Males saw their mothers as significantly (p<.05)
more demanding than did females. When social class was controlled, the same trend was observed, but the differences did not reach statistical significance. This may be a reflection of the sex-role expectations for males in this culture. Males are expected to become more independent and self-sufficient, whereas females are allowed more latitude in these areas.

No significant sex differences were observed in evaluating fathers on the Demanding scale; however, females rated their fathers as more variable than did males. A similar observation was made on the Protecting scale. Roe & Siegelman (1963) noted the greater variability of females on many of the PCR scales. They explained that two possibilities existed in comprehending this result: "(1) Parents differed more in their treatment of daughters, or (2) females more sharply discriminated between their parents than males [p. 360]."

The hypothesis was made that the parent who was the same sex as the child would be viewed as significantly more demanding than the parent of the opposite sex. This hypothesis was completely rejected. Males did not see their fathers as more demanding than their mothers. Also, females did not perceive their mothers as significantly more demanding than their fathers.

Becker (1964) noted that the opposite-sex parent was usually evaluated as more likely to grant autonomy to the
child than the same-sex parent. He also noted that the parent of the same sex was seen as less benevolent and more frustrating. The present data contradicted those findings.

A limitation of the study was the lack of precision in determining which father, biological or step-father, was evaluated. The Ss were instructed to rate the father who was predominantly in the home before their twelfth year. No data were obtained on the number of step-fathers rated, nor the number of biological fathers rated. No more than 25 per cent of the fathers could have been step-fathers, because 75 per cent of the Ss stated that their parents were still living together. Only four Ss reported not living with their mothers. It was not ascertained if these Ss rated their biological or step-mothers.

Several very important implications resulted from this study. In future research on birth order, separation of sexes who occupy the same birth order position should be taken into consideration. In addition, the sex of the other siblings in the family should be noted. The results of the present study indicated that opposite sex siblings in a two-sibling family viewed their parents quite differently than did same sex siblings.

Separation of only children and first-borns should be done in future birth order research. Findings from the present study suggested that only children and first-borns
differed on several dimensions in their perception of the parents' child-rearing practices.

Summary

The major findings of this study were the following:

1. Significant sex differences existed on all three scales studied. Females saw both fathers and mothers as significantly more loving, less rejecting, and more protective than did males. Males evaluated their mothers as significantly more demanding than did females, but no significant sex differences existed for evaluating the father on this dimension.

2. Adler's "dethronement" hypothesis was supported in-part. Second-borns saw their fathers and mothers as more loving and less rejecting than did first-borns, although only the data for the mothers reached statistical significance. This hypothesis was most strongly supported in mixed-sexed dyads.

3. Second-borns saw their fathers as significantly more protective than did first-borns.

4. When sex was controlled, only children tended to see their parents as more protecting than did the older of two.

5. Only children tended to evaluate their parents as more loving and less rejecting than did those who were the older of two.
6. Only males and males who were the older of two viewed their mothers as significantly more demanding than did males who were the second of two. These findings may, in part, explain the disproportionate number of first-borns and only children obtaining eminence.

7. Females rated their fathers as significantly more variable than males on two scales: Protecting and Demanding.

8. The parent who was the same sex as his child was not viewed as any more demanding than the parent of the opposite sex.
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Appendix I
Biographical Data Sheet

Fill in the corresponding blank on the answer sheet.

135. My sex is 1 Female 2 Male

136. The parent being rated on this sheet is my 1 Mother 2 Father

137. My age at present is (1) 17-18 (2) 19-20 (3) 21-22 (4) 23-24 (5) 25 or older

138. My parent's age at present is (1) 40 or less (2) 41-45 (3) 46-50 (4) 51-55 (5) 56 or older

139. I am (1) Caucasian (2) Oriental (3) Mexican-American (4) Negro (5) Other/prefer not to say.

140. I am an only child (1) Yes (2) No

141. My birth order position in my family is:
   (1) older of two
   (2) oldest of 3 or more
   (3) second of two
   (4) middle child (2nd of 3, or 2nd or 3rd of 4, etc.)
   (5) youngest of 3, 4, 5, etc.

142. If you are the older of 2, do you have a younger (1) brother (2) sister (3) does not apply to me

143. If you are the younger of 2, do you have an older (1) brother (2) sister (3) does not apply to me

144. The highest level of schooling completed by the parent rated on this sheet is:
   (1) Grade School (2) High School (3) Some College (4) College graduate (5) Advanced Degree

145. My parents are (1) living together (2) Widowed (3) Divorced or separated
146. My age at the time of my parent's divorce or separation was
   (1) 1-6 years (2) 7-10 (3) 11-14 (4) 15 or older
   (5) does not apply to me

147. After my parents separated, I lived mostly with my
   (1) mother (2) father (3) others (4) does not apply
   to me
Appendix II

Description of PCR Scales

Protective--This category includes parents who give the child's interests first priority. They are very indulgent, provide special privileges, are demonstratively affectionate, may be gushing. They select friends carefully, but will rarely let him visit other homes without them. They protect him from other children, from experiences in which he may suffer disappointment or discomfort or injury. They are highly intrusive and expect to know all about what he is thinking and experiencing. They reward dependency.

Demanding--Parents in this group set up high standards of accomplishment in particular areas, manners, school, etc. They impose strict regulations and demand unquestioning obedience to them, and they do not make exceptions. They expect the child to be busy at all times at some useful activity. They have high punitiveness. They restrict friendships in accord with these standards. They do not try to find out what a child is thinking or feeling, they tell him what to think or feel.

Rejecting--Parents in this group follow the extremer patterns of the preceding group, but this becomes rejecting when their attitude is a rejection of the childishness of the child. They may also reject him as an individual. They are cold and hostile, derogate him and make fun of him and his inadequacies and problems. They may frequently leave him alone and often will not permit other children in the house. They have no regard for the child's point of view. The regulations they establish are not for the sake of training the child, but for protecting the parent from his intrusions.

Neglecting--These parents pay little attention to the child, giving him a minimum of physical care and no affection. They forget promises made to him, forget things for him. They are cold, but are not derogatory nor hostile. They leave him alone, but do not go out of their way to avoid him.

Casual--These parents pay more attention to the child and are mildly affectionate when they do. They will be responsive to him if they are not busy about something else.
They do not think about him or plan for him very much, but take him as a part of the general situation. They don't worry much about him and make little definite effort to train him. They are easygoing, have few rules, and do not make much effort to enforce those they have.

**Loving**—These parents give the child warm and loving attention. They try to help him with projects that are important to him, but they are not intrusive. They are more likely to reason with the child than to punish him, but they will punish him. They give praise, but not indiscriminatingly. They try specifically to help him through problems in the way best for him. The child feels able to confide in them and to ask them for help. They invite his friends to the house and try to make things attractive for them. They encourage independence and are willing to let him take chances in order to grow towards it. Distinction between Loving and Casual categories can be difficult. A basic differentiating factor is the amount of thought given to the child's problems.

**Symbolic-Love Reward**—The parents using this kind of reward praise their children for approved behavior, give them special attention, and are affectionately demonstrative.

**Direct-Object Reward**—These include tangible rewards such as gifts of money or toys, special trips, or relief from chores.

**Symbolic-Love Punishment**—Such punishments include shamming the child before others, isolating him, and withdrawing love.

**Direct-Object Punishment**—These include physical punishment, taking away playthings, reducing allowance, denying promised trips, and so on.