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This study examined the relationship between the resistance to temptation of three-, four-, and five-year-old children and parental attitudes toward child-rearing. Other variables explored included gender of the children, employment status of mothers, and socio-economic status of families.

Fifty-two three-, four-, and five-year-old children from two centers were tested to determine their levels of resistance to temptation as measured by Grinder's Bean Bag Instrument. Parental attitudes toward child-rearing were measured by Schaefer and Bell's Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI).

To determine the difference between the resistance to temptation scores and socio-economic status, gender, and employment status of mothers, t tests were employed. No significant differences were found with regard to these variables. Factor analysis of the PARI resulted in three primary factors: Hostility-Rejection, Authoritarian-Control, and Democratic-Attitude. To determine the difference between the Hostility-Rejection scores,
Authoritarian-Control scores, and Democratic-Attitude scores of the mothers and socio-economic status, $t$ tests were employed. There were no significant differences between mothers of a lower socio-economic level and their Hostility-Rejection and Democratic-Attitude scores. However, mothers of a lower/upper socio-economic level showed significantly higher levels of Authoritarian-Control than mothers of an upper socio-economic level. To determine the difference between the Hostility-Rejection scores, Authoritarian-Control scores, and Democratic-Attitude scores of the mothers and employment status of the mothers, $t$ tests were employed. No significant differences were found regarding these variables. To determine the relationship between the Hostility-Rejection scores, Authoritarian-Control scores, and Democratic-Attitude scores of the mothers and resistance to temptation scores of the children, a Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was employed. Results indicated that there was no significant relationship between the Hostility-Rejection scores and the Authoritarian-Control scores of the mothers and the resistance to temptation score of the children. A significant relationship was found between the Democratic-Attitude scores of the mothers and the resistance to temptation score of the children.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A moral child is one who knows the difference between right and wrong and acts accordingly. To some degree, adults act as a judge and commend a child for holding moral positions and disapprove of a child for not acting in accordance with societal values. Who constitutes the idea of right and wrong? How much do parental attitudes and parental guidance relate to each child’s system of values? Does a child practice the "right" moral codes because of the situation he* is in or is it purely due to the individual child’s conscience?

A classic study regarding morality was conducted by Milgram whose results were surprising. Milgram (1973) conducted a study to measure the effect of punishment on learning at Yale University. The subjects used in this study ranged from 20 to 40 years of age and were employed as factory workers, city employees, laborers, barbers, businessmen, clerks, salespeople, white-collar workers, and members of other professions. One subject and one learner were involved in each experiment. The subject was told that he must administer an electric shock when the learner gave

*It is recognized that the researcher has used "he" when referring to "he" or "she" for reasons of consistency.
the incorrect response. The learner was a 31-year-old high school teacher of biology who was role playing. He pretended to receive the shocks when actually, he received no shocks at all. The subjects were under the impression that the learner was in varying degrees of pain depending upon how many volts of electricity they administered. The range of volts was from 15 to 450 volts and the levels were classified as Slight Shock, Moderate Shock, Strong Shock, Very Strong Shock, Intense Shock, Extreme Intensity Shock, Danger: Severe Shock. Following this last switch, there were two switches labeled XXX. When the subject hesitated to give the shocks initially, he was urged to continue and if this was not effective, then he was told he must continue even after the learner shrieked in agony from the shocks.

The main findings of this research were that decent people will follow the authority of another individual knowing that it is causing great pain to the third party.

Questions that arise are what made the subject administer such shock to the learner while thinking that the learner was in severe pain while being in full control of the situation? What makes adults do what they do? What makes children do what they do? Is there a relationship between adults in the parent role and their attitude toward child-rearing and the children holding moral positions of their own? The current study was designed to investigate
the influence of selected parental attitudes toward child-rearing upon the development of children's moral code.

Parents play an important role in determining the moral code of their children. The primacy and intimacy of parental influences are crucial to the formation of character among young children. The challenge has always been, and continues to be, how to be a better parent. In view of this, there is a clear need for research in the area of parent attitudes toward child-rearing and its relation to morality in young children.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to examine the relationship between one aspect of morality (resistance to temptation) in three-, four-, and five-year-old children and parental attitudes toward child-rearing. Other variables included the gender of the children, the employment status of mothers, and socio-economic status of the families.

Hypotheses

Resistance to Temptation

**Hypothesis 1**: Children of lower socio-economic status have less resistance to temptation than children of upper socio-economic status.

**Hypothesis 2**: Females show a higher level of resistance to temptation than males.
Hypothesis 3: Children whose mothers are full-time homemakers have higher levels of resistance to temptation than children whose mothers work outside the home.

Attitudes of Mothers Toward Child-Rearing

Hypothesis 4: Mothers of a lower socio-economic level have higher levels of Hostility-Rejection, as measured by the Parent Attitude Research Instrument, than mothers of an upper socio-economic level.

Hypothesis 5: Mothers of a lower socio-economic level have higher levels of Authoritarian-Control, as measured by the Parent Attitude Research Instrument, than mothers of an upper socio-economic level.

Hypothesis 6: Mothers of a lower socio-economic level have lower levels of Democratic Attitude, as measured by the Parent Attitude Research Instrument, than mothers of an upper socio-economic level.

Hypothesis 7: Mothers who work outside the home have higher levels of Hostility-Rejection, as measured by the Parent Attitude Research Instrument, than mothers who are full-time homemakers.

Hypothesis 8: Mothers who work outside the home have significantly higher levels of Authoritarian-Control, as measured by the Parent Attitude Research Instrument, than mothers who are full-time homemakers.

Hypothesis 9: Mothers who work outside the home have significantly lower levels of Democratic-Attitude, as
measured by the Parent Attitude Research Instrument, than mothers who are full-time homemakers.

Relationships

**Hypothesis 10:** Mothers who have higher levels of Hostility-Rejection have children who are lower in resistance to temptation than mothers who have lower levels of Hostility-Rejection.

**Hypothesis 11:** Mothers who have higher levels of Authoritarian-Control have children who are lower in resistance to temptation than mothers who have lower levels of Authoritarian-Control.

**Hypothesis 12:** Mothers who have higher levels of Democratic-Attitude have children who are higher in resistance to temptation than mothers who have lower levels of Democratic-Attitude.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined as follows for this investigation.

**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" (Good, 1959, p. 48).

**Authoritarian-Control**—"Suppressive, punitive, and restricting types of attitudes" (Zuckerman, Rebback, Monaskin, & Norton, 1958, p. 168).
Democratic—"Encouraging verbalization; . . .

equalitarianism; . . . comradeship and sharing (Zuckerman, et al., p. 170).

Hostility-Rejection—"Hostility toward children and

husband and rejection of the maternal role" (Zuckerman, et al., 1958, p. 168).

Lower Socio-Economic Status—Low income families who

meet the poverty level criteria required for their children
to attend a childcare center funded by United Way.

Upper Socio-Economic Status—Families who have the

financial means to pay $800.00/semester tuition for their

children to attend a university nursery school.

Morality—Resistance to temptation as measured by

Grinder's Bean Bag Instrument.

Mother—Primary female caretaker of the child, who has

responsibility for child's guardianship.

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" (Grinder, 1961, p. 679).

Limitations

It is recognized that the findings in this study may

not be broadly generalizable because of the possible bias in

volunteer sampling.
Summary

It is important in the early years to have those experiences which may foster morality in young children. But first, the experiences must be identified which support prosocial moral responses. In this study, an attempt was made to identify the relationship between the morality of young children and parental attitudes toward child-rearing, gender, working status of mothers, and socio-economic status of the families.
CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY


Emerging Theories of Moral Development and the Child

Piaget has done extensive research in the area of cognitive structures and morality in children. His first research on morality was published in 1932. Piaget developed two stages of development for children between the ages of 6 and 12. They are called heteronomy and autonomy. Heteronomy is the stage when children take rules very seriously because the rules were made by adults. As children mature, this stage becomes obsolete and the autonomy comes to the foreground. Autonomy is the stage of development in which rules are no longer sacred but are made by a free will and are entitled to respect. In regard to morality, Piaget studied two questions: how much do rules restrain and how much are rules practiced? In order to answer these questions, Piaget selected a game of marbles so that children of all ages would be familiar with the rules. He asked the children questions regarding the rules of the game attempting to find if children were more heteronomous or autonomous. His findings were relative to the ages of the children. In children up to the age of 2, Piaget found that no rules were followed; the children simply
demonstrated motor activity. In children between the ages of 2 and 6, rules became sacred and children imitated what they had seen. In children between the ages of 7 and 10, the children were grasping the feeling of competition. Children were observant of the other children to be assured that the rules were being followed because winning now played an important role. Children between the ages of 11 and 12 were willing to cooperate with each other when setting up the rules of the game. There was a level of abstract reasoning taking place. There are several conclusions that may be drawn from this research. (1) Children must be able to understand the rules before they are able to practice them. (2) Children must move out of the stage of hetereonomy before moving into the stage of autonomy. Discussions over rules are a natural progression in order for autonomy to take place (Duska & Whelan, 1975).

Kohlberg (1970) expanded on the work of Piaget by conducting a longitudinal study over an 18 year period with a group of 50 males ranging from the ages of 10 to 28. He interviewed the population every three years. From the interviews, he identified six stages of moral development. It is important to note that like Piaget, Kohlberg looked at the reason a person thought that an action was wrong rather than the action itself. There may, for example, be different reasons why a child does not steal an apple versus why an adult does not steal an apple. A child may not steal
an apple because an adult instructed him not to do so and an adult may not steal an apple because of the fear of getting caught. So the behavior is not as important as the reasons why. Kohlberg's six stages are divided into three categories: the pre-conventional level, the conventional level, and the post-conventional level. Under the pre-conventional level, there are two stages: the Punishment and Obedience Orientation and the Instrumental Relativist Orientation. The Punishment and Obedience Orientation is the stage during which the child obeys the rules solely to avoid punishment if he breaks the rules. There is no regard for meaning or value of the rule. The Instrumental Relativist Orientation is the stage during which the child thinks of his own needs first and only occasionally thinks of others needs. The nature of reciprocity does not stem from loyalty but from the idea that if you do something nice for me, I will do something nice for you. Under the conventional level, there are two stages: the Interpersonal Concordance of "Good Boy-Nice Girl" Orientation and the Law and Order Orientation. The Interpersonal Concordance of "Good Boy-Nice Girl" Orientation is the stage during which good behavior is reinforced and the child wants to please. The idea of intention is introduced in this stage. The Law and Order Orientation is the stage during which a child has respect for authority and does his duty. Under the post-conventional level, there are two stages: the Social-
Contract Legalistic Orientation and the Universal Ethical Principle Orientation. The Social-Contract Legalistic Orientation is the stage during which the American government and Constitution play a role. Although, not only do the official laws govern but the individual rights of people have to be considered also. The Universal Ethical Principle Orientation is the stage during which there is a respect for human beings as individuals and there are universal principles of justice felt from the heart. In conclusion, Kohlberg identified six stages of moral development and determined that children have various reasons for their actions depending on their stage of development (Duska & Whelan, 1975).

Empirical Data Regarding Moral Development and the Child

Among the first to study morality in young children was Read (1945) who studied children's morality by rating the responses of 32 parents with the behavior of their 20 children. Her data suggested that liberalism in child-rearing has an effect on the behavior of children. Children whose parents were more liberal had the freedom to make their own decisions. Radke (1946) developed scales measuring parental attitudes toward autocratic or democratic control of the child, amount of freedom, severity or mildness of punishment, rapport between parent and child, the relative responsibility of the parents for the child's discipline,
and sibling compatibility or incompatibility. Results suggested that there was a relationship between unfavorable conduct of children and the autocratic, restrictive, and extreme discipline techniques of the parents. Block (1955) also studied the relationship between parental attitudes in child-rearing and morality. His findings indicate that more restricted fathers were more likely to be constricted and submissive parents with low self esteem. Permissive fathers were more likely to be self-assured and functioning with more effectiveness.

Stegall (1978) conducted a study at the University of North Carolina focusing on the moral development of children. Her hypothesis was that moral development could be fostered in children in the first grade. In order to test her hypothesis, stories were read to children which instructed them on the consequences of doing misdeeds to other children. The researcher developed the Moral Development Inventory designed to measure moral development in children. Findings suggest the treatment effect was highly significant with the male population.

Vinson (1980) conducted a study with young children ranging in age from 5 to 11 years. The purpose of her study was to examine intentionality when making judgments after simplified stories were read to the children involving acts of damage. Children were asked to choose which punishment they thought was appropriate for the story characters.
Findings suggest that the children who ranged in age from 5 to 11 years were able to differentiate between intentional and accidental behaviors. Children in this age group chose a more severe punishment for those story characters who demonstrated intentional behaviors. Children who ranged from 8 to 11 years were able to establish more clearly which characters demonstrated intentional behaviors and which characters demonstrated accidental behaviors.

Parental Attitudes Toward Child-Rearing

The impact of parental attitudes toward child-rearing upon the morality of children is the major thrust for this research. According to Hoffman (1979), there are three specific parenting patterns: (1) power-assertive, (2) love-withdrawal, and (3) inductive. Power-assertive discipline is the technique during which the parent relies heavily on his sense of power over the child. The child minds the parent because of his position, not for the reason to please the parent or himself. Hoffman suggests that this type of parenting weakens the child's respect for his inner self, and he loses control over his own behavior. Love-withdrawal parenting techniques are on the opposite end of the spectrum from power-assertive parenting techniques. A parent may ignore the child, refuse to speak or listen to the child, isolate the child from friends and family, or threaten to leave him. Love-withdrawal parenting techniques can be the most damaging of the parenting techniques because of social
community. However, if the child is in a warm and nurturant environment, this method can hold less threat to the child. Induction parenting techniques include telling the child why his behavior is wrong so that the child may understand it. The child is not simply obeying the parent because the parent is an authority figure but knows why his behavior is not appropriate. The parent may also discuss the consequences with the child and may include concern for others while doing so. This technique is less punitive than the power-assertive and the love-withdrawal techniques.

Sears (1958) conducted a study of parental child-rearing behaviors at Harvard University. His sample consisted of 379 suburban New England mothers of children ranging in age from 5 to 6 years. The mothers were interviewed concerning their child-rearing practices. The purpose of this study was to determine the dimensions that underlie parental child-rearing behaviors by factor analysis. Because descriptors of parent behavior included terms such as "over-indulgent, authoritarian, permissive and castrating," it was decided that these terms were not efficient in that they denoted behavior which was not empirically consistent or mutually exclusive. Results of the study suggested the importance of parental permissiveness and the warmth dimension as descriptors of parent behavior. It was suggested that a parent who
demonstrated warmth would not be a parent who was non-permissive or restrictive.

Blum (1959) conducted a study involving the relationship between rigidity and flexibility in children and their parents at Purdue University. The underlying theory maintains that learned behavior patterns such as rigidity and flexibility are transmitted from parent to child through the home environment. The sample consisted of 17 four-year-old children who were enrolled in a laboratory school. It also included 34 natural parents of these children. The children and their parents were asked to place pictures of animals in order which consisted of a cat, almost cat, almost dog, and dog. The pictures that were used for the parents were similar but more complex. Results of the study suggested that a child's rigidity-flexibility pattern is positively related to this variable in his parents. A significant relationship was found between the child's rigidity-flexibility pattern and both parents' flexibility-rigidity patterns.

Nakamura (1959) conducted a study involving the relationship between children's expressions of hostility and methods of discipline exercised by dominant overprotective parents. His sample consisted of 78 women in an introductory course in psychology. Measures were obtained in the areas of (a) method of discipline exercised by parents, (b) parents' dominant overprotective or
nonoverprotective techniques of child-rearing, and (c) children's criticism of people other than their parents. Results indicated that subjects whose parents used positive types of discipline had a more favorable attitude toward their parents than subjects disciplined by negative methods. Those subjects who were overprotected and positively disciplined displaced more criticism to other persons than those subjects who were not overprotected and positively disciplined.

Gender of the Child and Morality

Burton, Allinsmith, and Macoby (1966) studied morality in young children relative to the gender of the child. Their proposed identification theory is that girls relate to their mother more than boys will relate to their father because their mother is the one who fulfills their needs in the early years and is the nurturant figure. Later, the mother's role fades for the boys and the father begins to take over as the figure for identification. Therefore, in their study, the prediction was that the boys would respond better to the male experimenters and the girls would respond better to the female experimenters. The population consisted of 112 four-year-old children from two nursery schools. The temptation to resistance of the children was measured by Grinder's Bean Bag Game. After explaining the rules of the game, the children were shown how to lock the door in order that they would not be disturbed. The
children proceeded to play the game as they wished by either cheating or playing by the rules. The children were given five bean bags and were told to toss them to the lights on the panel. The experimenter was behind the two-way mirror and turned on the lights by remote control. The children thought that they were turning the lights on. However, the children were not able to see whether or not they hit the trip string which allowed the experimenter to be in control. Results showed that children conformed more to the proper rules when an adult of the opposite sex explained the rules of the game. Burton (1966) attributes these results to the desire to please a cross sex adult.

Gray and Mumbauer (1969) conducted a study involving the resistance to temptation in young Black children in relation to sex of the subject, sex of the experimenter, and father absence or presence. The instrument used was Grinder's Bean Bag Game. The researchers' hypotheses were that (1) girls would be more resistant to temptation than boys; (2) girls would not act differently when their father was home vs. when he was not at home; and (3) boys with their father at home would be more resistant than the boys when their father was not at home. The results of this study did not support the hypotheses. The findings were that boys whose fathers were home resisted temptation more with an opposite sex rule giver and boys and girls whose
fathers were not at home resisted temptation more when a male gave the rules of the game.

Hall (1980) conducted a study at the University of Colorado with 33 boys and 31 girls. Kohlberg's research indicated that there was little importance placed on individual differences in the development of moral judgment and reasoning. Hall decided to assess the possible differences between sex and individual differences in early moral reasoning. Krahn's adaptation of Kohlberg's moral dilemmas was used to measure the subject's moral thought. Results indicated that girl's maternal inductive discipline was related to concern for others. For boys, the number of years in daycare, maternal affection, vocabulary ability, and role taking ability were all related to concern for others.

Allen (1982) conducted a study at Purdue University that focused on the moral reasoning of preschool children. She was particularly interested in the concept of intent and consequence when confronted with moral decision-making. She recorded observations of boys and girls in positive and negative interactions with their peers. The instrument that was used was a measure of moral reasoning that was designed as a test to measure young children's ability to differentiate between intent and consequence when making moral judgments. There were no significant differences in the moral reasoning scores between boys and girls and
between the children of different ages. However, there was a relationship between the moral reasoning scores and the amount of time spent in positive interaction with their peers. There was no relationship between the moral reasoning scores and the amount of time spent in negative interaction with their peers.

Previous research indicated that girls are more resistant to temptation than boys. Artmann (1983) conducted a study examining the relationship between the resistance to temptation in five-year-old children and regularity of church attendance of mothers and Sunday school attendance of children, single parent versus traditional family structure, parental attitudes, and sex of the child. However, Artmann found no significant difference between boys and girls and their resistance to temptation. Because the findings are inconsistent, there is reason for further research in this area. Artmann recommended that further research be implemented in a secular kindergarten. Artmann's research was conducted in a church-related school and the findings suggested that the frequency of Sunday school attendance had little or no effect on the level of resistance to temptation of five-year-old children. There was little relationship between attitudes of mothers toward child-rearing and the level of resistance to temptation of their children.
Employment Status of the Mother

Clark (1975) studied maternal employment and the influence it had on the behaviors of children. Results suggested that maternal employment by itself had little effect on the behavior of children. However, it was determined that the following variables did have an effect on the behavior of children: mother's reason for working, family's acceptance of mother's employment, quality of substitute childcare, family's social and emotional health, and economic conditions.

Harrell and Ridley (1975) interviewed 89 families regarding maternal job satisfaction, mother-child interaction, and childcare. It was found that satisfaction with childcare was positively related to maternal work satisfaction. There was little relationship between job satisfaction and the quality of mother-child interaction.

Juneja (1979) conducted a comparative study of working and non-working mothers with regard to practices and problems of child-rearing. The sample consisted of 50 working and non-working mothers. The working mothers terminated breast feeding earlier than non-working mothers and had a greater concern regarding their children's diet. Working mothers had a stricter method of teaching toilet training than non-working mothers. The children of working mothers were more independent and had more opportunity for socialization than children of non-working mothers.
Farel (1980) conducted a study involving the effects of maternal employment and sociodemographic status on school adjustment and competence. The sample consisted of 35 kindergarten children of working and non-working mothers. Results indicated that no significant differences were found on measures of school achievement and competence as measured by the Weschler Preschool and Primary Scale of Intelligence, between kindergarten children of working mothers and non-working mothers when controlling for sociodemographic variables. However, children whose mothers did not work performed better on the outcome measures than children whose mothers worked.

Socio-Economic Status

Dembroski (1973) studied the devaluation of forbidden toys among lower socio-economic children as related to the severity of threat. The cognitive dissonance theory is that children place less value on a toy when only mildly threatened not to play with it but place more emphasis on it when severely threatened. This study found the opposite to be true when working with the lower socio-economic children. These children found the toy to be less attractive when a harsh threat was used. Dembroski researched further to find that when a toy is associated with the threat of money and with the loss of approval, the children responded more to the loss of money.
Silva and Fergusson (1976) conducted a study involving socio-economic status, maternal characteristics, and intelligence in pre-school children. The sample consisted of 221 four-year-olds from New Zealand. A correlation matrix revealed that there was a positive correlation between socio-economic status, authoritarian control attitudes and the child's score on the Stanford Binet Intelligence Scale. Findings suggest that the children from a lower socio-economic status had mothers who were higher in authoritarian-control than children from a higher socio-economic status. Children from a high socio-economic status scored higher on the Stanford Binet Intelligence Scale.

Summary

In assessing the effects of parental attitudes toward child-rearing, moral stability, and trust, family consistency plays an important role. The more severe discipline techniques are associated with guilt and a lack of democracy. Amoral children have a tendency to have inconsistent parents who are lacking in trust and either practice severe discipline or have a laissez-faire approach. A quotation from Peck and Havinghurst seems to sum it well. "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" (Peck & Havinghurst, 1960, p. 177).
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PROCEDURES FOR THE COLLECTION OF DATA

To study one aspect of morality of three-, four-, and five-year-old children and the attitudes of their mothers/caregivers toward child-rearing, six hypotheses were advanced. Six hypotheses were also advanced to investigate the possible influences of gender of the child, employment status of mothers, and socio-economic level of the families upon measures of child morality.

Sample

Subjects for the study were from the three-, four-, and five-year-old population of two preschools. Those children were included in the sample whose mothers completed both the Parent Attitude Research Instrument and the Parent Information Instrument. These instruments were sent to a total of 89 mothers.

Center 1 was a university-operated nursery school consisting of 59 three-, four-, and five-year-old children. This center provided two half-day sessions. Parents were provided the option of having their children attend either half-day sessions or full-day sessions. Since tuition for one semester was $350.00 for the half-day program, $700.00 for the full-day program, and $800.00 for the
full-day program including supervision for home-provided lunch and since parents of the majority of children were pre-professional/professional degreed people, it was determined that these parents were of upper socio-economic status.

Center 2 was specifically designed to provide services for low income families. This center was funded by the United Way and parent fees on an ability-to-pay basis. The school had a total population of 30 three-, four-, and five-year-old children and this center operated as a full day program. In order for the children to attend, their families' income was at or below the poverty level. In order to qualify without paying fees, a family of two could not have an income above $764.00 per month; a family of three, $959.00 per month a family of four, $1154.00 per month; a family of five, $1349.00 per month; and a family of six, $1544.00 per month. Fees for a family with more than six members, would increase $195.00 for each additional member. Table 1 describes the child sample used in the study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center 1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center 2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 describes the parent sample.

Instrumentation

Three instruments were used to collect data for this study: (1) the Parent Attitude Research Instrument (PARI) which was designed to measure the attitudes of mothers toward parenting (see Appendix A), (2) Grinder's Bean Bag Instrument which was designed to measure one aspect of morality (see Appendix B), and the (3) Parent Information Instrument which provided information on mothers' employment outside the home, the family status, and the mothers' age group (see Appendix C).

Parent Attitude Research Instrument

Schaefer and Bell (1958) developed the Parental Attitude Research Instrument (see Appendix A). Because of a lack of appropriate measurements, Schaefer and Bell
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Mother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Homemaker</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Parents Household Present</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center 1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center 2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
indicated the need for the development of measures of parental attitudes. Schaefer and Bell chose 32 concepts from research on parent-child relationships. They developed these concepts into a questionnaire of 115 items forming the Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI). With this instrument, the parent was asked to respond to each item on a 4-point Likert scale. The questionnaire consisted of 23 five-item sub-scales. Factor analysis of this instrument resulted in three primary factors which are authority-control, hostility-rejection, and democratic attitudes. Schaefer and Bell employed the Kuder-Richardson Formula 20 for their scales in Trial 1 and Trial 2 of the forms. Internal consistency was tested by administering the forms to 100 student nurses. In Trial 1 and Trial 2, the internal reliability coefficients were .80 which suggests PARI is a reasonably reliable way to measure maternal child-rearing attitudes.

PARI is scored as follows. The sums of the rows were calculated and then recorded on the data sheet. (See Appendix D for the score sheet.) The scores were further divided into three categories: Authoritarian-Control, Hostility-Rejection, and Democratic-Attitude. The following sub-headings were placed under the three categories (Zuckerman et al., 1958).
1. HOSTILITY-REJECTION
   Marital Conflict
   Strictness
   Irritability
   Rejection of Homemaking Role

2. AUTHORITARIAN-CONTROL
   Fostering Dependency
   Seclusion of Mother
   Breaking the Will
   Martyrdom
   Fear of Harming the Baby
   Excluding Outside Influences
   Deification
   Suppression of Aggression
   Approval of Activity
   Avoidance of Communication
   Inconsiderateness of Husband
   Suppression of Sexuality
   Ascendancy of the Mother
   Intrusiveness
   Acceleration of Development
   Dependency of the Mother

3. DEMOCRATIC-ATTITUDE
   Encouraging Verbalization
   Equalitarianism
   Comradeship and Sharing
The sums of the rows were calculated and placed on the data sheet.

**Grinder's Bean Bag Instrument**

Grinder's bean bag instrument consisted of a panel of 5 multi-colored lights with a trip string located behind the panel (see Appendix B). Lights were operated by remote control by the researcher who was in an observation booth and could not be seen by the children. The children believed that they were causing the lights to turn on by tossing the bean bags and scoring. However, the researcher was actually controlling when the lights went on from behind the panel. This provision served as a control for individual differences in skill among the children. Each child was taken to the experimental room individually and the rules of the game were explained to the child. If the child could turn on three lights, he would win a prize. Each child was asked to repeat the rules in his own words to be sure that the rules were understood. To keep the motivation level high, the child was shown the box of prizes before the game began and was asked to choose a prize. The prize was then displayed in the room so that the child could see it. A standardized script (see Appendix E) was used when explaining the rules to the child so that there was no deviation in explanation of the rules. After the child had been told the rules of the game, a practice session took place to assure that the rules were understood. Following
the practice session, the researcher said that she had to leave the room to make a phone call and told the child to play the game according to the rules. During the next three minutes, the child's behavior was recorded from behind the observation booth. The child had two basic choices: (1) he could toss the bean bag to turn on a light to make a score or (2) he could hit the trip string where the bean bag should have landed to turn on the light to make a score.

The Grinder's Bean Bag Instrument was scored on a 7-point scale determined by the number of bean bags thrown correctly before cheating (see Appendix F). The lowest score a child could receive was a "1" which meant that the child deviated from the rules before any bean bags were thrown. Scores "2" through "6" were given when one was added to the number of bean bags thrown before deviating from the rules. The score of "7" was given when the subject played the game entirely by the rules with no deviation.

Burton, Allinsmith, and Maccoby (1966) conducted a study involving the resistance to temptation in relation to the sex of the child, sex of the experimenter, and withdrawal of attention employing the Grinder's Bean Bag game as their instrument. A retest reliability of .95 (N = 20) was found in this study.

Parent Information Instrument

The Parent Information Instrument informed the researcher of the mothers' employment status outside the
home, the family status, and the mothers' age group (see Appendix E). Under the category of family status, some mothers at the childcare center checked the line that said that the mother alone heads the family. They further explained that their boyfriends lived with them and shared responsibilities. For reasons of consistency, the researcher tabulated their results as mother alone heads the household when this occurred.

Data Collection

The researcher contacted directors who were agreeable to have the research conducted at their centers (see Appendix G and H). The Parent Attitude Research Instrument and the Parent Information Instrument were given to the mothers with a permission slip and a cover letter explaining the purpose of the study (see Appendix I and J). All instruments were returned to the researcher within seven days. Collection of the data was completed the week of June 16 to 20, 1986. In addition, the researcher made herself available at the entrance of each center during that period to answer any questions.

The Parent Attitude Research Instrument and Parent Information Instrument were distributed to 59 mothers at the nursery school and 30 mothers at the childcare center. Thirty questionnaires and information sheets were returned from the Nursery School which resulted in a return rate of 51%. Twenty-two questionnaires and information sheets were
returned from the childcare center which resulted in a return rate of 73%. The total percentage of return was 58%. Data were based on only those children whose mothers returned the instruments.

Procedures for the Analysis of Data

The children were tested on the 7-point scale of Grinder's Bean Bag Game. A raw score was calculated for each child. Raw scores were also calculated for each mother from the Parent Attitude Research Instrument. These scores were used in evaluating the hypotheses.

The analysis of hypotheses 1 through 3 which concerned the resistance to temptation was conducted using $t$ tests. The analysis of data concerning hypotheses 4 through 9 dealing with attitudes of mothers toward child-rearing and socio-economic level and employment status was conducted using $t$ tests. The analysis of hypotheses 10 through 12 which concerned relationships of Grinder's score and PARI was conducted using a Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient.


CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

Chapter IV presents findings related to 12 hypotheses advanced in Chapter I. Findings are presented in the following order: (1) the relationship between resistance to temptation in three-, four-, and five-year-old children and parental attitudes toward child-rearing, (2) the resistance to temptation in three-, four-, and five-year-old children and the gender of the children, (3) the resistance to temptation in three-, four-, and five-year-old children and the employment status of mothers, and (4) the resistance to temptation in three-, four-, and five-year-old children and the socio-economic status of the families.

Results

The analysis of hypotheses 1 through 9 was conducted using t-tests. The analysis of hypotheses 10 through 12 was conducted using a Pearson Product Moment Correlation.

Resistance to Temptation

Hypothesis 1: To test the hypothesis that children of lower socio-economic status have less resistance to temptation than children of upper socio-economic status, a t-test was employed. Table 3 presents related findings.
TABLE 3

RESULTS OF t TEST BETWEEN MEAN MORALITY SCORES OF CHILDREN FROM LOWER AND UPPER SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower SES</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05 • p-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper middle SES</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>-0.84</td>
<td>Retain Ho</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The obtained t is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. This suggests that there is no significant difference between the resistance to temptation scores of children from lower and upper socio-economic status and their resistance to temptation.

Hypothesis 2: To test the hypothesis that females show a higher level of resistance to temptation than males, a t-test was employed. Table 4 presents related findings.

TABLE 4

RESULTS OF t TEST BETWEEN MEANS OF MORALITY SCORES OF MALES AND FEMALES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>Retain Ho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>Retain Ho</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The obtained $t$ is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. This suggests that there is no difference between the resistance to temptation scores of females and males.

**Hypothesis 3**: To test the hypothesis that children whose mothers are full-time homemakers have significantly higher levels of resistance to temptation than children whose mothers work outside the home, a $t$ test was employed. Table 5 presents related findings.

**TABLE 5**

RESULTS OF $t$ TEST BETWEEN MEANS OF MORALITY SCORES OF CHILDREN WHOSE MOTHERS WORK OUTSIDE THE HOME AND CHILDREN WHOSE MOTHERS ARE FULL-TIME HOMEMAKERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>Decision $t_{.95}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working Mothers</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>Retain $H_0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Homemakers</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The obtained $t$ is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. This suggests that there is no difference between morality scores of children whose mothers were full-time homemakers and children whose mothers worked outside the home.
Attitudes of Mothers Toward Child-Rearing

Hypothesis 4: To test the hypothesis that mothers of a lower socio-economic level have significantly higher levels of Hostility-Rejection, as measured by the Parent Attitude Research Instrument, than mothers of an upper socio-economic level, a t test was employed. Table 6 presents related findings.

TABLE 6

RESULTS OF t TEST BETWEEN MEANS OF MOTHERS' HOSTILITY-REJECTION SCORES AND MOTHERS OF LOWER AND UPPER SOCIO-ECONOMIC LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower SES</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>58.64</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>Retain Ho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper middle SES</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>55.40</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The obtained t is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. This suggests that there are no differences between mothers of a lower socio-economic level and mothers of an upper socio-economic level and their Hostility-Rejection score.

Hypothesis 5: To test the hypothesis that mothers of a lower socio-economic level have significantly higher levels of Authoritarian-Control, as measured by the Parent Attitude Research Instrument, than mothers of an upper socio-economic
level, a t test was employed. Table 7 presents related findings.

**TABLE 7**

RESULTS OF t TEST BETWEEN MEANS OF MOTHERS' AUTHORITARIAN-CONTROL SCORES AND MOTHERS OF LOWER AND UPPER SOCIO-ECONOMIC LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower SES</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>207.55</td>
<td>39.58</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>Reject Ho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper middle SES</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>160.53</td>
<td>32.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results indicated that there is a significant difference (p<0.01) between mothers of a lower/upper-socio-economic level and their Authoritarian-Control score. The mean for mothers in a lower socio-economic level is 207.54 and the standard deviation is 39.5. The mean for mothers in an upper socio-economic level is 160.53 and the standard deviation is 32.9. This suggests that mothers of a lower socio-economic level have higher levels of Authoritarian-Control than mothers of an upper socio-economic level.

**Hypothesis 6:** To test the hypothesis that mothers of a lower socio-economic level have significantly lower levels of Democratic Attitude, as measured by the Parent Attitude Research Instrument, than mothers of an upper socio-economic level, a t test was employed. Table 8 presents related findings.
TABLE 8

RESULTS OF t TEST BETWEEN MEANS OF MOTHERS' DEMOCRATIC-ATTITUDE SCORES AND MOTHERS OF LOWER AND UPPER SOCIO-ECONOMIC LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower SES</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50.91</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>Retain Ho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper middle SES</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>51.37</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The obtained t is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. This suggests that there is no difference in mothers of a lower socio-economic level and mothers of an upper socio-economic level and their Democratic-Attitude score.

Hypothesis 7: To test the hypothesis that mothers who work outside the home have significantly higher levels of Hostility-Rejection, as measured by the Parent Attitude Research Instrument, than mothers who are full-time homemakers, a t test was employed. Table 9 presents related findings.

The obtained t is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. This suggests there is no significant difference between mothers who worked outside the home and mothers who were full-time homemakers and their Hostility-Rejection score.
Table 9

Results of t Test Between Means of Mothers' Hostility-Rejection Scores and Mothers Who Work Outside the Home and Mothers Who Are Full-Time Homemakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>t .95</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working Mothers</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>57.00</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
<td>Retain Ho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Homemakers</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>56.40</td>
<td>9.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 8: To test the hypothesis that mothers who work outside the home have significantly higher levels of Authoritarian-Control, as measured by the Parent Attitude Research Instrument, than mothers who are full-time homemakers, a t test was employed. Table 10 presents related results.

Table 10

Results of t Test Between Means of Mothers' Authoritarian-Control Scores and Mothers Who Work Outside the Home and Mothers Who Are Full-Time Homemakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>t .95</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working Mothers</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>180.88</td>
<td>35.88</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Retain Ho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Homemakers</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>179.70</td>
<td>52.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
findings. The obtained $t$ is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. This suggests that there is no difference between mothers who work outside the home and mothers who are full-time homemakers in their Authoritarian-Control score.

Hypothesis 9: To test the hypothesis that mothers who work outside the home have significantly lower levels of Democratic-Attitude, as measured by the Parent Attitude Research Instrument, than mothers who are full-time homemakers, a $t$ test was employed. Table 11 presents related findings.

TABLE 11
RESULTS OF $t$ TEST BETWEEN MEANS OF MOTHERS' DEMOCRATIC-ATTITUDE SCORES AND MOTHERS WHO WORK OUTSIDE THE HOME AND MOTHERS WHO ARE FULL-TIME HOMEMAKERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working Mothers</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>51.22</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>Retain Ho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Homemakers</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>51.10</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The obtained $t$ is not significant at the the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. This suggests that there is no difference between mothers who worked outside the home and mothers who were full-time homemakers in their Democratic-Attitude score.
Relationship

Hypothesis 10: Children whose mothers show higher levels of Hostility-Rejection have children who are lower in resistance to temptation than those children whose mothers are lower in Hostility-Rejection. A Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was computed to determine the relationship between the morality scores of children and Hostility-Rejection scores of the mothers. Table 12 presents related findings.

TABLE 12

RESULTS OF PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENT ANALYSIS FOR PARENT HOSTILITY-REJECTION, AUTHORITARIAN-CONTROL, AND DEMOCRATIC-ATTITUDE SUBSCALES OF PARI AND MORALITY SCORES OF CHILDREN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARI</th>
<th>Hostility-Rejection</th>
<th>Authoritarian-Control</th>
<th>Democratic-Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grinder's</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(p < .05)

Results indicate a correlation of .18. This is not significant at the .05 level. This suggests that little relationship exists between morality scores of children and Hostility-Rejection scores of the mothers.

Hypothesis 11: Children whose mothers show higher levels of Authoritarian-Control have children who are lower in resistance to temptation than children whose mothers are
lower in Authoritarian-Control. A Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was employed to determine the relationship between morality scores of children whose mothers showed higher levels of Authoritarian-Control and mothers who were lower in Authoritarian-Control. Table 12 presents related findings. Results indicate a correlation of -.21 which is not significant at the .05 level. This suggests that little relationship exists between morality scores of children and mothers who showed higher and lower levels of Authoritarian-Control.

**Hypothesis 12:** Children whose mothers show higher levels of Democratic-Attitude have children who are higher in resistance to temptation than children whose mothers are lower in Democratic-Attitude. A Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was employed to determine the relationship between morality scores of children whose mothers showed higher levels of Democratic-Attitude and those mothers who were lower in Democratic-Attitude. Table 12 presents related findings. Results suggest a correlation of .33 which is significant at the .05 level. This suggests that a moderate relationship exists between children whose mothers who show higher levels of Democratic-Attitude and children who are higher in resistance to temptation.
Summary

The analysis of hypotheses 1 through 9 was conducted using $t$ tests. No significant differences were found in hypotheses 1 through 4. However in hypothesis 5, a significant difference was found suggesting that mothers of a lower socio-economic level did show significantly higher levels of Authoritarian-Control than mothers of an upper socio-economic status. No significant differences were found in hypotheses 6 through 9. The analysis of hypotheses 10 through 12 was conducted using a Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient. No significant relationship was found in hypotheses 10 and 11. However in hypothesis 12, a significant moderate relationship was found suggesting that children whose mothers showed higher levels of Democratic-Attitude had children who were higher in resistance to temptation than children whose parents were lower in Democratic-Attitude.
SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION,
AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study examined the relationship between the resistance to temptation of three-, four-, and five-year-old children and parental attitudes toward child-rearing. Other variables explored were gender of the children, employment status of the mothers, and socio-economic status of the families.

Subjects from the study were from the three-, four-, and five-year-old population of two preschools. Those children were included in the sample whose mothers completed both the Parent Attitude Research Instrument and the Parent Information Instrument. These instruments were sent to a total of 89 mothers, and 52 mothers responded and participated in the study.

Three instruments were used to collect data for this study: (1) the Parent Attitude Research Instrument which was designed to measure the attitudes of mothers toward parenting, (2) Grinder's Bean Bag Instrument which was designed to measure one aspect of morality, and the (3) Parent Information Instrument which provided information on
the mothers' employment outside the home, family status, and the mother's age group.

The children were tested on the 7-point scale of Grinder's Bean Bag Instrument. A raw score was calculated for each child. Raw scores were also calculated for each mother from the Parent Attitude Research Instrument. These scores were used in evaluating the 12 hypotheses advanced.

Findings

The following findings are based on the data in this study.

Resistance to Temptation

1. The level of socio-economic status had no major effect on the level of resistance to temptation in three-, four-, and five-year-old children.

2. Gender of the child had no major effect on the level of resistance to temptation in three-, four-, and five-year-old children.

3. The employment status of the mother had no major effect on the level of resistance to temptation in three-, four-, and five-year-old children.

Attitudes of Mothers Toward Child-Rearing

4. The level of socio-economic status had no major effect on the level of Hostility-Rejection of the mother.

5. The level of socio-economic status had a moderate effect on the level of Authoritarian-Control of the mother.
6. The level of socio-economic status had no major effect on the level of Democratic-Attitude of the mother.

7. The employment status of the mother had no major effect on the level of Hostility-Rejection.

8. The employment status of the mother had no major effect on the level of Authoritarian-Control.

9. The employment status of the mother had no major effect on the level of Democratic-Attitude.

Relationships

10. The level of Hostility-Rejection of the mother had no major relationship on the child's level of resistance to temptation.

11. The level of Authoritarian-Control of the mother had no major relationship on the child's level of resistance to temptation.

12. The level of Democratic-Attitude of the mother had a moderate relationship on the child's level of resistance to temptation.

Conclusions

The following conclusions are based on the findings in this study.

Resistance to Temptation

1. Children of lower socio-economic status do not have less resistance to temptation than children of upper socio-economic status.
2. Females do not have a higher level of resistance to temptation than males.

3. Children whose mothers are full-time homemakers do not have higher levels of resistance to temptation than children whose mothers work outside the home.

**Attitudes of Mothers Toward Child-Rearing**

4. Mothers of a lower socio-economic level do not have higher levels of Hostility-Rejection than mothers of an upper socio-economic level.

5. Mothers of a lower socio-economic level have higher levels of Authoritarian-Control than mothers of an upper socio-economic level.

6. Mothers of a lower socio-economic level do not have lower levels of Democratic-Attitude than mothers of an upper socio-economic level.

7. Mothers who work outside the home do not have higher levels of Hostility-Rejection than mothers who are full-time homemakers.

8. Mothers who work outside the home do not have significantly higher levels of Authoritarian-Control than mothers who are full-time homemakers.

9. Mothers who work outside the home do not have significantly lower levels of Democratic-Attitude than mothers who are full-time homemakers.
Relationships

10. Mothers who have higher levels of Hostility-Rejection do not have children who are lower in resistance to temptation than mothers who have lower levels of Hostility-Rejection.

11. Mothers who have higher levels of Authoritarian-Control do not have children who are lower in resistance to temptation than mothers who have lower levels of Authoritarian-Control.

12. Mothers who have higher levels of Democratic-Attitude have children who are higher in resistance to temptation than mothers who have lower levels of Democratic-Attitude.

Discussion

Before discussing results of this investigation in terms of the literature reviewed in Chapter 2, the researcher would like to posit one overall explanation which might account for the nonsignificant findings. Although the Parent Attitude Research Instrument showed a great deal of promise in other studies reviewed, it may not have been as responsive with the unique population studied in this investigation.

Firstly, the researcher is not convinced that PARI accurately measured parental attitudes toward child-rearing. PARI consists of 115 questions which is a lengthy questionnaire. Previous researchers indicated that this
Instrument took about 30 minutes to complete. Although times were not computed in this study, comments from several parents suggested that subjects may have spent as much as 2 hours completing the instrument.

In addition to possible fatigue considerations, children were required to have PARI instruments returned by their mother prior to playing the Grinder's Game. The game was highly motivational. Perhaps reminders from children may have urged parents to randomly complete the instrument just so their children could play the game.

As also discussed previously, the reliability for PARI was conducted with 100 student nurses. This was a captive audience. The researcher worked with a population which may not have been as captive. PARI may have been frustrating to complete for those mothers with a lower educational level.

Hypotheses

The hypothesis that children of lower socio-economic status have less resistance to temptation than children of upper socio-economic status was not found in this study. Perhaps socio-economic status is not related to morality in young children. The quality of time spent with children, the amount of guidance given, and provision of a nurturant environment may play a more important role in raising moral children. Whether a family is financially secure or struggling to make ends meet may have little effect on providing an environment to raise moral children.
The hypothesis that females show a higher level of resistance to temptation than males was not consistent with the literature. Research reviewed in Chapter 2 indicated that females were more resistant to temptation than males. This was not, however, found in this study. Perhaps it is due to the advent of the women's liberation movement in that women are more independent, have joined the working force, and have more temptations available to them. There is little change for the males in the working force as their numbers have remained the same. Because there is a great increase of females in the working force, females have found more opportunities to seek new roles in today's society. In the process of opening new avenues, it naturally follows that more temptations would be available. According to the review, Piaget (Duska & Whelan, 1975) found that in children between the ages of 2 and 6, children imitate what they have seen. If mothers demonstrate less resistance to temptation, children may observe this behavior and may imitate less resistance to temptation.

The hypothesis that children whose mothers are full-time homemakers have higher levels of resistance to temptation than children whose mothers work outside the home was not supported in this study. Children whose mothers work may instruct their children more in the area of moral behavior to accommodate for not being with their child during the working hours. Perhaps the quantity of time
spent with children is less important than how that time is spent. Mothers who work may be more appreciative of the time that they are able to spend with their child and fill it with meaningful interaction more than mothers who are with their children all day.

The hypothesis that mothers of a lower socio-economic level have higher levels of Hostility-Rejection, as measured by the Parent Attitude Research Instrument, than mothers of upper socio-economic level was not found in the study. Perhaps it makes little difference whether a mother is struggling financially or is in a comfortable financial position as to the level of hostility shown to her husband and children. A mother may show rejection of the maternal role regardless of her financial situation. The level of Hostility-Rejection may be due to other reasons such as marital discourse, pressures at work, or general discontentment with her position in life.

The hypothesis that mothers of a lower socio-economic level have higher levels of Authoritarian-Control, as measured by the Parent Attitude Research Instrument, than mothers of upper socio-economic level was supported in this study. Mothers from a lower socio-economic level have financial concerns that may restrict them in what they are able to do and what experiences they are able to provide for their children. In turn, this may cause them to be more restrictive with their children. Perhaps it is less
disappointing for a child to be told not to do something rather than find out on his own that he is not able to do it even if he wanted to do so. For this reason, mothers of a lower socio-economic level may be more restrictive with their children than mothers from an upper socio-economic level who have many more opportunities and experiences open to themselves and their children. Another reason may be that a mother from a lower socio-economic level may find it necessary to be more restrictive living in an area which is more vulnerable to crime than a mother who lives in a well-lighted upper class neighborhood.

The hypothesis that mothers of a lower socio-economic level have lower levels of Democratic Attitude, as measured by the Parent Attitude Research Instrument, than mothers of upper socio-economic level was not found in the study. Perhaps socio-economic level has no effect on whether a mother encourages verbalization, equalitarianism, or comradeship. Whether a mother is wealthy or poor may be irrelevant to providing a nurturant environment for her child. Mothers from both backgrounds may be equally capable of encouraging positive behavior in their children.

The hypothesis that mothers who have higher levels of Democratic-Attitude have children who are higher in resistance to temptation than mothers who have lower levels of Democratic-Attitude was found in the study. Mothers who encourage verbalization with their children may have better
communication with them. In knowing how their children feel, a mother may be able to detect areas of weakness and instruct them in those areas. A mother who encourages comradeship and sharing may have a child who has less of a need to break the rules than a child who may not have as nurturant of a home environment.

Recommendations

The following recommendations for further study are based upon the data which was collected in this study.

1. It is recommended that this study be replicated using a different instrument other than the Parent Attitude Research Instrument. The instrument was composed of 115 questions which may have been too long for the parents to complete. An oral interview may be more effective for reasons stated in the section above.

2. Since the data are inconsistent from the literature reviewed and the findings of this study, it is recommended that further research be done concerning sex differences and children's resistance to temptation.

3. It is recommended that this study be replicated using older groups of children such as six-, seven-, and eight-year-olds.

4. It is recommended that this study be replicated using parental attitudes of both parents rather than focusing singularly on the mother. This may be increasingly appropriate as males assume more childcare responsibilities.
5. It is recommended that case studies be conducted on those children with extreme scores on Grinder's Bean Bag Game in order to conduct a thorough investigation of parental attitudes toward child-rearing.
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:

A A A A
strongly mildly mildly strongly
agree agree disagree disagree

Indicate your opinion by drawing a circle around the "A" if you strongly agree, around the "a" if you mildly agree, around the "d" 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.

Disa-
A a d D

Agree
gree

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 must 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.
33. 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. A wise 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 start.

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. A a d D
65. A mother has to do the planning because she is the one who knows what's going on in the home. A a d D
66. An alert parent should try to learn all her child's thoughts. A a d D
67. Parents who are interested in hearing about their children's parties, dates and fun help them grow up right. A a d D
68. The earlier a child is weaned from its emotional ties to its parents the better it will handle its own problems. A a d D
69. A wise woman will do anything to avoid being by herself before and after a new baby. A a d D
70. A child's ideas should be seriously considered in making family decisions. A a d D
71. Parents should know better than to allow their children to be exposed to difficult situations. A a d D
72. Too many women forget that a mother's place is in the home. A a d D
73. Children need some of the natural meanness taken out of them. A a d D
74. Children should be more considerate of their mothers since their mothers suffer so much for them. A a d D
75. Most mothers are fearful that they may hurt their babies in handling them. A a d D
76. There are some things which just can't be settled by a mild discussion. A a d D
77. Most children should have more discipline than they get. A a d D
78. Raising children is a nerve-wracking job. A a d D
79. The child should not question the thinking of his parents. A a d D
80. Parents deserve the highest esteem and regard of their children. A a d D
81. Children should not be encouraged to box or wrestle because it often leads to trouble or injury. A a d D
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. A a d D
83. As much as is reasonable a parent should try to treat a child as an equal. A a d D
84. A child who is "on the go" all the time will most likely be happy. A a d D
85. If a child has upset feelings it is best to leave him alone and not make it look serious. A a d D
86. If mothers could get their wishes they would most often ask that their husband be more understanding. A a d D
87. Sex is one of the greatest problems to be contended with in children. A a d D
88. The whole family does fine if the mother puts her shoulders on the wheel and takes charge of things. A a d D
89. A mother has a right to know everything going on in her child's life because her child is part of her. A a d D
90. If parents would have fun with their children, the children would be more apt to take their advice.
91. A mother should make an effort to get her child toilet trained at the earliest possible time.
92. Most women need more time than they are given to rest up in the home after going through childbirth.
93. When a child is in trouble he ought to know he won't be punished for talking about it with his parents.
94. Children should be kept away from all hard jobs which might be discouraging.
95. A good mother will find enough social life within the family.
96. It is sometimes necessary for the parents to break the child's will.
97. Mothers sacrifice almost all their own fun for their children.
98. A mother's greatest fear is that in a forgetful moment she might let something bad happen to the baby.
99. It's natural to have quarrels when two people who both have minds of their own get married.
100. Children are actually happier under strict training.
101. It's natural for a mother to "blow her top" when children are selfish and demanding.
102. There is nothing worse than letting a child hear criticism of his mother.
103. Loyalty to parents comes before anything else.
104. Most parents prefer a quiet child to a "scrappy" one.
105. A young mother feels "held down" because there are lots of things she wants to do while she is young.
106. 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.
107. The sooner a child learns that a wasted minute is lost forever the better off he will be.
108. The trouble with giving attention to children's problems is they usually just make up a lot of stories to keep you interested.
109. Few men realize that a mother needs some fun in life too.
110. There is usually something wrong with a child who asks a lot of questions about sex.
111. A married woman knows that she will have to take the lead in family matters.
112. It is a mother's duty to make sure she knows her child's innermost thoughts.
113. When you do things together, children feel close to you and can talk easier.
114. A child should be weaned away from the bottle or breast as soon as possible.
115. Taking care of a small baby is something that no woman should be expected to do all by herself.
APPENDIX B

SCHEMATIC OF BEAN BAG GAME AND OBSERVATION
APPENDIX C

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

4. Mother's age group
   ____ Below 18 years
   ____ 18-24 years
   ____ 25-30 years
   ____ 31-35 years
   ____ 36-45 years
   ____ Over 45 years
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</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 the 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 the 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 #23, 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.
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. (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 beanbag hits the string, I'm going to touch the string with the 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 bean 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 am gone. I am going to close this door behind me. I'll knock before I come in. (Goes out door.) 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>1 Deviated Before Any Bags Thrown</th>
<th>2 Deviated After 1st Bag</th>
<th>3 Deviated After 2nd Bag</th>
<th>4 Deviated After 3rd Bag</th>
<th>5 Deviated After 4th Bag</th>
<th>6 Deviated After 5th Bag</th>
<th>7 Did Not Deviate</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>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>
<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>
<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>
<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>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Code: TL--stepped across throw line; RB--retrieved bag to throw again; H--hit trip string with hand.
Dear Mrs. Carter,

I enjoyed visiting with you regarding moral issues and young children. I find it appropriate to study moral issues with the children at this Nursery School. I give my permission for you to collect your data at North Texas State Nursery School.

Carolyn G. Nygren, Director
NTSU Nursery School
APPENDIX H

April 29, 1986

Dear Mrs. Carter,

I enjoyed visiting with you regarding moral issues and young children. I find it appropriate to study moral issues with the children at this center. I give my permission for you to collect your data at Fred Moore Childcare Center.

Nancy B. Brown, Director
Fred Moore Childcare Center
APPENDIX I

COVER LETTER TO PARENTS

Dear ____________,

I am currently studying what mothers think about how children should be raised. No one is more qualified than you as a mother to share what you think about this issue! I have enclosed a list of ideas which other mothers have given to save time. Please complete the attached questionnaire. There is no wrong answer.

I shall also be working with the children in class by observing their reactions to a game. In order for your child to play this game, you must complete the Parental Permission Slip. Please return the questionnaire and the permission slip in the self-addressed, stamped envelope.

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

Respectfully yours,

Catherine S. Carter
Early Childhood Education

Approved: James L. Hoot
James L. Hoot, Ph.D.
Head, Early Childhood Program
APPENDIX J

PARENT PERMISSION SLIP

I, ________________________, give my permission for my child, ________________________, to take part in the research being conducted by Catherine S. Carter under the auspices of 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 the following if interested:

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