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This study measured the resistance to temptation of five-year-old children as related to their sex, Sunday school attendance, and mothers' working status; analyzed the mothers' parenting attitudes as influenced by work, church attendance, and family structure; and examined relationships between children's resistance to temptation and mothers' parenting attitudes.

Eighty-eight five-year-old children from two church related day schools were tested to determine their levels of resistance to temptation. They played Grinder's bean bag game for a prize, believing they were unsupervised. The children's behavior was recorded and scaled from an observation booth. Their mothers responded to Schaefer and Bell's *Parental Attitude Research Instrument* and a Parent Information Sheet.

Three-way analysis of variance was utilized to determine the relationships between the children's resistance to temptation scores and their sex, Sunday school attendance, and mothers' working status. No significant differences were found with regard to sex or Sunday school attendance.
Children whose mothers were full-time homemakers showed a trend to higher levels of resistance to temptation than children of working mothers \( p = .079 \). The twenty-three variables yielded by the Parental Attitude Research Instrument were submitted to factor analysis and reduced to three principal factors: Authoritarian-Control, Hostility-Rejection, and Democratic attitudes. After the mothers were classified according to working status, church attendance, and family structure, the mean factor scores of these groups were compared for the three principal factors. The differences related to working status and church attendance were reported in a two-way analysis of variance, with family structure reported separately. No significant differences were found for working status and church attendance, but family structure showed a trend toward mothers who headed the family as lower in Hostility-Rejection attitudes than mothers who were in a two-parent family structure \( p = .062 \). Multiple regression analysis revealed a low correlation between the three factor scores of parenting attitudes and children's resistance to temptation.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Research on moral development and its antecedents has spanned over half a century, with renewed vitality in recent years as the result of public awareness of increasing crime, declining religious involvement, and such events as Watergate, Jonestown, and the Kitty Genovese murder (17). In the classic study of character conducted by Hugh Hartshorne and Mark A. May, about eleven thousand children aged eight to sixteen were subjected to all or part of various tests in order to measure deceit, service, self-control, and organization of character (14, p. 408). This study was done at Teachers College, Columbia University, beginning in 1924, under the supervision of Edward L. Thorndike (14, p. vi), and was conducted over a five-year period. The findings indicated that honesty was not a unitary characteristic within individuals but was situationally related. This study served as a deterrent for further research until the 1960's when Burton re-examined the data and found evidence of a unitary factor (1).

The challenge has always been, and continues to be, identifying any types of experiences which may foster the internalization of prosocial moral responses. Orthodox
psychoanalytic theory holds that these responses emanate from an integrated superego (26). This superego is the result of successful resolution of the Oedipal conflict and identification with the appropriate parent figure and his moral values (25, 26). An investigation of parental attitudes as related to the child's developing moral code seemed to be an appropriate topic for research.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was an examination of the relationship between resistance to temptation in five-year-old children and the attitudes of their mothers toward child rearing. Additional variables utilized were the sex of child, regularity in church attendance of mothers and Sunday school attendance of children, single parent versus traditional family structure, and working or non-working status of mothers.

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study were to (1) measure the resistance to temptation in five-year-old children as related to their sex, Sunday school attendance, and mothers' work status; (2) examine the effects of working outside the home, frequency of church attendance, and family structure on the attitudes toward child rearing of mothers of five-year-old children as measured by the Parental Attitude Research Instrument; and (3) examine the relationship between
resistance to temptation in five-year-old children and the attitudes of their mothers toward child rearing.

Hypotheses

In order to achieve the purposes of this study, the following hypotheses were tested.

1. Five-year-old females will show a significantly higher level of resistance to temptation than will five-year-old males.

2. Five-year-olds who are in the top one-third in regularity of Sunday school attendance will show significantly higher levels of resistance to temptation than will five-year-olds who are in the lowest one-third of Sunday school attendance.

3. Children whose mothers are full-time homemakers will show significantly higher levels of resistance to temptation than will children whose mothers work outside the home.

4. Mothers who work outside the home will show significantly higher levels of Hostility-Rejection and Authoritarian-Control parenting dimensions, as measured by the Parental Attitude Research Instrument, than will mothers who are full-time homemakers.

5. Attitudes of mothers who are among the top one-third in regularity of church attendance will be significantly lower in the Hostility-Rejection parenting dimension, as
measured by the Parental Attitude Research Instrument, than will attitudes of mothers who are among the lowest one-third in church attendance.

6. Mothers who are operating within a single-parent family will show significantly higher levels of the Hostility-Rejection and Authoritarian-Control parenting dimensions, as measured by the Parental Attitude Research Instrument, than will mothers who are part of a two-parent family structure.

7. The child's level of resistance to temptation will be significantly related to the mother's parenting attitudes.

Background and Significance

The belief in the early 1920's that honesty could be attributed to a unitary moral characteristic led to the classic studies on morality conducted by Hartshorne and May (14, 15, 16). These two researchers, intermittently joined by Maller and Shuttleworth (15, 16), set out to determine whether or not honesty could be considered a unified character trait (13). Over a period of five years, they studied the behavior of several thousand children in twenty-nine situations involving temptation.

This lengthy and thorough investigation led to a variety of multifaceted findings. It was revealed that brothers and sisters tended to resemble each other in self-control (15, p. 488). Deceit was shown to be associated with parental discord, parental example, bad discipline, unsocial attitude
toward the children, impoverished communities, and changing socioeconomic conditions (14, p. 409). Children enrolled in Protestant Sunday schools cheated less than those not enrolled, but there was no corresponding relationship between regularity or length of Sunday school attendance and self-control (15, p. 449). Girls proved to be far more able to resist the temptations in all situations than were boys (14, p. 447). At the conclusion of these studies, Hartshorne and May concluded that moral behavior could not be regarded as emanating from an inner core operating independently from the situational context (16, pp. 374-375).

These findings seem to serve as a deterrent to research on moral development. Later, Burton's factor analysis of the original Hartshorne and May data revealed a strong "g" factor which accounted, with statistical corrections, for more than 60 per cent of the variance in the table of intercorrelations among the measures of honesty. Burton concluded that there is an underlying trait of honesty which a person brings with him to a resistance to temptation situation. However, the results strongly agree with Hartshorne and May's rejection of the "all or none" formulation regarding a person's character (1, p. 492).

Peck and Havighurst (22), reporting their extensive study in The Psychology of Character Development, were at odds with the original Hartshorne and May findings even before Burton reanalyzed the data. They found that there seemed to be persisting patterns of attitudes and motives within individuals which produce a rather predictable kind and quality of
moral behavior. They found that these patterns, when present at age ten, seemed to persist throughout adolescence, and the authors predicted that they would be even more consolidated throughout adulthood.

Nelson, Grinder, and Mutterer (21), in a partial replication of the Hartshorne and May study, found that their results were in basic agreement with Burton's reanalysis of the Hartshorne and May data. Although the data were collected some forty years after the original study and consisted of different populations, tasks, and procedures, the conclusion was that additional support was provided for Burton's findings in favor of an underlying trait of honesty. That is, there seemed to be a disposition toward either honesty or dishonesty which persisted across a variety of temptation situations. These researchers suggested that the general lack of consistency of results in research about moral behavior may be due to the difficulty inherent in constructing a tool to measure this general trait of honesty.

Moral development has been analyzed historically at various times from three viewpoints: cognitive-developmental moral reasoning as researched by Kohlberg and Piaget (20, 23, 27); intensity of guilt feelings as delineated by Freud (8, 26, 27); and moral behavior, frequently measured as resistance to temptation (2, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 27). Currently Kohlberg, who until recently had staunchly maintained the efficacy of efforts to raise the level of moral reasoning through
stage-relevant discussions of moral issues, now has declared that behavior must also be considered (19). The low correlations in various studies between moral reasoning and moral behavior have led him to assert that

in this context, the educator must be socializer teaching value content and behavior, and not only a Socratic or Rogerian process-facilitator of development. In becoming a socializer and advocate, the teacher moves into "indoctrination"; a step I originally believed to be philosophically invalid (19, p. 14).

Considering this decision by Kohlberg, a highly respected authority on moral development; the highly-behavioral emphasis of the Hartshorne and May studies; and the reportedly low correlations between guilt measures and moral behavior (3); this study was limited to the measurement of the behavioral aspect of moral development.

While there is considerable agreement concerning certain aspects of the findings of research, a scarcity of replications and inconsistency of results have also been reported (18). Similarly, carefully conducted investigations rarely report high correlations among child-rearing variables and resistance to temptation (21). The findings to date are, therefore, inconclusive.

The proliferation of programs and books on parenting, such as the books by Dinkmeyer (4), Dreikurs and others (7), Dodson (5), Ginott (9), and others, coupled with their popularity with the public, seems to indicate an interest in the previously untaught but highly critical subject of how
to nurture children effectively. A scanning of new courses on parenthood being considered for use in high schools (4, 5, 6, 7, 9) reveals that most of them contain either no component in moral development or minimal information on the topic. Increasing awareness of the public concerning the need for morality (17) underscores the need for including such a component in classes on parenting.

Although a review of the literature has resulted in the discovery and synthesis of considerable research on parenting as related to moral behavior, the bulk of this research was conducted during the 1960's or earlier. A careful search has revealed no significant studies on this topic beyond that period. Accordingly, the impact of many changes in American culture as it exists in the 1980's remains to be explored. How has the decline of the nuclear family, frequently replaced by the single parent home, affected the attitudes of mothers toward their role? With the advent of more mothers working, does the working mother have different parenting attitudes than the full-time homemaker? If these attitudes have changed, has there been a corresponding change in the moral behavior of children? Is the declining church attendance in the lives of many Americans showing a resultant change in the moral behavior of young children? As a comparison with Hartshorne and May's findings, could Sunday school and church attendance represent something in the 1980's that it did not represent in the 1920's?
As indicated by this brief review of key studies, the present study is significant in that it (1) examines relationships between resistance to temptation in five-year-old children and the child-rearing attitudes of their mothers; (2) compares the resistance to temptation scores of children after first classifying them according to sex, regularity of Sunday school attendance, and their mothers' working status; (3) compares the mothers' attitudes toward child rearing after first classifying them according to working status, regularity of church attendance, and family status; (4) provides a current addition to the body of research on resistance to temptation in young children and parenting attitudes; and (5) provides a sample of children who may be followed on a longitudinal basis to determine possible future changes in values.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined as follows for this study.

Temptation.--"A type of conflict where a choice must be made between (a) conformity to some socially expected role behavior and nonattainment of a goal and (b) nonconformity and attainment of the goal" (11, p. 679).

Attitude.--"A readiness to react toward or against some situation, person, or thing, in a particular manner, for
example, with love or hate or fear or resentment, to a particular degree of intensity" (10, p. 48).

**Authoritarian-control.**—"Suppressive, punitive, and restricting types of attitudes" (28, p. 168).

**Democratic.**—"Encouraging verbalization; . . . equalitarianism; . . . comradeship and sharing" (28, p. 170).

**Mother.**—Primary female caretaker of the child, who has responsibility for child's guardianship.

**Hostility-rejection.**—"Hostility toward children and husband and rejection of the maternal role" (28, p. 168).

**Instruments**

Two instruments were used. One instrument was a game by Grinder administered to the children in order to assess resistance to temptation. The other instrument was a questionnaire which provided a measure of attitudes toward parenting.

The major dependent variable of Grinder's bean bag game was a behavioral measure of whether or not a child would conform to the rules of the game when he played without supervision. Incentive for temptation was enhanced by offering the child a prize, and fear of detection was minimized in an effort to produce a spontaneous reaction to the temptation situation (11).

The mothers of the subjects were sent a cover letter (Appendix A) in which they were requested to complete the
Parent Attitude Research Instrument (PARI, Appendix C), a questionnaire of 115 items of general opinion. The respondent indicated agreement or disagreement on a four-point scale of intensity (28). The PARI consists of twenty-three scales of five questions each, and factor analysis revealed three primary factors: Authoritarian-Control, Hostility-Rejection, and Democratic Attitudes (24, 28). The mothers were also asked to respond to a Parent Information Sheet (Appendix D). This sheet consists of questions concerning the working or non-working status, age, and church attendance of the mother; family structure, Sunday school attendance, and child care provisions for the child.

The Sample

Permission was obtained from the two school principals for testing a required minimum of sixty five-year-old children. Children from two church-related schools were tested. Each school offered instruction from kindergarten through twelfth grade, and each school had three sections of kindergarten. The total school populations were 563 and 584. Only those children whose mothers had filled out the forms described above were included in the final sample. A total of ninety-two children was tested and eighty-eight children composed the final sample, since one child showed symptoms of being emotionally disturbed and the parental questionnaires for the other three were apparently lost in the mail.
Procedures for Collection of Data

Each parent was asked to fill out a permission slip for testing her child (Appendix B), a Parent Information Sheet (Appendix D), and the Parental Attitude Research Instrument (Appendix C).

The children were tested on resistance to temptation one at a time while their kindergarten class was in progress. The game and observation booth were set up within an unused room in the church facility which was far enough away from the classroom to allow several minutes for the research assistant to establish rapport with the child while walking back to the testing area.

Procedures for the Analysis of Data

Three-way analysis of variance was utilized in order to determine the relationships between sex, Sunday school attendance, and working status of the mother with the child's resistance to temptation.

Two two-way analyses of variance were conducted to determine the relationship between the mother's working status, family structure, and church attendance with the Hostility-Rejection and Authoritarian-Control dimensions of attitudes as measured by the Parental Attitude Research Instrument.

Multiple regression was utilized to test the relationships between the child's level of resistance to temptation and his mother's parenting attitudes.
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CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Components of Morality

A review of the literature on moral development indicates that this topic has many dimensions. Numerous researchers (9, 33, 36, 46, 60) have found low correlations among the various facets of moral development. They affirm that we can only look at the various dimensions of morality separately.

Philosophical Perspectives

Historically, three philosophical perspectives of moral development of the child have influenced theories of moral education. One perspective is the Calvinist-Puritan tradition of "original sin," which stresses the need for adults to mold the lives of young children in order to protect them from becoming the victims of their own natural passions as they mature. A second perspective is the doctrine of "innate purity," as advanced by Rousseau. The child's original pure state is corrupted by adults and society. The third perspective is related to John Locke's tabula rasa concept. The child is neutral morally at birth but infinitely malleable (62).

Each of the three philosophical perspectives has a modern counterpart. The doctrine of original sin is
represented, in modified form, by the Freudian psychoanalytic approach (15, 25). Although critical of the suppression of the child's needs by society, Freud nevertheless viewed the child as a bundle of drives which must be controlled by adults in order to meet social acceptance in society. To Freud, this socialization constituted moral development. The doctrine of innate purity is representative of the followers of Piaget. The third major approach, behavioral learning theory, is related to the *tabula rasa* concept. It is comparable to the doctrine of the perspective of original sin. It stresses the need for adult intervention to prevent the child from finding primary motivation through satisfying his basic biological desires (25).

In examining the research on moral development, two basic approaches to determining the child's morality became apparent. They are thinking and doing.

According to Aristotle, "virtue is of two kinds, intellectual and moral. While intellectual virtue owes its birth and growth to teaching, moral virtue comes about as a result of habit. The moral virtues we get by first exercising them; we become just by doing just acts, temperate by doing temperate acts, brave by doing brave acts" (34, p. 77).

The cognitive-developmental, or thinking approach has been defined primarily by Piaget and Kohlberg. The behavioral learning theory approach stresses habitual behavior, including both learned responses and psychoanalytic feelings which inhibit behavior. Both approaches are studied mainly through
examining techniques of adult socialization. These two approaches are reviewed separately.

Cognitive-Developmental Approaches

The original theorist of the cognitive-developmental approach to moral development was Piaget. The essence of Piaget's viewpoint of morality is the individual's respect for the rules of society and his sense of justice (45). To Piaget, moral growth is accomplished as an individual shifts from respect and submission to authority (heteronomous morality) to self-government and self-control (autonomous morality).

Through cross cultural observation of children, Piaget became convinced that there were two broad stages of moral development which encompass a respect for rules and a sense of justice. In the earlier stage of moral realism or heteronomous morality, the child feels an obligation to obey rules because they are sacred and unalterable. Behaviors are viewed as totally bad or totally good. The magnitude of the consequences of the behavior determines how bad or good a person is, not his intentions. The child believes in "immanent justice," the natural punishment by God of wickedness through some physical accident or misfortune if this act is not first punished by man. Thus, the child believes in swift, severe, retributive punishments for errors. In the latter stage of autonomous morality, the child comes to view
rules as established by social agreement and thus changeable in response to human need. Intentionality of acts becomes more important in assessing blame rather than the size of the consequences of the act. He no longer believes punishment by God immediately follows all acts of transgression (45).

Piaget asserted that parents tend to be authoritarian in their practices, and thus inadvertently help consolidate the child's natural tendency toward heteronomy or blind obedience to rules established externally. He recommended that they provide the child with opportunities to interact with them in a reciprocal fashion. This interaction would assist children in moving more rapidly toward the stage of moral autonomy. By calling attention to one's own obligations and deficiencies, an atmosphere of mutual help and understanding may be developed (25).

In this way the child will find himself in the presence, not of a system of commands requiring ritualistic and external obedience, but of a system of social relations such that everyone does his best to obey the same obligations, and does so out of mutual respect (45, p. 134).

Piaget stresses the efficacy of peer relationships in moral development because peer relationships are by nature more likely to be mutual and reciprocal. With proper understanding, Piaget feels that parents could overcome their natural tendency to interact with children as divine sources of authority and utilize more reciprocal methods to foster their moral growth (25).
Finally, Piaget views moral development as an active process in which the child seeks to make sense out of his experiences. He incorporates them into his existing cognitive structure to resolve contradictions between the new and the old experiences, thus creating a new structure. This view holds that the child is a more active participant in the process than do the other approaches. The natural seeking of a higher level of moral functioning is in accord with the original philosophical assertion—the innate purity of the child.

While accepting and building upon the cognitive-developmental approach of Piaget, Kohlberg attempted to retain the best of the theory while fitting it into a more refined, comprehensive, and logically consistent framework (25). His final system consists of six developmental stages ordered into three levels of moral development. Through cross cultural research, he has asserted that these levels occur universally and that they are invariant in sequence. The basic themes and major attributes of the levels and stages are summarized as follows.

**Stage 1:** Punishment-obedience orientation. The physical consequences of an action determine goodness or badness.

**Stage 2:** Instrumental-relativist orientation. Obeying rules should bring some sort of benefit in return.

**Stage 3:** Good boy-nice girl orientation. The right action is one likely to impress others.

**Stage 4:** Law and order orientation. To maintain the social order, rules must be established and obeyed.
Stage 5: Social contract orientation. Rules must be based on mutual agreement, but the rights of the individual must be taken into account.

Stage 6: Universal ethical principle orientation. Moral decisions should be based on consistently applied principles (7, pp. 569-570).

The cognitive-developmental approach to moral education springs from the roots of Socrates. He conceived universal justice as a virtue for which he was willing to die. He thought this virtue lay latent in every man, waiting to be developed through probing questions and social dialogue (32). As Kohlberg stated,

The only philosophically justifiable statement of aims of moral education, the only one which surmounts the problem of relativity, is a statement in terms of the stimulation of moral development conceived of as the encouragement of a capacity for principled moral judgment and of a disposition to act in accordance with this capacity (34, p. 37).

Impressive as the theoretical creeds of Socrates and Kohlberg may be, the empirical evidence linking cognitive-developmental theory to the moral behavior of the child is minimal and inconclusive. Grinder (19) found that belief in immanent justice and consideration of intentionality did not relate to a laboratory test of resistance to temptation in children ranging in age from seven to eleven years of age. In a similar vein Nelson, Grinder, and Challas (42) reported that maturity of moral judgment as measured by Kohlberg's system did not relate to resistance to temptation in seventh-grade boys or girls. On the other hand, Krebs (35) used Kohlberg's stages and found that sixth-grade children
operating at stages five or six resisted temptation to a greater extent than sixth-grade children operating at stages three or four. Fedorko (13) found that it is possible to advance the onset of Kohlberg's stages by parental training. Children who had received two weeks of one-to-one training with their parents who emphasized subjective rather than objective judgments of morality, were significantly more advanced on post-test scores of stories based on Piagetian morality than children who had received no training (13).

The danger of existing in a state of heteronomous morality is underscored in the classic study by Milgram (40). The experiment was presented in an attempt to observe the effect of punishment on learning. The learner received shocks from volunteer subjects when he made a mistake. The intensity of the shock appeared to be modulated. Beyond seventy-five volts the learner, who was in collaboration with the experimenter, pretended to be in great pain. The subjects were urged to continue increasing the intensity of the shock. When they hesitated, the experimenter escalated the commanding quality of his voice and told them there was no choice and that they must continue. The major finding of this research was the extreme lengths to which perfectly decent people will go upon the command of an accepted authority, even to the point of inflicting great pain upon another person (40).
Hoffman views the major contributions of the cognitive-developmentalists as conceptual and theoretical (25). They have called attention to the cognitive dimensions and prerequisites of a mature moral perspective, emphasizing the individual's direct influence on his own moral development through social experience. This approach is in direct contrast to other approaches which view the child primarily as a passive recipient of interventions by authorities.

Krebs and Kohlberg reported research which substantiates the premise that certain internal variables are predictive of moral behavior and that moral behavior is not essentially determined by situationally related ethics (47). These researchers maintain that the situational forces are most likely to affect the person who operates at a low, or pre-conventional, cognitive level of morality. At the conventional level a battle exists between situational forces and the person's moral stage of development. The struggle is mediated by "moral will," described as ego controls. Persons at the advanced, or principled, level of moral development are not influenced by situational forces, according to Krebs and Kohlberg, and therefore do not undergo a struggle with conscience. They determine their behavior rationally based upon their philosophical principles. This behavior holds true in what they term "minor moral decision making." They define these situations as an absence of intense sacrifice. When intense sacrifice is involved, even adults at the
principled level may need to introduce ego controls in order to carry out their principled morality steadfastly (47).

In contrast, Robert Coles warns of the great danger of attending to theory more than to real life situations. He cites his case study of a six-year-old Black girl whom he observed for over six months in New Orleans during 1960 at the height of the integration strife in the public schools (10). He watched this child face possible assault if not death at the hands of snarling white mobs she had to pass each morning and afternoon on her way to and from school. Daily she hear adults hurl obscenities against her, yet she forgave them and prayed for them, saying, "God will understand them and teach them" (10, p. 71). Coles points out that this child, because of her age, would obviously have to be on the preconventional level of Kohlberg or the heteronomous morality level of Piaget. Yet her actions surpassed the actions of adults. Though she could not have expressed her morality in sophisticated cognitive terms, Coles asserts that moral analysis is never going to be the same as moral action. "One can get all A's in moral philosophy courses and flunk life ethically" (10, p. 73).

Behavioral Learning Theory Approaches

Most of the research dealing with parenting behavior and moral development has been outside the domain of the cognitive-developmental approach. The affective domain,
as represented by the Freudian psychoanalytic approach, has had two primary concerns. These concerns are molding the moral development of the child through the strengthening of the superego and measuring the level of morality empirically by testing the level of guilt of the individual. The research by the environmentalists has centered upon the child's resistance to temptation or his altruistic responses to his environment. They advocate and test many specific programs of systematic reinforcement of the child's behavior to enhance this facet of his development. Since affective and environmentalist theorists assume that the young child lacks the motivation to control his own behavior, they view adult intervention as the central determiner of the moral development of the child (25). This intervention forms the emotional and motivational aspects of morality.

According to the psychoanalytic approach, the young child is inevitably subjected to many frustrations during his development. Some of these frustrations are due to parental intervention and control while some are not. All frustrations, however, contribute to the development of hostility toward the parent. Due to anxiety over the possible loss of love and fear of abandonment by the parent, the child represses the hostility. In repressing these feelings, the child adopts the parent's rules and develops a generalized motivation to emulate the behavior of the parent. In addition, he acquires the parental capacity to punish himself when he
violates a prohibition or he is tempted to do so, turning on himself the hostility that was originally directed toward the parent. This punishment of self emerges as guilt feelings which the child seeks to avoid because of their intensity and their similarity to early anxiety over possible abandonment. Most authorities agree that this basic conscience formation has taken place by about five or six years of age (27).

Two types of identification with the parents are reported in the literature. They are anaclitic and defense identification. Developmental or anaclitic identification is based on the child's anxiety over the possible loss of the love of his parent. To relieve himself of this extreme anxiety, he strives to become like his parent, incorporating everything about him, including his moral standards. This type of identification, viewed by Freud as specifically characteristic of females, is assumed by most present day researchers to underlie the development of an inner conscience in both sexes (27). In the case of the male, the adoption of the defensive identification based on fear of punishment avoids the conflict and gains parental approval by taking on the characteristics and point of view of the parent. Although Freud saw this type of identification as central to the development of the male conscience, most current psychologists view it as a rather temporary mechanism. They state that it can lead to a rather hostile outlook on the world, rather than to the development of an inner conscience (27).
Part of the extensive study by Sears, Rau, and Alpert (53) was concerned with the development of conscience in relation to this anaclitic and defensive identification. The children were studied at age four, a prime age for this development. Resistance to temptation was closely related to non-aggressiveness in both sexes. The child rearing correlates, however, were different for the two sexes. Boys tended to be influenced by the fathers' close attention and moral training, whereas the girls were more influenced by the mothers' high standards and discipline. Regarding guilt reactions, the boys who showed a high upset over guilt had mothers who tended to be cold, restrictive, and nonpermissive about sex, and fathers who tended to be authoritarian. Girls with high scores on emotional guilt tended to have close relationships with their fathers, suggestive of the Oedipus complex, low pressure for any kind of standards, and high mother acceptance of the daughter (53).

Allinsmith and Greening (1) studied male college students who recalled both parents as using mainly psychological discipline rather than corporal punishment. This group showed significantly higher guilt over aggression scores than other students who recalled the use of corporal punishment. The researchers theorized that the significant variable in the use of non-power-assertive techniques may be the difference of the parent model in controlling his own anger. As the child is discouraged through the effects of models from
openly expressing his anger, this process may promote turning anger inward. This theory agrees with psychoanalytical theory in the process through which guilt capacity is formed (1).

Hoffman, in studying fifth- and seventh-grade middle class children and their parents, found no sex differences in internal moral judgment. He did find, however, that moral transgressions are more likely to be associated with guilt in females and fear in males. This finding may lend some support for the separate formation of conscience within the sexes; females favoring anaclitic identification and males utilizing defensive identification (28).

Mussen and others, while studying honesty and altruism among preadolescents, found marked sex differences in the correlates of moral behavior. Girls who were honest and altruistic showed warm, intimate interactions with their mothers and high self esteem. The honesty of boys was negatively correlated with gratifying relationships with parents and peers, and with self esteem. This finding lends weight to the possibility that boys exhibit moral behavior based on fear, while girls are controlled by warm relationships leading to guilt upon transgression (41).

In summarizing his review of the research, Hoffman stated that females appear to be more morally internalized than males. He hypothesized that more parents of girls use inductive techniques and express affection. Similarly, he states that females have been socialized more into the "expressive" role
of giving and receiving affection, while males are often instructed in the "instrumental" role needed for occupational success. He hypothesizes that this difference may soon diminish with the changing socialization patterns for females (24). This hypothesis is one premise examined in the present study.

The Parental Role in Moral Development

Since time immemorial, human beings have wondered how children are led to accept the values and rules of adult society. The goal of socializing the child is to get him to accept the norms and standards of the society in which he lives and to feel that such acceptance is right (10).

Caretakers around the world have relied heavily on the external contingencies of reward and punishment in order to modify or strengthen children's moral behavior. In the course of development, however, the effectiveness of parental control wanes and the child's behavior gradually becomes governed by internal monitors. These mechanisms for self-control appear to function in much the same way as the original external controls had managed behavior. Only the locus of control seems to change. Somehow, the child incorporates the rules of the socializing agent concerning proper behavior. To accomplish this purpose effectively, parents in our increasingly mobile society and nuclear family separate from the extended family have sought assistance from a variety of sources.
Helps for Parents

As early as 1975, Books in Print listed over 200 books on popular methods of child care, not including scholarly books or textbooks (11). Baby and Child Care by Spock had sold over 28 million copies, but several other more recent books had totaled over a half-million sales each (11). Clarke-Stewart conducted a random survey in 1975 utilizing the Chicago phone directory. Of her respondents, 94 per cent stated that they had read at least one article or book on child care while their children were young, 38 per cent had read more than ten articles, and 25 per cent reported reading more than five books. A second questionnaire, distributed through the public library to persons checking out books on parenting, dispelled the myth that the highly affluent and educated parent would be the primary reader of such books. Approximately equal proportions of patrons were found from the working class, lower middle class, and professional middle class (11).

Giffore has pointed out the problem in following popular child care books. The problem is the unknown and perhaps unwelcome results that may occur if the parent accepts one such book as the final authority on such matters (17). Since most authors give very little if any documentation based on empirical research, and since the advice given by the books varies widely, unless wide reading is coupled with intuition, unsatisfactory results are the norm (17).
Another source of guidance which many parents use in moral development is the church. Although Sunday schools vary widely in the kinds of curriculum materials, it is interesting to note how religious training since the time of the Victorian Sunday school has reflected the social values of the middle class as well as the religious values it was originally designed to teach (56). As a product of the evangelical revival, the Victorian Sunday school had as its original purpose the inculation of religious and moral principles. But as time passed, it embodied a culturally related Christianity that had developed out of a complex interrelationship between evangelicalism and "the world" (57). Thus, such values as the work ethic and good manners were included in the moral training along with traditional evangelical values such as piety, charity, and honesty. Apparently parents might be wise to investigate what particular moral principles are being stressed in the Sunday schools their children attend.

**Styles of Parenting**

Much has been researched and written concerning the efficacy of various styles of parenting upon moral development. Earl Schaefer prepared a diagram which described the major dimensions of maternal behavior. This diagram was represented in a circular figure in which two poles of behavior formed crossed axes. The relative position of any
maternal behavior could then be represented by plotting the dimensions on the two axes in relation to each other. The two dimensions were hostility versus love and autonomy versus control (51). Schaefer then pointed out the strengths and weaknesses of various positions upon the model. Many researchers have employed his dimensions.

Diana Baumrind found the combination of parental warmth and control to be the most effective in producing "ego strength" in children (3). This ego strength was exhibited through competence and friendliness, with an absence of immature behavior, passiveness, anxious withdrawal, impulsive actions, or disruptive forms of behavior. She defined high control as consistent follow-through on seeing that demands are met, even though a great deal of reasoning and explanation may also have been employed. She stated that authoritative, traditional, and harmonious patterns of upbringing appear to be more beneficial than restrictive, authoritarian, or permissive patterns. The relation of high parental control to social responsibility in the child depends upon the extent to which the parent also encourages individuality and independence when appropriate. These encouragements are the major demarcation between authoritative and authoritarian parenting (4).

Becker found that parents who are highly controlling and warm produce children who are conforming, obedient, neat, and
polite, but who do not tend to be as creative, independent, or socially outgoing as children of parents who are warm but less restrictive (5).

Sears, Maccoby, and Levin (52) studied identification as a key element in the development of conscience. They perceived role practice as one major method by which this is accomplished. They believed a prevalent way to motivate this role practice is through making the child's experiences with his parent pleasant, so that he will desire to reproduce this pleasant experience by living through it again. These researchers suggest that a child will be most likely to practice the roles of his parents extensively if he has been strongly dependent upon them and if he is having some problems with sharing the time and energy of the parents. This situation grows out of the warmth and demonstrativeness of affection of the mother. They also suggest that if she uses love oriented discipline techniques, the child's efforts at rehearsal will be more tenacious than if she uses physical punishment or deprivation of privileges. Extensive practice of parental roles enhances the development of conscience because the child practices his parents' value statements and thus makes them his own. Sears' findings showed that the use of love oriented discipline techniques of praise, isolation, withdrawal of love, and reasoning was higher with children with highly developed consciences than the use of tangible rewards, deprivation of privileges, or physical punishment.
The researchers stated, "The pattern most calculated to produce 'high conscience' should be mothers who are usually warm and loving and then, as a method of control, threaten this affectionate relationship" (52, p. 388).

Parental Strictness

Both the original Sears study and several follow-up studies seem to indicate the efficacy of strictness during the early years. Maccoby studied the children at age twelve whom Sears had researched at age five. She found that the parents who had been restrictive in the early years, as evaluated at age five, had produced boys who were enforcers of strict rules at age twelve. Boys who enforced rules also showed less overt aggression as rated by teachers, less misbehavior when the teacher was out of the room, and seemed highly motivated to do school work. Maximum rule enforcement was found when the mother was warm and restrictive while minimum rule enforcement was found when the mother was warm and permissive (37). Grinder, in following the children described in Patterns of Child Rearing by Sears, Maccoby, and Levin, found high parental standards for neatness and orderliness and high standards for obedience were related to boys' resistance to temptation. Pressures associated with weaning, bowel training, and sex training were related to girls' resistance to temptation. Subjects who had developed a capacity to feel guilt at age five or six showed significantly more resistance to temptation at eleven or twelve (18).
McCord, McCord, and Zola reported that the lowest crime rates occur when both parents were consistently punitive during the early years of the child's development (39). Kagan and Moss also found that early restrictiveness appears to have far greater inhibiting power than later restrictiveness. They assert that restrictiveness when the child is older, whether it succeeds in producing a conforming and dependent child or not, is likely to generate more hostility in the child, even though it may be controlled hostility. At these later ages, the child frequently is aware of the "unfairness" of a restrictive parent and will resent excessive control (31).

Cognitive-Developmental Parenting

According to Piaget, the child is an active participant in constructing his or her own reality. This process includes structuring moral development. However, Piaget contends that parental authority early in life is critical to the moral development of the child. These moral views of the parent are "interiorized" and later become the source of the child's own autonomy (61).

The Piagetian role of parents in the child's moral development can be divided into two categories. In one the child assigns authority to the parent, and in the other category the parent provides continuing guidance during childhood until his position is weakened by peers. Piaget claims
that it is the peers who ultimately determine the level of moral development of the child (61).

Piaget states that the child respects the rules set by his parents as a function of his respect and awe of them as adults. At first it does not occur to him to question their wisdom or to suspect that they might be capable of change. The child's egocentrism prevents him from seeing alternate points of view (45).

Eventually, by about eleven to thirteen years of age, peers begin to produce the disequilibrium necessary for cognitive growth. The child then comes to form relationships based on mutual respect rather than on parental authority. The child no longer obeys a rule just because it is a rule, but he obeys it because he understands and appreciates the need to treat others in the way he would like to be treated (14).

Although he believes that peers are the primary factor in the moral development of the child, Piaget affirms that parental behavior can either accelerate or retard it. It is important that child rearing practices employ consistency of punishment and incorporate discussion or reasoning between the parent and the child. He points out that parents often perpetuate egocentrism and low levels of moral development in their children by making general rules without explaining when and why they are appropriate and by not providing options so that the child has practice in making decisions.
Piaget uses the term "conscience" to represent the child's "interiorization" of rules (61). He urges the parent to introduce the topic of intention for actions for discussion early and continuously since the young child tends to center on the magnitude of the damage rather than on the intentions behind the act. This parenting procedure should produce healthy tempering of obedience as opposed to the insistence that the child blindly follow rules and subordinate his will to the parent.

Piaget asserts that parents have very little to do with the child's concepts of justice as he becomes older. However, he does say that the sense of justice and equality develops much earlier in homes where children can imitate parents who set good examples rather than exercising constant supervision and freely using punishment as a preferred method of discipline (61).

In the developmental process described by Kohlberg, the effect of parents on the moral development of their child is indirect. Parents can provide opportunities for the child to practice roletaking, even though the child is not capable of imitating the parent's cognitive moral structure. Through playing roles, the child can begin to adopt a perspective different from his own. This process is related to "decentering" as described by Piaget, an ability to be aware of more than one characteristic in a situation. In decentering, the child becomes aware of another person's point of view.
While Kohlberg states that parents provide opportunities for taking roles, he also stresses that they are not the only persons who provide this opportunity. Peers, the community, and other adults also provide this interaction even if the parents fail to do so. In Kohlberg's view, parental inadequacy would thus not necessarily diminish the ability to develop moral reasoning (61). However, Kohlberg found children in orphanages who were not as advanced morally as children living with their families. But children reared in a kibbutz were morally on a par with children raised in an urban family (47). Kohlberg felt that the role taking opportunities in the families and in the kibbutz caused the difference in moral development. Parents invite the child to participate in decisions offering opportunities to play roles, permit him to assume responsibility, encourage discussion, and point out the part his own actions play in the feelings of others.

In summary, Kohlberg does not believe that any one individual, group, or institution has special importance in providing for the moral development of the child. He adheres to the belief that moral development is enhanced by greater social stimulation. The more individuals, groups, and institutions that interact with the child, the greater the opportunities for role taking (61).
Parenting Based on Behavioral Learning Theory

The approach based on behavioral learning theory to socialization is that cultural norms, including beliefs about right and wrong, become internalized in the child at a very early age and form the basis for his moral system. This approach is probably the most popular public view of the formation of beliefs that govern moral behavior (61).

According to behavioral learning theorists, morals are first acquired from parents through modeling and imitation. These morals are gradually internalized in early childhood, probably between the ages of five and eight (61). Both positive and negative reinforcement help determine which moral behaviors will be internalized. Violating a rule of the adult will cause the child to experience feelings of guilt. The anxiety which accompanies the guilt, or the anticipation of the anxiety, deters the child from committing an act contrary to that sanctioned by the parent. Later, as an adult, he is similarly controlled from committing an act forbidden by society.

Power-assertion vs. induction.—Child rearing practices and attitudes which relate to moral development are the major emphasis for this research. The bulk of background research divides these parental practices and attitudes into three specific parenting patterns: power-assertive, love-withdrawal,
and inductive (25). Some authorities combine love-withdrawal with induction, making the only distinction between power-assertive and non-power-assertive or love-oriented techniques.

Power-assertive discipline relies on physical punishment, deprivation of material objects or privileges, direct applications of force, or the threat of any of these disciplinary techniques. The parent seeks to control the child by capitalizing on his superior position of power rather than by relying on, or developing, the inner resources of the child. Hoffman feels this type of parent behavior prevents the child from martialing his own inner control system to master his own behavior (25).

Non-power-assertive parents sometimes practice love-withdrawal techniques. In using such methods, the parent gives direct but nonphysical expression to his anger or disapproval of the child for engaging in a prohibited behavior. The parent may ignore the child, refuse to speak or listen to him, express a dislike for the child, isolate him, or threaten to leave him. These techniques may be more psychologically damaging than the power-assertive techniques (25, 61). Bronfenbrenner points out that this method is the highly effective, although painful one, used primarily in the Soviet Union (8). The parenting practices in the Soviet Union set the base for love-withdrawal to be very effective; encompassing the child in a warm, physically demonstrative love relationship. Bronfenbrenner states that love-withdrawal
holds little threat to the child if he has not truly experienced a dependence upon a warm, loving parent (8). Other investigators (3, 4, 51, 52, 61) assert that nurturance, or love and warmth, is a major factor in establishing parental controls. Sears, Maccoby, and Levin state that the child's conscience develops as an internalization of parental values. These researchers found that love-oriented parents have children who internalize parental values earlier than children whose parents are power-assertive (52).

Induction techniques are used when reasons are given for requiring the child to change his behavior, including pointing out the consequences of his behavior on himself and on others. These techniques are less punitive than the first two methods, and an attempt is made to persuade the child to change his behavior according to the standards of the parents. Appeals to the child's pride, strivings for mastery, and concern for others are also included. One type of induction described by Hoffman (25) as "other oriented" emphasizes the implications of the child's behavior for another person. Some of these techniques seem designed to obtain the proper behavior by arousing guilt (25).

Hoffman and Saltzstein assessed seventh-graders on intensity of guilt, moral judgments, tendency to confess improper acts, and extent of showing consideration for others. With considerable consistency, advanced moral development was associated with infrequent use of power-assertion and
frequent use of induction. Love-withdrawal, however, when parceled out separately from other non-power-assertive techniques, related infrequently to moral development (29). When these two researchers asked children to make moral judgments about norm violations such as stealing, lying, or violating a trust, the boys who responded in terms of an internalized standard instead of just fear of punishment reported that their parents were more permissive in discipline, used power-assertive techniques less often, used techniques emphasizing the painful consequences of the child's acts for the parents more often, and their mothers tended to be more affectionate. The only significant difference for the girls with high development of conscience was that their mothers threatened to have their fathers discipline them less often and their fathers used rational appeals in their discipline more often. In completing stories, the subjects of both sexes who showed higher development of conscience also consistently gave more responses indicating severe guilt. Subjects with high conscience development were subdivided into humanistic moralists who take a rational view of the subjective elements in the situation, and conventionally punitive moralists who tend to combine all types of rule infractions together into the same degree of seriousness. Mothers of conventional subjects were more prone to use ego attack techniques such as shaming or blaming. The mothers of the humanistic group tended to use
techniques projecting disappointment in the child for not living up to their expectations (30).

Aronfreed found that the use of induction techniques in discipline was positively related to a high degree of internally motivated self correction with an absence of punishment from external sources as revealed in sixth-grade children's completion of stories. Mothers using corporal punishment produced children whose stories contained more external punishment (2).

Whiting and Child (59) found a positive relationship between the cultural index of guilt in various parts of the world and the prevalence in that culture of love-oriented techniques of discipline. They advanced the theory that these techniques contribute to guilt by keeping the child oriented toward the goal of affection while at the same time arousing uncertainty as to the attainment of that goal.

MacKinnon subjected college students to a test in which they were not aware that their behavior was being monitored. The researcher observed them through a one-way mirror to check whether or not they cheated. He found a positive relationship between physical punishment by parents and cheating and between parents' use of psychological punishment and not cheating. He defined psychological punishment as techniques which point out that the child has fallen short of the ideal in some way, or hurt the parent, and therefore that they love or approve of him less (38).
In the realm of deviant behavior, when psychopaths were compared with nonpsychopathic delinquents, Fodor found that psychopaths viewed their fathers as less nurturant toward them and as giving them less praise. The mothers of the psychopaths were reported to demand less achievement of their sons than the mothers of nonpsychopathic delinquents (14).

A synthesis of the findings from many studies (23) seems to be that affectionate upbringing contributes to identification with the parent. In general, psychological discipline which capitalizes on this affectionate relationship fosters the development of internalized moral structures. Variations in the type of psychological discipline used may account for the particular kind of internalized moral structure that develops. These variations are predominantly oriented toward human need or toward conventional authority. A moral orientation based on fear of punishment seems to be associated with frequent use of physical punishment and material deprivation. A moral orientation characterized by independence of external sanctions with high guilt is associated with the frequent use of psychological or love-oriented discipline (23).

Resistance to temptation.--From the standpoint of society, the most important index of conscience is the degree to which the individual can be trusted to resist temptation even when the possibilities of detection and punishment are remote (61). Social learning theorists point out the problem that moral
development frequently requires the substitution of an activity that is not inherently rewarding for an activity that is rewarding. Therefore, the individual must be able to administer both negative and positive reinforcements to himself. Primarily this ability is acquired through the history of direct reinforcement of his parents and other social agents. Bandura and Walters, however, have also shown that behavior can be acquired through simple observation of models without direct reinforcement (37).

Observed consequences to the model are also important in the acquisition of behavior by this method. Walters and Parke, in testing five- and six-year-old boys in a temptation situation, divided them into four groups. One of the four groups witnessed a film model transgress and be rewarded for it. A second group witnessed a film model transgress and be punished for it. Another group witnessed a film model transgress with no consequences, and the fourth group did not view a film. Their findings indicated that there was little deviation among those who saw the model punished in the film or who did not view the film. Significantly more deviation was found among the children who viewed either the reward situation or the no consequences situation (58). Hoffman, in summarizing the research, asserts that children will readily imitate an adult who yields to temptation, as if this serves to make such an activity legitimate, but they are less prone to imitate resistance to temptation (24).
Rosenhan, Frederick, and Burrowes tested the efficacy of direct teaching of standards of resistance as opposed to merely modeling the behavior (48). Fourth-grade children who were taught and who also observed a model of a stringent norm, were most prone to observe the norm. Children exposed to a self-indulgent adult model were most prone to violate both stringent and lenient norms and to demonstrate ambivalent behavior. Those children who were exposed to a child-indulgent adult model violated the lenient norms the least. While both modeling and direct teaching were powerful in influencing the internalization of the norm and behavior, modeling was clearly the stronger determinant.

Adult warmth and encouragement, both in a continuing and in an interrupted situation, have also been studied. Parke exposed first- and second-grade children to a five minute warm and encouraging interaction with an adult who introduced the child to an art activity individually and who commented on his work. For the nurturance withdrawal group, the adult then abruptly walked to the other side of the room where he sat with his back to the child. For the continuing nurturance group, the adult continued to help and encourage the child for another five minutes and then the session ended. After this exposure the children were tested individually for resistance to temptation by being left alone in a room with toys which they had been forbidden to touch. The experimenter observed them through a one-way mirror. The nurturance
withdrawal group showed slightly less deviation, significant at the .05 level, as had been hypothesized. But the girls, when examined statistically separately, deviated significantly less (p < .01) than girls in the continuous nurturance condition (43).

Sawin and Parke (50) studied the difference between approaches designed to produce empathy or fear. Nursery school children and second graders were tested and compared. The findings indicated that second graders showed greater inhibition of touching the toys when told by the experimenter that she would be sad if they touched the toys. Nursery school children, not as greatly affected by this induction statement, showed greatest inhibition of touching toys when the experimenter told them she would be angry if they touched the toys. This seems to correlate with research cited earlier that the age for strictness in discipline is most effective in the early years (18, 31, 39).

Consistency of moral standards and instructions between multiple adult role models has long been hypothesized as important to the favorable moral development of children. Stouwie examined the importance of role models empirically. Second- and third-grade children who had consistently permissive instructions from two adult social agents had the highest level of touching forbidden toys, while the children who had received consistently prohibitive instructions showed the lowest level of touching forbidden toys.
Children who had received inconsistent instructions demonstrated emotional upsets, to the extent that the experimental session could not be completed for nearly 40 per cent of them (56). In a subsequent research project, Stouwie added the dimensions of warmth versus domination. Inconsistent verbal instructions were given by two adults, one of whom was dominant and the other nurturant. Analyses of variance of two resistance to temptation measures revealed that the least deviation occurred when the dominant adult forbade the touching of the toys while the most deviation occurred when the dominant adult indicated a permissive stance (55).

Different cultures have also been studied for the extent to which their children resisted temptation. Greenglass conducted a cross cultural study in which she compared eight- and nine-year-old children from Italy and Canada. Italian boys, whose mothers tended to use imperative communication more than Canadian mothers, showed greater resistance to temptation. The girls from the two ethnic groups did not differ significantly in resistance to temptation, but evidence was presented that the girls as individuals showed higher levels of resistance when one of their parents exerted efforts at overt control of their behavior (16).

Prosocial training.--Another facet of the process of social learning theory in moral development builds upon the child’s potential for prosocial feelings—mainly the capacity
for empathy. Hoffman (25) suggests that developmental parenting consists of techniques of discipline that foster a simultaneous experience of empathy with the awareness of the harmful effects of one's actions on others. These techniques are known as victim centered discipline. This parental practice results in a guilt response focused on the inner state of the victim rather than on the past experience of the actor. The procedure thus lacks much of the irrationality of the guilt postulated by psychoanalytic theory. The parental practice ordinarily requires the intervention of an adult who is able to remain both sympathetic and objective, using techniques of discipline with highly inductive components. Hoffman further reports that the findings suggest that altruistic children have at least one parent, usually of the same sex, who serves as an altruistic model, and at least one parent, usually of the opposite sex, who utilizes victim centered discipline. Affectionate relationships between mothers and sons were also found to be significantly positively related to boys' altruism, but not to girls' altruism (22).

Carolyn Zahn-Waxler (63) has recently been involved in investigation of altruistic responses of children previously considered too young for such feelings or behavior. In a nine month naturalistic study, she investigated maternal influence on the responses of eighteen-month to two-year-old infants to events of emotional distress occurring in the
family environment. Analysis of maternal techniques indicated that mothers were not very active when their children were bystanders to distress. However, the disciplinary techniques of mothers in response to distress caused by their own child emerged as a salient element in the child's moral learning. The frequent use of affective explanations by the mother when the child transgressed was significantly linked with more making amends by their children. Neutrally delivered explanations were unrelated to children's making amends. The mothers of the more altruistic children in situations where they were innocent bystanders, had used affective explanations in handling the transgressions of their children. The frequent use of unexplained prohibitions as a disciplinary technique tended to deter learning of altruistic behavior (63).

In a study of effects of modeling on altruistic behavior, Rosenthal and White studied fourth- and fifth-grade children who played a bowling game one time in the presence of an adult model and once in his absence. Each time the adult won gift certificates, he donated half to charity. Of the controls who did not observe an adult model but who were told that they could donate part of their certificates to charity if they desired, none donated to the charity voluntarily. Among the children who donated to the charity when there was no adult present, most of them had also donated in his presence. This finding suggests that rehearsal as well as
observation is necessary to produce a likelihood of such a result (49).

Staub investigated the effects of allowing peer teaching to encourage prosocial behavior and found that the results on the teachers were significant. The teachers wrote more letters to children in the hospital than those who were taught, and they chose to donate more gift certificates to a worthy cause. Induction in combination with participation in a prosocial project also showed increases in general prosocial behavior, especially for the girls. Staub suggests that induction or prosocial verbalization to children may be considerably more effective when it accompanies "doing" (54).

Correlation and Causation of Moral Development

Frequent citations in the research, attributing child behavior to varying parenting approaches have led Richard Bell to sound a word of warning that correlation does not indicate causation or direction of effect. In tune with current research which indicates the bi-directional influence between parent and child, he asserts that we can no longer dismiss the effect of children on parents as an implausible alternative explanation of correlations (6). Hoffman, however, offers a rebuttal to this stance, giving numerous arguments to reinforce the position that the frequent correlation between resistance to temptation and discipline reflects parental influence. He asserts that the unequal power
structure between parent and child indicates that compliance is more likely to be the consequence of disciplinary choices made by the parent, rather than that these disciplinary choices are the consequence of the compliance of the child. He further hypothesizes that discipline is important because it gives children the experience necessary for achieving a balance between expressing and controlling desires. Only through such experience, Hoffman states, can the process become internalized (26).

Summaries of research and suggested models.--Since the advent of the classic Hartshorne and May study during the 1930's, several extensive studies on moral development have been reported, some even proposing a model for the explanation and nurturance of moral development.

Hartshorne and May offered the following key findings which relate to parenting and moral development. Prevailing ways of teaching ideals and standards probably do little good and may do harm when the ideals set before the child contradict the practical demands of the very situations in which the ideals are taught. Contradictory demands made upon the child in different situations in which he is responsible to adults not only prevent the organization of a consistent character, but actually compel inconsistency as the price of peace and self-respect. In order that growing consistency in a world of conflicting standards may
be achieved, ideals must issue from experience and become the beginnings of future conduct. The normal unit for character education is the group, small community, or family, which provides the moral support for development through cooperative discussion (20).

Although Hartshorne and May found that moral behavior was situationally relevant rather than consistent from one situation to another within the same individual (20), Peck and Havighurst (44) found that there seemed to be persisting patterns of attitudes or motives within individuals which produce a rather predictable kind and quality of moral behavior. These patterns shown by age ten seem to persist throughout adolescence as indicated in this study, and the researchers believe they will become even more consolidated throughout adulthood. From their observations, they defined and labeled five ascending levels of character (44).

The Amoral stage is fixated at the Freudian oral stage of psychosocial development, demonstrating a profound lack of basic trust and an inability to respond to reason. Remediation requires firm outside control and guidance. The Expedient stage is self-centeredly preoccupied with "getting," yet they never get enough. They recognize that they must go along with rules of society when forced, but they have internalized few of these rules. The Conforming stage has much moral stability which has been produced primarily through superego strength. Their behavior is totally influenced by what others think of
them. They need and seek to be surrounded with a familiar world that reinforces their belief in the rightness of the authoritarian answers which have been programmed into them without their conscious thought (44).

On the same level with the Conforming stage is the Irrational-Conscientious. They have low ego powers with even a more powerful superego than the members in the Conforming stage. They are covertly hostile, yet too restrained to violate moral codes. The highest level identified by Peck and Havighurst is the Rational-Altruistic. Moral stability is accomplished through the use of highly developed ego powers. They are friendly, spontaneous, and notably lacking of the hostility-guilt complex. As an individual ascends this ladder of morality, he will find increasing ego strength. His superego strength also increases and interacts with the Id, giving him an increasing capacity to love (44).

In assessing the effects of parental relationships, ego strength and moral stability were closely associated with the establishment of mutual trust and family consistency; superego strength was most closely associated with consistency; and hostility-guilt complex was most highly related to severity of discipline, lack of trust, and lack of democracy. Overall maturity of character correlated with mutual trust and consistency to a significant degree (44).

The Amoral individual tended to come from families that were chaotically inconsistent, lacking in trust or affection,
and either were autocratic and severe in punishment or extremely laissez faire. Expedient subjects were reared with a good bit of lenient, indiscriminantly freedom by parents who tended to approve of them but in an unthinking and inconsistent way. Conforming subjects most typically came from consistent, authoritarian families where punishment was severe. Irrational-Conscientious subjects came from very severe families with average to high consistency. Rational-Altruistic subjects were reared in consistent, loving, strongly trustful, highly democratic families who were lenient in punishment, but who were by no means "progressive" in the lenient sense of the term. Parents firmly reserved the right to make the final decision when necessary, but encouraged children to make an increasing number of decisions as they matured. Most of the children with good character came from actively religious families (44). An interesting quotation from Peck and Havinghurst's book seems to summarize their findings. "Indeed, it seems reasonable to say that, to an almost startling degree, each child learns to feel and act, psychologically and morally, as just the kind of person his father and mother have been in their relationships to him" (44, p. 177).

In an attempt to relate moral development to the global development of the child, Norman and Sheila Williams proposed a stage theory for meeting the primary needs of children for moral development at five stages. The task of the infant is to establish a basis for concern. Caregivers are urged to
provide their infants with a warm, stable environment from which they can develop a satisfying emotional relationship. The primary task of the toddler is to relinquish his egocentric position. The researchers assert that providing him with enough security and stability within the family environment will enable him to take this step forward. The preschool child is faced with the task of establishing the elements of control. His foremost need is for suitable models in the adult world. Lacking modes of moral thought, he needs adults who communicate with him. The child of school age needs to further reconcile and generalize these modes of moral thought and to learn social skills. A stimulating social environment will present him with adequate opportunities for taking roles. The tasks of adolescents involve a drastic reorganization of the personality at a physical, emotional, and social level. Much reappraisal of former sanctions and moral problem solving must be reexamined and personalized or discarded. The authors make no specific suggestions for this stage (60).

In summarizing the research on child rearing, Windmiller states that although power-assertion techniques are not as advantageous to moral development as the love-oriented and induction methods, nevertheless certain studies indicate that with high intensity and early timing, power-assertion yields good results (61). These techniques of power-assertion appear to foster immediate suppression of tendencies toward pleasure oriented responses and they show a sleeper effect.
Havighurst reports that there seems to be general agreement among authorities that the development of moral character is influenced by four factors (21). First, the early moral training of the family, through reward of desirable behavior, leads to seeking and avoiding certain types of behaviors. Second, identification by imitating persons of prestige or having an emotional relationship with the child leads to the development of character. Sometime between the ages of four and six, the average child goes far enough in the process of identifying with his father and mother to internalize their warning and punishing moral commands. Third, the child learns morality from groups outside the family. Fourth, his acquaintance with rational analysis and reflective thinking prevents moral development from becoming fixated at the immature level of conformity to group mores or of obedience to a rigid, irrational conscience. Reflective thinking requires practice and needs to be rewarded in order to become a habit (21).
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CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES FOR COLLECTION OF DATA

This study was designed to examine the relationship between resistance to temptation in five-year-old children and the attitudes of their mothers toward child rearing. After classifying the mothers according to working status, regularity of church attendance, and family structure, their attitudes toward child rearing were compared. After classifying the children according to sex, regularity of Sunday school attendance, and mothers' working status, their resistance to temptation scores were compared.

Pilot Study

In an effort to test and perfect the use of the apparatus for this study and to test the efficacy of the instructions and procedures, a pilot study was conducted and videotaped. This pilot study was accomplished in a child-related cluster of an urban high school which trains high school students to care for young children in a child care setting. One Mexican American boy, one white girl, and two Black American boys were tested. Each of the four children was four years of age. As a result of this pilot study, the instructions were revised to give a more emphatic instruction to the child to play the
game in the absence of the research assistant. This decision was made because one of the children sat and waited for the research assistant's return without playing the game. Varying levels of motivation and of cheating behavior were readily seen in this initial pilot study. These results showed that this procedure would produce differing responses.

Subjects

The subjects of this study were drawn from the total kindergarten populations of two Protestant church related schools, both offering classes from kindergarten through grade twelve. The two schools were similar in size and the total school enrollments were 563 students and 584 students, respectively. Each school had three sections of kindergarten. There were 88 kindergarten children in one school and 73 kindergarten children in the other school. Of this number, 92 children were tested and 88 included in the final sample. Each school had day care facilities. Of the 88 children utilized in the final study, 73 per cent were in day care. However, when the parents were questioned concerning their primary reason for selecting this school for their child's kindergarten, only 9 per cent of the mothers listed the availability of day care as their primary concern. The religious emphasis in the school was noted by 52 per cent as the important factor, with an additional 19 per cent listing a combination of day care and the religious emphasis.
One of the schools is located within an older area of a city in north Texas which is undergoing historical restoration of older homes. These homes had previously been subdivided into low cost apartments. Many middle class families have moved into this area, living in the homes while renovating the houses themselves.

The second school was located in a suburb of the same city. This suburb was not originally developed as a bedroom community for the city. It developed around a large aircraft industry which receives many major government contracts each year. A naval air station is also located in this suburb. Both of the schools serve predominantly middle class families who are able to pay the private tuition. However, most of the mothers worked outside the home. Of the eighty-eight families represented in the sample, 82 per cent of the mothers worked outside the home.

Of the total population from both kindergartens, only those children were included in the final sample whose mothers completed the two forms described in the section on instrumentation. A total of ninety-two children was tested. Of these children, one child was judged by her teacher, the major researcher, and the research assistant as emotionally disturbed and was therefore not included in the final sample. Three more children were tested but were not included in the final sample because their parents sent the forms but they had not been received. Since the parents
were not willing to complete the forms again, the three children were not included. The study was based on eighty-eight five-year-olds; thirty-eight males and fifty females. Fifty-five of the children were white; twenty-five were Black American; seven were Mexican American; and one child was of Asian heritage.

Instrumentation

For the purposes of this study, two instruments were used, plus a parent information sheet. Grinder's bean bag game (4) was a behavioral measure of the child's resistance to temptation (Appendix C). The Parent Attitude Research Instrument (Appendix C) was used to assess the attitudes of the mothers toward parenting. The Parent Information Sheet (Appendix D) was used to determine family structure, working or non-working status of the mother, Sunday school attendance of the child, and church attendance of the mother. These materials were introduced to the mothers by a cover letter (Appendix A).

Resistance to Temptation

The major dependent variable of Grinder's bean bag game is a behavioral measure of whether or not a child will conform to the rules of a game when he plays without supervision. Temptation incentive is enhanced by offering the child a prize, and fear of detection is minimized in an
effort to produce a spontaneous reaction to the temptation situation (4).

The game consists of a one-foot by four-foot board on which five lights are evenly spaced across the front to indicate scoring. A throw line is drawn parallel to the panel, five feet from the panel. The subject was instructed to stand behind this line and not to cross it. He was given five bean bags to throw over the panel one at a time. He tried to turn on the lights by hitting a trip string behind the panel. Each light counted as a score. The game was placed against a wall so that any bags which went over the panel would appear to land somewhere near the string, although they could not be seen as they landed. In reality, regardless of how many times the bean bag hit the string, the lights were activated only when the hidden experimenter turned them on. This provision served as a control for individual differences in skill and for regulation of schedules of reinforcement. The experimenter was located behind a one-way mirror in a portable observation booth and controlled the lights from a panel of switches located in that area (3, 4).

The subject was told that if he could turn on three lights, he would win a toy as a prize. To insure motivation to compete, the child was shown a box of carnival prize toys purchased for approximately twenty-five cents each. These included toy cars, rubber snakes and lizards, folding fans,
necklaces, bracelets, hand puppets, costume glasses, and similar prizes. Before the game was played, the child was asked to select the prize he would most like to receive if he should win. His choice was then set aside and prominently displayed while he played the game. A standardized script was used in showing the subject how to play the game (Appendix E). Rules were explained the same to each child. The child was allowed to play a practice game. The research assistant made encouraging comments during this practice session. All children were given the success reinforcement of two lights in this practice game as a controlled schedule of reinforcement. Since the child could not see whether or not the bean bag actually hit the string, this control was possible if the bags landed behind the panel. If the child did not have enough skill to throw two of the bags behind the panel, he was allowed to practice until he could do so.

After the child was questioned and it was clear that he understood the rules about not stepping over the line, not retrieving the bags, and winning the prize by turning on three of the five lights, the research assistant excused herself to make a phone call. She told the subject to play the game according to the rules while she was out of the room. The implication was that the game played while she was gone was to be for the prize. The child was shown how to place a chair in front of the door so that nobody would disturb him while he played the game. The research
assistant promised to knock when she returned. She remained out of the room for exactly three minutes. During this time, the child's behavior was observed through a one-way glass in an observation booth and recorded by the major researcher. If the subject played according to the rules, he received no lights, thus increasing his frustration and temptation to cheat. Since the child could not see exactly where the bags landed, even if the bags went over the panel this lack of success seemed plausible. Nevertheless, most of the children reacted with extreme consternation because the success rate was so much lower than during the practice session.

The research assistant had demonstrated during the practice session that the lights could be lighted when the string was touched by a bean bag or a hand. If the child made this choice, the procedure for cheating was clear. Accordingly, lights were turned on while the research assistant was out of the room only if a child cheated overtly by stepping across the line and placing a bag directly on the string or hitting the string with his hand. This procedure was similar to the method utilized by Burton, Maccoby, and Allinsmith (2).

Grinder's seven point scale was used to measure resistance to temptation (4). This scale is based on time, giving a higher score to children who try to play the game several times according to the rules before cheating. Children who cheated immediately received the lowest possible score. The
score was based on the number of bags the child threw according to the rules prior to cheating. Accordingly, one point was given for deviating before any bags were thrown, and two to six points were given by adding one to the number of bags thrown before breaking the rules. Seven points were given when the subject never deviated during the three minute testing period (4). In addition, a tally was kept of the total number of times each child cheated during the three minute period (Appendix F).

Burton, Allinsmith, and Maccoby found that this bean bag game had high test-retest reliability. Nineteen out of twenty children, when tested one week apart, either conformed to the rules both times or deviated both times. Among the children who cheated, there was a tendency to deviate more quickly the second time. The faster deviation was not statistically significant (2).

Attitudes Toward Parenting

The mothers of the children were requested to complete the Parent Attitude Research Instrument (Appendix B), a questionnaire of 115 items of general opinion. The respondent was asked to indicate agreement or disagreement on a four point scale of intensity. The questionnaire consists of twenty-three five item scales. Factor analysis by Zuckerman, and others revealed three primary factors: Authoritarian-Control, Hostility-Rejection, and Democratic
attitudes (11). Factor analysis of the data generated by this study originally pointed to the presence of five factors. However, since the two least significant factors together only accounted for 13.6 per cent of the variance, the factor analysis was held to three factors to determine their similarity to Zuckerman's factors.

Schaefer and Bell, in constructing the Parent Attitude Research Instrument, used Kuder-Richardson Formula 20 for the scales in their first two trial forms. The five most reliable items for each of the twenty-three scales were selected for the Final Form IV. Internal consistency reliability coefficients were then calculated on new samples of sixty mothers of more than one child and sixty first-time mothers. Scales from Trial Forms I and II were included in Trial Form III, which was then administered to 100 student nurses to assess internal consistency. In both cases, internal reliability coefficients were satisfactory. Test-retest reliability was calculated for sixty members of the group who were retested after a period of three months. The reliability was generally good but a few scales on which there had been very little variability originally, showed appreciably lower test-retest reliability than internal consistency reliability (9).

Zuckerman, Ribback, Monashkin, and Norton collected normative data based on 222 mothers from the general population, sixty mothers who were psychiatric inpatients, and
sixty-two mothers of children referred to the guidance clinic. The results indicated that the obtained factors were stable over two different samples and may thus be used for comparisons between similar criterion groups (11).

Although the Parental Attitude Research Instrument has been widely used, the literature discloses certain flaws. Lydiat has pointed out the discrepancy between the attitudes parents report and their actual practices. He stated that his data also suggested that the Parental Attitude Research Instrument might be insufficiently sensitive in some areas to allow an accurate measure of direction and intensity of belief (7). Becker and Krug, in their review of the research concerning the Parental Attitude Research Instrument, noted several weaknesses. They cited lack of control for response sets as one problem. Most of the subscales of the instrument involve measures of authoritarian attitudes, which are strongly influenced by an acquiescence response set and the educational level of the respondent. They also cited a possible artifact of style of question, which biases the reporting according to educational level (1). These flaws may have contributed to the lack of statistically significant findings in this study.

Procedures for Collection of Data

Permission was obtained from the principals of two church related schools to test the five-year-old children
in their kindergartens and to distribute the questionnaire and information sheet to the parents. Written permission was obtained from the parents before each child was tested. A cover letter (Appendix A), a permission slip (Appendix B), and a Parent Information Sheet (Appendix D) were sent to them.

In one school, the distribution of the materials for parents corresponded in timing with the annual parent conferences. The principal requested that the teachers distribute the materials at the parent conferences and explain the procedures to allay any misgivings about the test. The parents completed the forms and gave them to the teachers. In some instances, the materials were taken home, completed later, and given to the teachers by the children. In the other school, the materials were mailed to the parents with a self-addressed, stamped envelope. In both schools, the weekend before the data were gathered, all parents who had not returned the materials were contacted by phone and urged to complete the forms and return them to the school. The incentive was a reminder that their child might be disappointed if he could not play the game for a prize. In each school, these reminders, along with the urging of the children after others played the game, produced over half of the total completed forms. The eagerness of the children to play the game for the prize thus
provided an incentive for the completion of the forms by the parents.

A research assistant was carefully trained with specific instructions (Appendix E) to interact with the children. The instructions to the children included an explanation of the game as well as a view of the mechanism which supposedly made the game work. The rules were explained, emphasized, repeated, and the child was asked questions to be certain he understood the rules. Grinder's bean bag game (3) and Burton's portable observation screen (2) were set up in an unused room in each school which was far enough away from the classroom to allow the research assistant to establish a rapport with the child while they were walking to the testing room. The children were brought to this room individually by the research assistant while their kindergarten class was in session.

Each child was shown a tray of prizes. From these prizes, he was asked to select the one he would like to receive if he should win the game. This choice was designed to maximize motivation for winning. The major researcher sat behind a portable observation screen (2) and marked student responses to the game for a three-minute period while the research assistant was out of the room. She provided a carefully scheduled reinforcement, the same for all children. A specially designed data sheet was used (Appendix F) to facilitate speedy and soundless recording.
When the research assistant returned, she remarked that the child certainly knew how to play the game, and that this time he would play it for the prize. Each child then was given a successful experience in playing and winning a prize. If the children could not throw three bags behind the panel when offered the five bean bags, the research assistant allowed them to play the game again until they were successful. This procedure was taken from Burton, Maccoby, and Allinsmith (1) and it was intended to reduce any guilt possibly aroused by cheating, to relieve feelings of failure in non-cheaters, and to avoid reinforcement of cheating behavior.

Procedures for Analysis of Data

The twenty-three scores yielded by the Parental Attitude Research Instrument were submitted to factor analysis. Kerlinger states that because of its power and elegance, factor analysis could be called the queen of the analytic method (6, p. 659). It serves the cause of scientific parsimony. The original computer factor analysis extracted five factors from the twenty-three scores provided by the questionnaire. The computer was then instructed to hold the factors to three for a closer comparison with the Zuckerman and others factor analysis of the PARI (11). This decision was justified because the combined percentage of variation coming from the fourth and fifth factors was only 13.6 per cent.
Hypotheses 1 through 3 were tested with three-way analysis of variance since Roscoe warns against the repeated use of t-tests in a design of this nature. He states that the probability of rejecting a true hypothesis, Type I error, would be much greater than the level of significance (6, p. 292). Huck and others recommend the three-way analysis of variance rather than the use of three one-way analyses of variance because the three-way analysis is more parsimonious, more powerful, and provides information about interaction effects (5, p. 78).

Hypotheses 1 through 3 were tested for both main effects and interaction effects. The dependent variable was the five-year-old child's level of resistance to temptation. The independent variables, expressed in two dimensions each, were (1) male or female, (2) low or high Sunday school attendance, and (3) housewives or working mothers.

Hypotheses 4 through 6 were tested by conducting two two-way analyses of variance, one for each dependent variable. The two dependent variables were the Hostility-Rejection attitudes of mothers in the sample and their Authoritarian-Control attitudes. The independent variables were (1) housewives or working mothers, (2) low or high church attendance in mothers, and (3) single parent or married parent status. Although two three-way analyses were originally planned, empty cells created by the absence of non-working married mothers with low church attendance
caused the reporting of results in two two-way analyses of variance with marital status reported separately.

Hypothesis 7 was tested with a multiple regression equation. Spiegel describes the purpose of this equation as "estimating a dependent variable, say $X_1$, from the independent variables $X_2, X_3, \ldots$" (10, p. 269). In a three-dimensional rectangular coordinant system, this forms a regression plane similar in function to the regression line produced by two variables (10). Where H-R represents Hostility-Rejection parenting attitudes, A-C represents Authoritarian-Control attitudes, D represents Democratic attitudes, and L or R represents Level of Resistance to Temptation, the functional notation read: $L \text{ of } R = f(H-R, A-C, D)$. In order to determine whether it was possible to predict level of resistance to temptation on the basis of the three parental attitude scores, tests were made for the coefficient of multiple correlation and individual beta weights, as described by Huck and others (4).
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CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purposes of this study were (1) to measure the resistance to temptation in five-year-old children as related to their sex, Sunday school attendance, and mother's work status; (2) to examine the effects of working outside the home, frequency of church attendance, and family structure on the attitudes toward child rearing of mothers of five-year-old children; and (3) to examine the relationship between resistance to temptation in five-year-old children and the attitudes of their mothers toward child rearing.

Demographic Characteristics of Subjects

The subjects were drawn from the total kindergarten populations of two protestant church related schools. Both kindergartens provided day care, but when questioned concerning their primary reason for choosing the school, this proved not to be the major reason for choosing the particular school, as shown in Table I. The data presented in Table I indicate that the church related program was a major factor in the choice of the school for a majority of the parents. Fifty-two per cent, or a total of 46 mothers, listed the church related program as being the deciding factor. In addition, 19 per cent, or 17 mothers, checked
TABLE I
REASONS FOR SELECTING SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Choice</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day care availability</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend church here</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church-related program</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church-related program and day care availability</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(checked both)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenient to work or home</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>88</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

both day care and the church related program as the combined reason for their choice. These findings limit generalizing the findings of this study to similar populations where religious orientation is a high priority. The "other" category in Table I included writing in such variables as the academic program, recommendations by friends, ineligibility for public school age requirement, and employment by the school. Seventeen mothers wrote in that the reputation of the academic program was either a primary or an additional factor that influenced their choice of school.

The Parent Information Sheet (Appendix B) supplied demographic data as reported in Tables II and III.
The data presented in Table II indicate that the sample was predominantly Caucasian, from two-parent homes. Sunday school attendance was primarily represented by the two extremes of "every week" or "rarely or never."

The data presented in Table III indicate that the majority of the mothers worked outside the home and utilized day care. While mixed in ages, the majority of mothers was under thirty years of age. Comparing Tables II and III,
TABLE III
DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF MOTHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Working status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time homemaker</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work outside the home</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>81.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child care utilized</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day care</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hired individual in child's home</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hired individual in her home</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Church attendance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every week</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About twice a month</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About once a month</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About six times a year</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About four times a year</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely or never</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50 per cent of the mothers indicated that they attend church every Sunday, while they only indicated that 43.2 per cent of the children attend Sunday school every Sunday. Similarly, only 12.5 per cent of the mothers reported that they rarely or never attended church, while they stated that 29.5 per cent of the children rarely or never attended Sunday school. Since no questions were asked concerning the church attendance of the children, the possibility exists that these children attended
church or junior church although they did not attend Sunday school.

Children's Resistance to Temptation

Hypotheses 1 through 3 were stated as directional, research hypotheses. They were tested in the null form by combining them into a three-way analysis of variance in order to test for any interaction effects between the independent variables. The three independent variables were (1) sex of child, (2) frequency of Sunday school attendance of child, and (c) working status of the mother. The dependent variable was the child's resistance to temptation. Means were obtained by summing all scores of subjects in each category and dividing by the number of subjects included in the summation. The results of the three-way analysis of variance are shown in Table IV.

Hypothesis 1.—Five-year-old females will show a significantly higher level of resistance to temptation than will five-year-old males.

The resistance to temptation of the children was tested with Grinder's bean bag game. A range from one to seven was possible, with seven indicating perfect resistance to temptation and one indicating immediate deviation. The hypothesis was based upon findings in previous studies (5, 7, 9, 10). Although there was not a statistically significant difference found between the two groups, the direction
TABLE IV

TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR RESISTANCE TO TEMPTATION UTILIZING SEX OF CHILD, SUNDAY SCHOOL ATTENDANCE OF CHILD, AND WORKING STATUS OF MOTHER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Frequency of Sunday School Attendance</th>
<th>Working Status of Mother</th>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>5.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex of child</td>
<td>1.288</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.288</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>.567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS attendance</td>
<td>2.983</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.491</td>
<td>.383</td>
<td>.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working status</td>
<td>12.362</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.362</td>
<td>3.176</td>
<td>.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex x SS attendance</td>
<td>2.054</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.027</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex x working status</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex x SS attendance x working status</td>
<td>5.408</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.704</td>
<td>.695</td>
<td>.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>299.713</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3.892</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of higher resistance to temptation was for males rather than for females. This finding was in opposition to the prior studies cited and to the research hypothesis. The null hypothesis was therefore retained and the research hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 2.—Five-year-olds who are in the top one-third in regularity of Sunday school attendance will show
significantly higher levels of resistance to temptation than five-year-olds who are in the lowest one-third of Sunday school attendance.

The six response categories on the Parent Information Sheet (Appendix D) were collapsed into three levels by combining "rarely or never" and "about four times a year" into a low level of attendance, "about six times a year" and "about once a month" into a medium level, and "about twice a month" and "every week" into a high level of attendance.

The data presented in Table IV indicate there is no significant difference in resistance to temptation scores associated with varying levels of regularity in Sunday school attendance. The means for resistance to temptation were within .03 points of each other for the high attendance group and the low attendance group, with the low group yielding the higher mean. The null hypothesis was therefore retained and the research hypothesis was rejected. This reaffirms the findings of Hartshorne and May (5).

Hypothesis 3.--Children whose mothers are full-time homemakers will show significantly higher levels of resistance to temptation than will children whose mothers work outside the home.

The data presented in Table IV indicate that while children whose mothers were full-time homemakers showed a higher resistance to temptation than children whose mothers were working, the .05 level of statistical significance was
not attained. The findings were $p = .079$. The null hypothesis was therefore retained and the research hypothesis was rejected.

The data in Table IV further indicate that there was no significant interaction effect among the three variables, as well as no significant main effects.

**Attitudes of Mothers Toward Child Rearing**

**Factor Analysis of Parental Attitude Research Instrument**

In order to analyze the data concerning the hypotheses relating resistance to temptation with mothers' attitudes toward child rearing, it was first necessary to subject the data from the Parental Attitude Research Instrument to factor analysis. This analysis was done to reduce the number of the twenty-three variables it yielded to a smaller number that could be subjected to statistical tests with a small group, and to permit comparison with Zuckerman's factors (11).

A correlation matrix was prepared for the twenty-three variables (see Table V). Eigenvalues and percentages of variation were then computed for the collapsed variables. Means and standard deviations were computed for each of the twenty-three variables (see Table VI). A table of the original raw scores is in Appendix H.
### TABLE V

**CORRELATION MATRIX: TWENTY-THREE PARI SCALES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable*</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>- .10</td>
<td>- .17</td>
<td>- .06</td>
<td>- .02</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>- .03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Key to variables follows table.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A factor matrix was prepared which indicated the presence of five factors. Since the combined percentage of variation attributed to the two least significant variables was only 13.6 per cent, a new factor matrix was prepared which held the variables to three. This procedure allowed comparison of the findings with the factors extracted by Zuckerman and others (11). The factor loadings for this study for each of the twenty-three variables on each of the three principal factors, the eigenvalues showing the contribution of each factor to the total communality, and the communalities for each of the twenty-three variables are shown in Table VII.
TABLE VI
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE PARI
(Range = 5 to 20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Label</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging Verbalization</td>
<td>16.625</td>
<td>2.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostering Dependency</td>
<td>9.875</td>
<td>2.673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seclusion of the Mother</td>
<td>10.443</td>
<td>2.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaking the Will</td>
<td>11.205</td>
<td>2.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martyrdom</td>
<td>10.341</td>
<td>3.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Harming Baby</td>
<td>13.045</td>
<td>3.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Conflict</td>
<td>14.727</td>
<td>2.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strictness</td>
<td>14.898</td>
<td>3.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irritability</td>
<td>13.170</td>
<td>2.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluding Outside Influences</td>
<td>11.386</td>
<td>2.992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deification</td>
<td>13.545</td>
<td>3.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppression of Aggression</td>
<td>11.909</td>
<td>2.424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejection of Homemaking Role</td>
<td>12.148</td>
<td>3.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equalitarianism</td>
<td>15.659</td>
<td>2.284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of Activity</td>
<td>12.943</td>
<td>3.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance of Communication</td>
<td>9.068</td>
<td>2.682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsiderateness of Husband</td>
<td>12.557</td>
<td>3.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppression of Sexuality</td>
<td>9.557</td>
<td>2.572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascendancy of Mother</td>
<td>10.659</td>
<td>3.318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrusiveness</td>
<td>11.545</td>
<td>3.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comradeship and Sharing</td>
<td>17.307</td>
<td>1.926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceleration of Development</td>
<td>11.295</td>
<td>3.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependency of Mother</td>
<td>12.932</td>
<td>3.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Factor 1 Authoritarian-Control</td>
<td>Factor 2 Hostility-Rejection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging Verbalization</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostering Dependency</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seclusion of Mother</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>-.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaking the Will</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martyrdom</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Harming the Baby</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Conflict</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strictness</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irritability</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluding Outside Influences</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deification</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppression of Aggression</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejection of Homemaking Role</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equalitarianism</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of Activity</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance of Communication</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsiderateness of Husband</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppression of Sexuality</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>-.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascendancy of Mother</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrusiveness</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>-.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comradeship and Sharing</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceleration of Development</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependency of Mother</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalues</td>
<td>7.16866</td>
<td>2.17352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent of Variation</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The three factors extracted in the present study are similar to those factors found by Zuckerman and others (11) with some minor exceptions. A description of these exceptions is included in the discussion of Factor 2.

Factor 1 is similar to Factor A in Zuckerman's study. Factor 1 has loadings of .50 or above on fifteen of the factors, as indicated in Table VII. The Zuckerman factor analysis showed factor loadings of .50 or above for Factor A on seventeen of the twenty-three factors. All fifteen factors indicated as loading highly in this study were also reported as loading highly by Zuckerman. In addition, he reported a .54 loading on Strictness for Factor A, while the findings for Factor 1 in this study are similar at a .48 loading. Zuckerman also found a .65 loading on Suppression of Aggression for Factor A, while the findings for Factor 1 in this study are a loading of .43. As indicated in Table VII, the largest percentage of variation is attributed to Factor 1, 68.1 per cent. This larger variation may also be observed by comparing the more numerous high factor loadings shown for Factor 1 in Table VII with the loadings of the other two factors. These heavier loadings for Factor 1 were also found for Factor A by Zuckerman (11). Zuckerman's loadings were higher than the loadings found in this study. He stated that his factor loadings were higher than those reported by Schaefer and Bell in their original factor analysis of the Parental
Attitude Research Instrument (11). Zuckerman hypothesized that this was because his sample was more heterogeneous than the sample studied by Schaefer and Bell. As indicated in the demographic data, the sample in this study was homogeneous. This may account for the lower loadings than the ones found by Zuckerman. Zuckerman gave the following definition for his Factor A:

The scales which contribute most heavily to this factor are those which measure authoritarian, suppressive, punitive, and restricting types of attitudes. However, this factor is so broad that it may be measuring a general response set to the test as well as specific response to the content of the scales (11, p. 168).

Since the factor loadings for Factor 1 are quite similar to Zuckerman's Factor A, his label of Authoritarian-Control was retained.

Zuckerman found that his Factor B was defined primarily by the two scores on Irritability and Rejection of the Homemaking Role. These variables were loaded at .69 and .62, respectively (11, p. 171). This study shows lower overall loading on these variables for Factor 2. The findings approached Zuckerman's figures, with Irritability loading at .48 and Rejection of the Homemaking Role loading at .60 (Table VII). The findings also included a loading of .46 on Marital Conflict (Table VII), which seems to fit the description of the factor given by Zuckerman. Zuckerman found a .34 loading on Marital Conflict for his Factor B.

The major differences between Zuckerman's Factor B and the
Factor 2 of this study were the findings for Equalitarianism and Encouraging Verbalization. Zuckerman found low loadings for these two variables with .17 for Equalitarianism and .07 for Encouraging Verbalization for his Factor B (11, p. 171). The finding of this study shows loadings of .44 on Equalitarianism and .42 on Encouraging Verbalization for Factor 2 (Table VII). Taken within the context of the remainder of the factor characteristics, heavier weightings on these two variables in this study may suggest a propensity for argumentation. Zuckerman offers the following definition for his Factor B, which he labels as Hostility-Rejection: "The character of this factor can be described as hostility toward husband and children and rejection of the maternal role" (11, p. 168). The Hostility-Rejection label was retained for Factor 2, which accounted for 20.6 per cent of the variation. Similar loadings to those found by Zuckerman were present, along with a high loading on Marital Conflict which reaffirms Zuckerman's label and definition, and high loadings on Equalitarianism and Encouraging Verbalization, which suggest a propensity for argumentation.

Factor 3 in the present study, which accounted for 11.3 per cent of the variation, has very similar significant loadings to Factor C in Zuckerman's factor analysis. Zuckerman found loadings of .55 on Encouraging Verbalization, .60 on Equalitarianism, and .58 on Comradeship and Sharing (11, p. 171) for his Factor C. The data in this
study indicate a loading of .56 on Encouraging Verbalization, .40 on Equalitarianism, and .33 on Comradeship and Sharing for Factor 3 (Table VII). As in the case of Factors 1 and 2, the loadings are generally lower than in the factor analysis by Zuckerman. An added highly loading factor in this study is Approval of Activity, with a loading of .41 (Table VII), while Zuckerman only found a loading of .16 for this variable on Factor C (11, p. 171). The addition of this weighted variable seems to make Zuckerman's definition of Factor C, Democratic Attitudes, more stable. He defines this factor as "measuring democratic attitudes toward child rearing" (11, p. 170). The label Democratic Attitudes was thus retained for Factor 3 in this study.

**Hypotheses 4 Through 6**

After the testing to confirm the factors and the factor labels for the Parental Attitude Research Instrument, hypotheses 4 through 6 were to be tested with two three-way analyses of variance, one for each dependent variable. The two dependent variables were two of the factors extracted from the factor analysis: Hostility-Rejection attitudes and Authoritarian-Control attitudes of mothers in the sample. The independent variables were (1) full-time homemakers or working mothers, (2) low or high church attendance in mothers, and (3) single or married parent status. Because of statistical problems created by empty cells since there
were no non-working married mothers with low church attendance, the final results were reported in two two-way analyses of variance, and the marital status was reported separately.

A factor score for Authoritarian-Control, Hostility-Rejection, and Democratic Attitudes was computed for each parent. These factor scores were based on the raw scores for the twenty-three variables and the loadings of each variable on the three factors as shown in Table VII. Three factor scores were derived for each of the eighty-eight subjects by taking the raw score for each of the twenty-three factors for an individual, converting it to a z-score, and multiplying it by the factor loading of that particular variable. These were then summed to provide the factor score for each individual for each factor.

Hypothesis 4.—Mothers who work outside the home will show significantly higher levels of Hostility-Rejection and Authoritarian-Control Parenting dimensions, as measured by the Parental Attitude Research Instrument, than will mothers who are full-time homemakers.

The results of the two two-way analyses of variance used to test this hypothesis in the null form are found in Tables VIII and IX.

The data presented in Table VIII indicate that although there was not a significant difference, the non-working mothers showed a higher level of Authoritarian-Control
TABLE VIII

AUTHORITARIAN-CONTROL PARENTING ATTITUDES IN RELATIONSHIP TO WORKING STATUS AND CHURCH ATTENDANCE OF MOTHERS USING SEQUENTIAL SUMS OF SQUARES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working status</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.790</td>
<td>3.121</td>
<td>.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church attendance</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working status x church</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>75.099</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>.894</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parenting attitudes than did the working mothers. The direction was thus opposite to the one predicted by the hypothesis. The null hypothesis was retained and the research hypothesis was rejected. The trend thus shown was for non-working mothers to value authoritarianism more than working mothers.

The data presented in Table IX indicate that although a significant difference was not found, working mothers did
TABLE IX

HOSTILITY-REJECTION PARENTING ATTITUDES IN RELATIONSHIP TO WORKING STATUS AND CHURCH ATTENDANCE OF MOTHERS USING SEQUENTIAL SUMS OF SQUARES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working status</td>
<td>1.090</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.090</td>
<td>1.291</td>
<td>.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church attendance</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td>.958</td>
<td>.331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working status x church</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>70.923</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>.844</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

show a higher level of Hostility-Rejection parenting attitudes than did non-working mothers. The direction was as hypothesized but not significant. The data presented in Tables VIII and IX indicate that the null hypothesis was retained and the research hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 5.—Attitudes of mothers who are among the top one-third in regularity of church attendance will be significantly lower in the Hostility-Rejection parenting dimension, as measured by the Parental Attitude Research
Instrument, than will attitudes of mothers who are among the lowest one-third in church attendance.

The combination of three levels of church attendance with working or non-working mothers resulted in empty cells since there were no non-working mothers whose church attendance was in the medium-frequency category. The data were therefore decreased from three to two categories for church attendance of the mothers. The data were labeled "rather low" and "medium to high." The results of the two-way analysis of variance used to test this hypothesis in the null form are shown in Table IX.

The data in Table IX indicate that although mothers with relatively high church attendance showed lower levels of Hostility-Rejection parenting attitudes than mothers with relatively low church attendance, the difference between the two groups was not statistically significant. The null hypothesis was retained and the research hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 6.—Mothers who are operating within a single-parent family will show significantly higher levels of the Hostility-Rejection and Authoritarian-Control parenting dimensions, as measured by the Parental Attitude Research Instrument, than will mothers who are part of a two-parent family structure.

Empty cells prevented valid computation of the two three-way analyses of variance as originally planned to
compare attitudes of mothers toward Authoritarian-Control and Hostility-Rejection with church attendance, single versus married status, and working versus non-working status. Since there were no non-working, married mothers with low church attendance, the marital status was dropped from the three-way analyses and reported separately. The results of the separate reporting of the test of hypothesis 6 in the null form are shown in Tables X and XI.

TABLE X
IMPACT OF FAMILY MARITAL STRUCTURE ON MOTHERS' AUTHORITARIAN-CONTROL PARENTING ATTITUDES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single parent</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-.05801</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.185</td>
<td>3.574</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married parent</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>.33534</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>.891</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in Table X indicate that while married mothers showed higher levels of Authoritarian-Control parenting attitudes than did single mothers, the .05 level of statistical significance was not attained. The direction was opposite to that predicted in the hypothesis, and approached significance at p = .062. The data in Table XI indicate that while married mothers showed a higher level of Hostility-Rejection parenting attitudes than did single
mothers, the .05 level of statistical significance was not attained. The direction was opposite from that originally predicted in hypothesis 6.

**TABLE XI**

**IMPACT OF FAMILY MARITAL STATUS ON MOTHERS' HOSTILITY-REJECTION PARENTING ATTITUDES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single parent</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-.04575</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.361</td>
<td>.414</td>
<td>.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married parent</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>.15968</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data presented in Tables X and XI indicate that the null hypothesis was retained and the research hypothesis was rejected.

**Relationship Between Resistance to Temptation and Attitudes Toward Parenting by Mothers**

Hypothesis 7.--The child's resistance to temptation will be significantly related to the mother's parenting attitudes.

This hypothesis was tested with a multiple regression equation. Where H-R represented Hostility-Rejection parenting attitudes, A-C represented Authoritarian-Control parenting attitudes, D represented Democratic parenting attitudes, and L of R represented Level of Resistance to Temptation,
the functional notation read: \( L \) of \( R = f(H-R, A-C, D) \).

Data pertaining to this hypothesis are presented in Table XII.

### TABLE XII

CHILDREN'S RESISTANCE TO TEMPTATION AS RELATED TO PARENTING ATTITUDES: MULTIPLE REGRESSION SUMMARY TABLE

(N = 88)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Mult R</th>
<th>( R ) Square</th>
<th>RSQ Change</th>
<th>Simple R</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian-Control</td>
<td>.22299</td>
<td>.04972</td>
<td>.04972</td>
<td>-.22299</td>
<td>-.46356</td>
<td>.22764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostility-Rejection</td>
<td>.25915</td>
<td>.06716</td>
<td>.01744</td>
<td>.12826</td>
<td>.29321</td>
<td>.12915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Attitudes</td>
<td>.26220</td>
<td>.06875</td>
<td>.00159</td>
<td>.03554</td>
<td>.84353</td>
<td>.04006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data presented in Table XII indicate that both the simple and the multiple correlation scores are quite low. Borg and Gall have stated, "Correlations ranging from .20 to .35 show a very slight relationship between the variables although this relationship may be statistically significant. A correlation of .20 indicates that only 4 per cent of the variance in the two measures that have been correlated is common to both" (2, p. 513). These low simple and multiple correlation scores would seem to indicate that for this
sample and these instruments, parenting attitudes and children's level of resistance to temptation are not significantly related. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained and the research hypothesis was rejected.

Discussion

None of the hypotheses in this study reached the .05 level of significance, and three of the directional hypotheses showed trends in the opposite direction from the predictions, although none of these differences was statistically significant.

The prediction in Hypothesis 1 was, based on the findings of earlier studies (5, 7, 9, 10), that girls would show a higher level of resistance to temptation than boys. Although not significant, the trend proved to be in the opposite direction. Perhaps the advent of the women's liberation movement has changed the achievement motivation of females. This increased achievement motivation has been closely linked with decreased resistance to temptation by authorities (3, 4, 6).

Hypothesis 2 compared the children's frequency of Sunday school attendance with their level of resistance to temptation. The results indicated very little effect. Students with high and low Sunday school attendance attained similar mean scores on resistance to temptation, while the middle level of attendance showed a slightly lower resistance
mean score (Table IV). All scores produced means above 5.0. The total group mean for resistance to temptation was 5.46, with a standard deviation of 1.93. Since 7.0 represents perfect resistance to temptation, each group and the total group show high mean scores. Since a high priority for religious instruction was indicated in selection of the school, 52 per cent listing the church related program as top priority for their choice and 19 per cent listing a combination of the church related program and day care as their top priority for the choice, this possibly resulted in a lower variability of scores within the homogeneous group. Hartshorne and May similarly found that while frequency of Sunday school attendance was not a significant factor in resistance to temptation, enrollment in Sunday school was a significant factor (5). Apparently parental priorities and intentions for religious training, although not always followed with actions, were significant. A similar influence would seem to be operating in this present study.

The prediction in Hypothesis 3 was that children whose mothers were full-time homemakers would show significantly higher levels of resistance to temptation than those whose mothers worked outside the home. Although not attaining the .05 level of significance, the results were in the direction predicted. Perhaps mothers who remain within the home, at least in the population for this study, do some
type of direct or indirect teaching which may lead to increased resistance to temptation.

The prediction in Hypothesis 4 was that working mothers would be higher on attitudes of Hostility-Rejection than non-working mothers. The results showed a trend in the predicted direction, although this trend was not statistically significant. Fatigue and lack of time may be factors which could raise the frustration level of the working mothers.

The prediction in Hypothesis 5 was that mothers who attended church regularly would be lower in attitudes of Hostility-Rejection toward their children than mothers who attended church rarely. The findings were in the predicted direction, although not statistically significant. Church attendance may contribute, at least to some extent, to the patience and understanding necessary for greater tolerance in rearing children.

The prediction in Hypothesis 6 was that mothers operating within a single-parent structure would show more Hostility-Rejection and Authoritarian-Control parenting attitudes than mothers who were a part of the traditional two-parent family structure. Although the results were not statistically significant, the findings for Hostility-Rejection were in the opposite direction. Perhaps a release from the conflicts of marriage resulted in greater patience toward the children. The findings for the Authoritarian-Control attitudes were also in the opposite direction from
the one predicted. Mothers who were working showed lower levels of the Authoritarian-Control attitudes than mothers who were non-working, although this finding was not statistically significant. Since all except one of the mothers who were single parents were working, lack of time could have caused the lower levels of Authoritarian-Control attitudes also shown for the working mothers. Perhaps guilt feelings or substitution could also be involved.

The prediction in Hypothesis 7 was that the child's level of resistance to temptation would be significantly related to his mother's parenting attitudes. Low simple correlation and multiple correlation scores indicated that this prediction was not true in this study. Perhaps the three factors parceled out by factor analysis of the Parental Attitude Research Instrument are not the crucial factors in developing resistance to temptation. As previously mentioned, some authorities have also questioned the validity of the Parental Attitude Research Instrument (1, 8).

When the twenty-three scores, yielded by the Parental Attitude Research Instrument, were examined separately as correlates to the resistance to temptation scores, Avoidance of Communication showed the highest correlation, although in a negative direction \((r = -0.318)\). Even this score, according to Borg and Gall, showed only a very slight relationship.
Specific observations in this study were made of children who were pristinely moral in resisting temptation although obviously highly tempted and children who were completely uninhibited and amoral in their approach. Perhaps individual case studies of these specific children in their home environments would produce informative results. Some of the children were so inhibited that they would not play the game when the research assistant was absent, and they also acted extremely anxious during this time. One child said to the research assistant, "I think I should go where you are, because I might cheat." One child threw her five bags, talked to herself agitatedly, rolled her eyes toward the ceiling, folded her arms, and turned her back toward the game. She refused to look in the direction of the game until the research assistant returned. Several children resisted for a time while continually talking to themselves, and then they cheated. The constant presence of the monologue in almost all of the children observed was extremely intriguing. The content of such monologues could make a revealing study. One child resisted for a time, then cheated, and announced to the research assistant upon her return, "I cheated." Three children waited only until they were certain the research assistant was gone and the door was locked. Then they walked directly to the game mechanism and placed the bean bags on top of the string, making no effort to play the game legitimately. Specific case studies of the
backgrounds provided by the parents of children involved in the two extremes of resistance to temptation behavior, might be informative.

The results of this study indicated, overall, that resistance to temptation in children may be affected more by deep-seated core values in the parent than by specific items, such as working status, church attendance, and marital status. This hypothesis is reflected in the high mean scores for resistance to temptation found throughout this study. A similar study in a public kindergarten environment might be desirable to test this hypothesis. The findings concerning the lack of influence of Sunday school attendance might indicate a need for closer examination of Sunday school programs if resistance to temptation is a goal sought by the churches. Nevertheless, since none of the hypotheses reached the .05 level of significance, these slight trends must be given the status of hypotheses to be further tested rather than the status of facts.
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CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study measured and compared the level of resistance to temptation in five-year-old children as related to the attitudes of their mothers toward parenting, augmented by an analysis utilizing sex of the child, regularity in church attendance of mothers and children, single parent versus traditional two-parent family structure, and working or non-working status of the mothers.

In the fall of 1981, a sample was drawn from the total kindergarten populations of two Protestant church related schools. One of the schools was located in a large metropolitan area and the other was in a suburb of the same area. All children were tested whose mothers gave written permission for testing and who also responded to the data sheet and questionnaire distributed to them. A total of eighty-eight children was included in the study out of ninety-two children tested.

The instrument used to measure resistance to temptation behaviorally was Robert Grinder's bean bag game. This device was designed to measure the child's resistance to
the temptation to cheat when he believed he was unsupervised as he played a game to win a prize. The instrument used to measure the attitudes of the mothers toward parenting was the Parental Attitude Research Instrument designed by Earl Schaeffer and Richard Bell. This instrument consisted of 115 questions of general opinion on parenting, and the respondent expressed agreement or disagreement on a four-point scale of intensity. The Parent Information Sheet included demographic information such as working status of the mother, family marital structure, regularity of Sunday school attendance of the child and of church attendance of the mother, and reason for selecting the kindergarten.

The twenty-three variables yielded by the Parental Attitude Research Instrument were subjected to factor analysis. To compare the findings with previous research and to apply statistical significance to a small group, the twenty-three variables were collapsed into three factors. The three factors or parenting attitudes were labeled the same as those found by Zuckerman: Authoritarian-Control, Hostility-Rejection, and Democratic Attitudes. Due to statistical problems created by empty cells, two two-way analyses of variance were used. These two-way analyses of variance compared the Hostility-Rejection attitudes of the mothers and their Authoritarian-Control attitudes after classifying the mothers according to working status and frequency of their church attendance. The mothers'
attitudes as classified by family marital structure were reported separately. The overall relationship between the resistance to temptation of the child and the parenting attitudes of his mother was then explored using a multiple regression equation.

Findings

The findings presented in this study apply specifically to the subjects used in this study. The validity of the findings was contingent upon the population from which the sample was drawn, the conditions under which the data were collected, and the instruments used to collect the data. The study resulted in the following findings.

1. Five-year-old females did not show a higher level of resistance to temptation than did five-year-old males.

2. Five-year-old children who were high in their frequency of Sunday school attendance did not show higher levels of resistance to temptation than did five-year-old children who were low in their frequency of Sunday school attendance.

3. Five-year-old children whose mothers were non-working showed a trend toward being more resistant to temptation than five-year-old children whose mothers worked outside the home, but not to the .05 level of statistical significance (p = .079).

4. Mothers who worked outside the home were not higher on Authoritarian-Control parenting attitudes than mothers
who were non-working. The trend was in the opposite direction but it was not statistically significant. Mothers who worked outside the home were not significantly higher on Hostility-Rejection parenting attitudes than mothers who were non-working.

5. Mothers who were high in church attendance were not significantly lower in Hostility-Rejection parenting attitudes than mothers who were low in church attendance.

6. Mothers who were operating within a single-parent family structure were not higher on Hostility-Rejection parenting attitudes than mothers operating within the traditional two-parent family structure. The trend was in the opposite direction and approached statistical significance (p = .062).

7. The level of resistance to temptation in five-year-old children showed only a low correlation with the parenting attitudes of the mother.

Conclusions

The following conclusions are based upon the findings from the specific sample involved in this study.

1. Sex of the child has little or no effect on the level of resistance to temptation of five-year-old children.

2. Frequency of Sunday school attendance has little or no effect on the level of resistance to temptation of five-year-old children.
3. Five-year-old children whose mothers are non-working show a trend toward more resistance to temptation than five-year-old children whose mothers work outside the home.

4. Mothers who work outside the home do not differ significantly on their Authoritarian-Control or Hostility-Rejection parenting attitudes from mothers who are non-working.

5. Mothers who are high in church attendance do not differ significantly in their Hostility-Rejection parenting attitudes from mothers who are low in church attendance.

6. Single parent mothers do not differ significantly in Hostility-Rejection parenting attitudes from mothers in a traditional two-parent family structure.

7. Attitudes of mothers of five-year-old children toward child rearing show a low correlation with the level of resistance to temptation of their children.

Recommendations

The following recommendations for future research are based upon the related research and upon the data collected in this study.

1. It is recommended that this study be replicated in a secular kindergarten environment to test the possibility that the high mean scores for resistance to temptation reported throughout the study are related to the parents' choice of a church related program.
2. Since parenting attitudes showed a low correlation with resistance to temptation in this study, it is recommended that this study be replicated, comparing parenting practices with resistance to temptation in five-year-old children.

3. Grinder's bean bag game measures behavioral resistance to temptation. It is recommended that this study be replicated measuring a different facet of moral development such as the cognitive level described by Piaget and Kohlberg or the guilt level described by Freud.

4. The Parent Attitude Research Instrument measures twenty-three attitudes toward parenting, making valid comparisons of small groups difficult. It has also been criticized for a response-acquiescence set. It is recommended that this study be replicated utilizing another instrument to measure parenting attitudes.

5. Frequency of Sunday school attendance, mothers' church attendance, and the sex of the child apparently have little effect on levels of resistance to temptation in five-year-old children. It is recommended that additional variables, such as socioeconomic status, Sunday school enrollment, intelligence quotient, ethnicity, and motivation levels be examined to determine their significance in affecting these levels of resistance to temptation.

6. Although previous research had reported that girls are more highly resistant to temptation than boys, the
findings in this study did not support this hypothesis. A replication of this study, with testing of motivation levels in both boys and girls, might ascertain whether girls' resistance to temptation has changed and whether this difference is related to changing motivational levels in females.

7. Five-year-old children whose mothers were non-working, showed a trend toward increased resistance to temptation. It could be informative if future studies examined varying levels of resistance to temptation in five-year-old children in different child care facilities such as secular child care, church-related child care, and family day homes.

8. It is recommended that this study be replicated investigating the parenting attitudes of the fathers as well as the mothers, if there is disparity between the attitudes of the two parents, and the possible effects of these variables upon the resistance to temptation of the five-year-old child.

9. It is recommended that individual case studies be made of the parenting environments and backgrounds of children who were highly resistant to temptation and of the children who were amoral in their behavior.
APPENDICES
Appendix A
Cover Letter to Parents

Dear _____________,

In cooperation with (child's school), Dallas Baptist College, and North Texas State University, I am studying what mothers think about how children should be brought up. Much is written on this subject in various newspapers and magazines. Frequently these writers do not agree. I thought it would be helpful to find out what mothers themselves think. You can help in this study. Be frank, and give your own personal views regardless of what others might think. To save time, a list of ideas which other mothers have contributed is enclosed. Instructions are included.

I shall also be working with the children in your child's kindergarten class by observing their reactions to a game. This activity will be done at school. Although the exact details of the study cannot be explained at this time since this would invalidate the findings, let me assure you that no harm will come to your child. When the study is complete, I shall be happy to explain the study and findings to you in detail.

Please complete the enclosed questionnaire, which will take less than twenty minutes. Return it and the Parental Permission Slip, along with the Parent Information Sheet, in the self-addressed, stamped envelope.

Thank you so much for your help. It is through the willingness of parents like yourself to take the time to be part of research, that we are able to find better ways to help future parents. I eagerly await your reply.

Respectfully yours,

Sylvia Artmann
Assistant Professor
Elementary Education
Appendix B

Parent Permission Slip

I, ____________________________, give my permission for my child, ____________, to take part in the research being conducted by Mrs. Sylvia Artmann under the auspices of Dallas Baptist College and North Texas State University. I understand that no harm will come to my child, and that all results concerning my child will be strictly confidential.

Signed: ____________________________
(parent or guardian)

Please mark one of the following:

____ I am interested in learning the details and findings of this study.

____ I am not interested in learning further about the study.
Appendix C

Parental Attitude Research Instrument

SAMPLE COPY OF FINAL FORM IV (PARI)*

INVENTORY OF ATTITUDES ON FAMILY LIFE AND CHILDREN

Read each of the statements below and then rate them as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
<th>mildly agree</th>
<th>mildly disagree</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicate your opinion by drawing a circle around the “A” if you strongly agree, around the “B” if you mildly agree, around the “C” if you mildly disagree, and around the “D” if you strongly disagree.

There are no right or wrong answers, so answer according to your own opinion. It is very important to the study that all questions be answered. Many of the statements will seem alike but all are necessary to show slight differences of opinion.

1. Children should be allowed to disagree with their parents if they feel their own ideas are better. A a d D
2. A good mother should shelter her child from life’s little difficulties. A a d D
3. The home is the only thing that matters to a good mother. A a d D
4. Some children are just so bad they must be taught to fear adults for their own good. A a d D
5. Children should realize how much parents have to give up for them. A a d D
6. You must always keep tight hold of baby during his bath for in a careless moment he might slip. A a d D
7. People who think they can get along in marriage without arguments just don’t know the facts. A a d D
8. A child will be grateful later on for strict training. A a d D
9. Children will get on any woman’s nerves if she has to be with them all day. A a d D
10. It’s best for the child if he never gets started wondering whether his mother’s views are right. A a d D
11. More parents should teach their children to have unquestioning loyalty to them. A a d D
12. A child should be taught to avoid fighting no matter what happens. A a d D
13. One of the worst things about taking care of a home is a woman feels that she can’t get out. A a d D

*Permission is granted to anyone to reproduce this material with proper acknowledgment, without permission of the authors or of the Society for Research in Child Development.
14. Parents should adjust to the children some rather than always expecting the children to adjust to the parents.
15. There are so many things a child has to learn in life there is no excuse for him sitting around with time on his hands.
16. If you let children talk about their troubles they end up complaining even more.
17. Mothers would do their job better with the children if fathers were more kind.
18. A young child should be protected from hearing about sex.
19. If a mother doesn’t go ahead and make rules for the home the children and husband will get into troubles they don’t need to.
20. A mother should make it her business to know everything her children are thinking.
21. Children would be happier and better behaved if parents would show an interest in their affairs.
22. Most children are toilet trained by 15 months of age.
23. There is nothing worse for a young mother than being alone while going through her first experience with a baby.
24. Children should be encouraged to tell their parents about it whenever they feel family rules are unreasonable.
25. A mother should do her best to avoid any disappointment for her child.
26. The women who want lots of parties seldom make good mothers.
27. It is frequently necessary to drive the mischief out of a child before he will behave.
28. A mother must expect to give up her own happiness for that of her child.
29. All young mothers are afraid of their awkwardness in handling and holding the baby.
30. Sometimes it’s necessary for a wife to tell off her husband in order to get her rights.
31. Strict discipline develops a fine strong character.
32. Mothers very often feel that they can’t stand their children a moment longer.
33. A parent should never be made to look wrong in a child’s eyes.
34. The child should be taught to revere his parents above all other grown-ups.
35. A child should be taught to always come to his parents or teachers rather than fight when he is in trouble.
36. Having to be with the children all the time gives a woman the feeling her wings have been clipped.
37. Parents must earn the respect of their children by the way they act.
38. Children who don’t try hard for success will feel they have missed out on things later on.
39. Parents who start a child talking about his worries don't realize that sometimes it's better to just leave well enough alone.

40. Husbands could do their part if they were less selfish.

41. It is very important that young boys and girls not be allowed to see each other completely undressed.

42. Children and husbands do better when the mother is strong enough to settle most of the problems.

43. A child should never keep a secret from his parents.

44. Laughing at children's jokes and telling children jokes makes things go more smoothly.

45. The sooner a child learns to walk the better he's trained.

46. It isn't fair that a woman has to bear just about all the burden of raising children by herself.

47. A child has a right to his own point of view and ought to be allowed to express it.

48. A child should be protected from jobs which might be too tiring or hard for him.

49. A woman has to choose between having a well-run home and hobnobbing around with neighbors and friends.

50. A wise parent will teach a child early just who is boss.

51. Few women get the gratitude they deserve for all they have done for their children.

52. Mothers never stop blaming themselves if their babies are injured in accidents.

53. No matter how well a married couple love one another, there are always differences which cause irritation and lead to arguments.

54. Children who are held to firm rules grow up to be the best adults.

55. It's a rare mother who can be sweet and even tempered with her children all day.

56. Children should never learn things outside the home which make them doubt their parents' ideas.

57. A child soon learns that there is no greater wisdom than that of his parents.

58. There is no good excuse for a child hitting another child.

59. Most young mothers are bothered more by the feeling of being shut up in the home than by anything else.

60. Children are too often asked to do all the compromising and adjustment and that is not fair.

61. Parents should teach their children that the way to get ahead is to keep busy and not waste time.

62. Children pester you with all their little upsets if you aren't careful from the first.

63. When a mother doesn't do a good job with children it's probably because the father doesn't do his part around the home.
64. Children who take part in sex play become sex criminals when they grow up.

65. A mother has to do the planning because she is the one who knows what's going on in the home.

66. An alert parent should try to learn all her child's thoughts.

67. Parents who are interested in hearing about their children's parties, dates and fun help them grow up right.

68. The earlier a child is weaned from its emotional ties to its parents the better it will handle its own problems.

69. A wise woman will do anything to avoid being by herself before and after a new baby.

70. A child's ideas should be seriously considered in making family decisions.

71. Parents should know better than to allow their children to be exposed to difficult situations.

72. Too many women forget that a mother's place is in the home.

73. Children need some of the natural meanness taken out of them.

74. Children should be more considerate of their mothers since their mothers suffer so much for them.

75. Most mothers are fearful that they may hurt their babies in handling them.

76. There are some things which just can't be settled by a mild discussion.

77. Most children should have more discipline than they get.

78. Raising children is a nerve-wracking job.

79. The child should not question the thinking of his parents.

80. Parents deserve the highest esteem and regard of their children.

81. Children should not be encouraged to box or wrestle because it often leads to trouble or injury.

82. One of the bad things about raising children is that you aren't free enough of the time to do just as you like.

83. As much as is reasonable a parent should try to treat a child as an equal.

84. A child who is "on the go" all the time will most likely be happy.

85. If a child has upset feelings it is best to leave him alone and not make it look serious.

86. If mothers could get their wishes they would most often ask that their husband be more understanding.

87. Sex is one of the greatest problems to be contended with in children.

88. The whole family does fine if the mother puts her shoulders to the wheel and takes charge of things.

89. A mother has a right to know everything going on in her child's life because her child is part of her.
If parents would have fun with their children, the children would be more apt to take their advice.

A mother should make an effort to get her child toilet trained at the earliest possible time.

Most women need more time than they are given to rest up in the home after going through childbirth.

When a child is in trouble he ought to know he won't be punished for talking about it with his parents.

Children should be kept away from all hard jobs which might be discouraging.

A good mother will find enough social life within the family.

It is sometimes necessary for the parents to break the child's will.

Mothers sacrifice almost all their own fun for their children.

A mother's greatest fear is that in a forgetful moment she might let something bad happen to the baby.

It's natural to have quarrels when two people who both have minds of their own get married.

Children are actually happier under strict training.

There is nothing worse than letting a child hear criticisms of his mother.

Loyalty to parents comes before anything else.

Most parents prefer a quiet child to a "scrappy" one.

A young mother feels "held down" because there are lots of things she wants to do while she is young.

There is no reason parents should have their own way all the time, any more than that children should have their own way all the time.

The sooner a child learns that a wasted minute is lost forever the better off he will be.

The trouble with giving attention to children's problems is they usually just make up a lot of stories to keep you interested.

Few men realize that a mother needs some fun in life too.

There is usually something wrong with a child who asks a lot of questions about sex.

A married woman knows that she will have to take the lead in family matters.

It is a mother's duty to make sure she knows her child's innermost thoughts.

When you do things together, children feel close to you and can talk easier.

A child should be weaned away from the bottle or breast as soon as possible.

Taking care of a small baby is something that no woman should be expected to do all by herself.
Appendix D

Score Sheet for Sample

23 Scale, 5-Item Questionnaire (Form IV)

Name ___________________________ Date _______ Number _______

Parental Attitude Research Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Score</th>
<th>Sub-Test Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 24 47 70 93</td>
<td>Encouraging Verbalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fostering Dependency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Seclusion of the Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Breaking the Will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Martyrdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fear of Harming the Baby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Marital Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Strictness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Irritability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Excluding Outside Influences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Deification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Suppression of Aggression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Rejection of Homemaking Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Equalitarianism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Approval of Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Avoidance of Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Inconsiderateness of Husband</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Suppression of Sexuality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Ascendancy of the Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Intrusiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Comradeship and Sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Acceleration of Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Dependency of the Mother</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructions: Enter the number 4, 3, 2, or 1 in each square according to whether the response was Strong Agreement, Mild Agreement, Mild Disagreement, or Strong Disagreement.
respectively. Thus, if the subject responded with Mild Disagreement to item #25, a 2 would be entered in the second cell of the second row. Total score is merely the sum of entries across rows. Since items are arranged in a cyclical order by scales all items in a given row belong to the same scale. Hence, summing across gives the score for that scale.
Parent Information Sheet

For each question, please mark one of the following categories which most closely describes your situation.

1. Job status
   _____ Full-time homemaker
   _____ Work outside the home

2. If mother works outside the home, child care is provided by
   _____ Day care
   _____ Relative
   _____ Hired individual in child's home
   _____ Hired individual in her home
   _____ Other (explain)

3. Family status
   _____ Both mother and father present in the home
   _____ Mother alone heads the family
   _____ Father alone heads the family
   _____ Other (explain)

4. Sunday school attendance of child
   _____ Rarely or never
   _____ About four times a year
   _____ About six times a year
   _____ About once a month
   _____ About twice a month
   _____ Every week
5. Church attendance of mother
   ______ Rarely or never
   ______ About four times a year
   ______ About six times a year
   ______ About once a month
   ______ About twice a month
   ______ Every week

6. Mother's age group
   ______ 18-24 years
   ______ 25-30 years
   ______ 31-35 years
   ______ 36-45 years
   ______ Over 45 years

7. Reason for choosing this kindergarten for your child
   ______ Day care available
   ______ Attend church here
   ______ Church-related program
   ______ Convenient to work location or home
   ______ Other (explain)
Appendix E
Script for Research Assistant

The research assistant will spend the few minutes while walking down the hall with the child in trying to establish rapport through friendly questioning and comments of encouragement. The scripted portion begins when the two come into the room where the game has been placed.

Research Assistant: Today I'm going to teach you how to play a new game. I think you'll like it, and I want to be sure you understand how it works so you can do well. After I'm sure you understand the game, and you've had a chance to practice it, you'll get to try for a prize. I'd like for you to choose now the prize you'd like to win if you play the game well enough.

Research Assistant now displays the toy assortment and has the child choose one.

Research Assistant: That's a lovely prize! Let's put it right up here waiting for you to win it. (Displays choice prominently, sets aside other toys.) Now, I want to show you how the game is played. See that board over there with the lights on it? (Child's response.) Every time you throw a bean bag so that it hits the wall and falls down in such a way that it hits a string behind that
board, a light will come on. When you play for the prize, you will have five bean bags--five chances to get three lights on, which will win you the prize. Would you like to see the string? Come, I'll show you how it works. (Takes the child by the hand, crosses the throw line, and leads over to the mechanism.) Just to show you what happens when the bean bag hits the string, I'm going to touch the string with my hand as if I were a bean bag falling on the string. (Demonstrates, light comes on.) Again (another light comes on). Now, let's go learn how to really play the game (pushes button to deactivate lights, and takes child back to the throwline).

See this line? (Nod or affirmative from child.) This is called the "throw line" because you must stand behind it when you throw the bean bags. You must not step across it, because that would be cheating. Do you understand?

Now, tell me, what do you need to do to win the prize? (Repeats previous instruction until child is able to indicate awareness of five bean bag throws in an effort to turn on three lights.) And what must you not do in order not to cheat? (Repeats previous instructions until sure child knows he is not to cross the throw line.)
Now, let's practice! Here are the five bean bags. Come stand behind the throw line. You may toss them any way you like, as long as you do not cross the throw line. (Child throws all five bags, nods of encouragement being given as needed. Two lights come on.)

That was almost good enough for the prize, and this is only the practice game (suddenly looks at watch)! Oh, dear, I forgot that I have a phone call to make! But you can go ahead and play the game while I'm gone. As soon as I'm gone I want you to slide this chair in front of the door so that nobody will bother you. I'll knock when I come back, and you can take the chair away, okay? (Goes out door.) Do you have the chair in front of the door? (Child response.) Okay, now you go play the game. I'll knock when I return.

Three minutes later, measured by stop watch, Research Assistant knocks on door and waits to be readmitted.

Well, you really should know how to play the game now (deactivates lights). Now let's play for the prize.

Rest is ad lib.
Appendix F

Data Sheet for Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child's Name and Parent Identification Number</th>
<th>Deviated Before Any Bags Thrown</th>
<th>Deviated After 1st Bag</th>
<th>Deviated After 2nd Bag</th>
<th>Deviated After 3rd Bag</th>
<th>Deviated After 4th Bag</th>
<th>Deviated After 5th Bag</th>
<th>Did Not Deviate</th>
<th>Scale Score</th>
<th>Times Cheated</th>
<th>Comments on Demeanor, Behavior, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Code: TL--stepped across throw line; RB--retrieved bag to throw again; H--hit trip string with hand.
Appendix G

Schematic of Bean Bag Game and Observation Booth
Appendix H

Resistance to Temptation

Raw Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Number</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TS-2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-8</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-9</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-11</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-12</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-13</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-16</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-17</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-20</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-33</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-36</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-38</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-39</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-41</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-8</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-9</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-11</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-18</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-19</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-23</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-25</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-26</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-27</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-28</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-30</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-32</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-32</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-34</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-35</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-38</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-41</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-42</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-43</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-44</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-45</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-47</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-48</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-19</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Number</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-21</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-23</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-25</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-27</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-30</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-32</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-35</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-37</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-42</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-12</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-16</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-20</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-21</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-22</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-29</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-36</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-37</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-39</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-46</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-50</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-18</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-7</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-13</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-40</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-22</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-29</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-28</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-31</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-14</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-49</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-26</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-17</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-24</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-31</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET-33</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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