

379
N81d
No. 1203

CHILD REARING ATTITUDES AND PERCEIVED
BEHAVIOR PATTERNS OF NATURAL
PARENTS AND STEPPARENTS

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
North Texas State University in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

Judith Ann Keith, B.S., M.Ed.

Denton, Texas

August, 1977

Keith, Judith A., Child Rearing Attitudes and Perceived Behavior Patterns of Natural Parents and Stepparents. Doctor of Philosophy (Counseling and Student Services), August, 1977, 143 pp., 45 tables, bibliography, 45 titles.

The problem of this study is to investigate child rearing attitudes of stepparents and natural parents and differences in perceived parental behavior patterns within reconstituted and intact families.

Purposes of the study are to compare childrearing attitudes of natural parents in intact families, natural parents in reconstituted families, and stepparents and to discover whether the three groups differ in their ability to predict their children's or stepchildren's perceptions of parental behavior.

The subjects are fifty elementary school aged children and their parents from intact families, ninety-four stepchildren with their stepparents, and their natural parents. All subjects were volunteers who were contacted by letters sent out through suburban schools.

The Hereford Parent Attitude Survey (PAS) is used to measure parental attitudes in five areas of confidency, causation, acceptance, understanding, and trust. The Child's Report of Parental Behavior Inventory-Revised (CRPBI-R) is used to assess the child's perception of parental behavior

in three areas of acceptance, indirect psychological control, and overt control and to ascertain how the parent believes his child perceives that behavior.

Test data are parents' scores on each of five scales of the PAS, children's factor scores on the CRPBI-R, and parents' factor scores on the CRPBI-R. Demographic data used as variables include age of child at time of his entry into the stepfamily and length of time that the stepfamily lived together.

One-way analysis of variance design compares the differences among the three groups on each scale of the PAS. Two multiple linear regression models are used to find factors affecting the prediction of distortion of perceived parental behavior. Distortion, the dependent variable, is defined as the difference between child and parent factor scores on the CRPBI-R. Independent variables in the regression model applied to all three groups are kind of family, kind of parent, sex of parent, and sex of child. Independent variables in the regression model applied to stepparents only are sex of stepchild, sex of stepparent, length of time stepfamily has lived together, and age of child at time of his entry into the stepfamily.

Findings indicate significant differences between stepparents and natural parents from intact families with regard to parental attitudes as measured by the PAS. Stepparents

are more likely to be less accepting of normal childhood behavior, and more likely to avoid communication with the child. In addition, stepparents and stepchildren are more likely than natural parents and children to produce higher distortion on parental acceptance. Stepmothers are more likely than stepfathers to produce higher distortion on indirect parental control. Distortion is lower the longer stepparent and stepchild live together and the younger the child at the time he enters the stepfamily. Although these variables do contribute to the prediction of distortion, only one to five per cent of the variance is accounted for by all predictor variables. Therefore, it is concluded that either there are better predictor variables than those used here, or that most distortion should be accounted for by individual differences.

On the basis of these findings, further research is recommended to include other socioeconomic classes, more predictor variables, and wider age range of subjects. Investigation should also be made into whether stepparents' actual behavior is more or less accepting or controlling than that of natural parents.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	v
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	
Purposes of the Study	
Definition of Terms	
Hypotheses	
Background and Significance of the Study	
Basic Assumptions	
Limitations of the Study	
Treatment of the Data	
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	15
Parental Attitudes and Behavior Patterns	
Stepparent-Stepchild Relationships	
Summary	
III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES	37
Selection of the Subjects	
Description of the Instruments	
Examiners and Their Training Procedure	
Collecting the Data	
Treatment of the Data	
IV. ANALYSIS OF RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	53
Discussion	
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	94
Conclusions	
Recommendations	

	Page
APPENDIX	105
BIBLIOGRAPHY	140

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Means of Scores Obtained on <u>Confidence</u> Scale of the <u>Parent Attitude Survey</u> . . .	54
II. Analysis of Variance Data Obtained on <u>Confidence</u> Scale of <u>Parent Attitude Survey</u>	54
III. Means of Scores Obtained on <u>Causation</u> Scale of <u>Parent Attitude Survey</u>	55
IV. Analysis of Variance Data Obtained on <u>Causation</u> Scale of <u>Parent Attitude Survey</u>	55
V. Scheffe F Test for <u>Causation</u> Scale of <u>Parent Attitude Survey</u>	56
VI. Means of Scores Obtained on <u>Acceptance</u> Scale of <u>Parent Attitude Survey</u>	56
VII. Analysis of Variance Data Obtained on <u>Acceptance</u> Scale of <u>Parent Attitude Survey</u>	57
VIII. Scheffe F Test for <u>Acceptance</u> Scale of <u>Parent Attitude Survey</u>	57
IX. Means of Scores Obtained on <u>Understanding</u> Scale of <u>Parent Attitude Survey</u> . . .	58
X. Analysis of Variance Data Obtained on <u>Understanding</u> Scale of <u>Parent Attitude Survey</u>	58
XI. Scheffé F Test for <u>Understanding</u> Scale of <u>Parent Attitude Survey</u>	59
XII. Means of Scores Obtained on <u>Trust</u> Scale of <u>Parent Attitude Survey</u>	60

Table	Page
XIII. Analysis of Variance Data Obtained on <u>Trust Scale of Parent Attitude</u> <u>Survey</u>	60
XIV. Regression Results for Full Model as Applied to the <u>Acceptance vs.</u> <u>Rejection Factor</u> --Three Groups Considered	61
XV. Comparison of Full Model with Restricted Model with Regard to <u>Acceptance vs.</u> <u>Rejection Factor</u>	62
XVI. Regression Results for Full Model as Applied to <u>Psychological Autonomy vs.</u> <u>Psychological Control Factor</u> --Three Groups Considered	63
XVII. Comparison of Full Model with Restricted Model with Regard to <u>Psychological</u> <u>Autonomy vs. Psychological Control</u> <u>Factor</u>	63
XVIII. Regression Results for Full Model as applied to <u>Firm vs. Lax Control</u> <u>Factor</u> --Three Groups Considered	64
XIX. Comparison of Full Model with Restricted Model with Regard to <u>Firm vs. Lax</u> <u>Control Factor</u>	65
XX. Comparison of Full Model with Restricted Model with Regard to <u>Acceptance vs.</u> <u>Rejection factor</u>	66
XXI. Correlation Matrix for Predictor Variables and Distortion of Per- ceived Parental Behavior on the Three <u>CRPBI-R</u> Factors	67
XXII. Comparison of Full Model with Restricted Model with Regard to <u>Psychological</u> <u>Autonomy vs. Psychological Control</u> <u>Factor</u>	68
XXIII. Comparison of Full Model with Restricted Model as Applied to <u>Firm vs. Lax</u> <u>Control Factor</u>	68

Table	Page
XXIV. Comparison of Full Model with Restricted Model with Regard to <u>Acceptance</u> vs. <u>Rejection</u> Factor--Three Groups	69
XXV. Regression Results for Full Model as Applied to <u>Acceptance</u> vs. <u>Rejection</u> Factor--Stepparents only	70
XXVI. Comparison of Full Model with Restricted Model with Regard to <u>Acceptance</u> vs. <u>Rejection</u> Factor--Stepparents only	71
XXVII. Comparison of Full Model with Restricted Model with Regard to <u>Psychological Autonomy</u> vs. <u>Psychological Control</u> Factor--Three Groups	72
XXVIII. Regression Results for Full Model as Applied to <u>Psychological Autonomy</u> vs. <u>Psychological Control</u> Factor--Step-parents only	73
XXIX. Comparison of Full Model with Restricted Model with Regard to <u>Psychological Autonomy</u> vs. <u>Psychological Control</u> Factor--Stepparents Only	73
XXX. Comparison of Full Model with Restricted Model with Regard to <u>Firm</u> vs. <u>Lax Control</u> Factor--Three Groups	74
XXXI. Regression Results for Full Model as Applied to <u>Firm</u> vs. <u>Lax Control</u> Factor--Stepparents Only	75
XXXII. Comparison of Full Model with Restricted Model with Regard to <u>Firm</u> vs. <u>Lax Control</u> Factor--Stepparents Only	75
XXXIII. Comparison of Full Model with Restricted Model with Regard to <u>Acceptance</u> vs. <u>Rejection</u> Factor--Three Groups	76
XXXIV. Comparison of Full Model with Restricted Model with Regard to <u>Acceptance</u> vs. <u>Rejection</u> Factor--Stepparents Only	77
XXXV. Comparison of Full Model with Restricted Model with Regard to <u>Psychological Autonomy</u> vs. <u>Psychological Control</u> Factor--Three Groups	78

Table	Page
XXXVI. Comparison of Full Model with Restricted Model with Regard to <u>Psychological Autonomy</u> vs. <u>Psychological Control</u> Factor--Stepparents Only	78
XXXVII. Correlation on Matrix for Predictor Variables and Distortion of Perceived Parental Behavior on the Three <u>CRPBI-R</u> Factors--Stepparents Only	79
XXXVIII. Comparison of Full Model with Restricted Model with Regard to <u>Firm</u> vs. <u>Lax Control</u> Factor--Three Groups	80
XXXIX. Comparison of Full Model with Restricted Model with Regard to <u>Firm</u> vs. <u>Lax Control</u> Factor--Stepparents Only	81
XL. Comparison of Full Model with Restricted Model with Regard to <u>Acceptance</u> vs. <u>Rejection</u> Factor--Stepparents Only	82
XLI. Comparison of Full Model with Restricted Model with Regard to <u>Psychological Autonomy</u> vs. <u>Psychological Control</u> Factor--Stepparents Only	83
XLII. Comparison of Full Model with Restricted Model with Regard to <u>Firm</u> vs. <u>Lax Control</u> Factor--Stepparents Only	84
XLIII. Comparison of Full Model with Restricted Model with Regard to <u>Acceptance</u> vs. <u>Rejection</u> Factor--Stepparents Only	85
XLIV. Comparison of Full Model with Restricted Model with Regard to <u>Psychological Autonomy</u> vs. <u>Psychological Control</u> Factor--Stepparents Only	85
XLV. Comparison of Full Model with Restricted Model with Regard to <u>Firm</u> vs. <u>Lax Control</u> Factor--Stepparents Only	86

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The increasing divorce and remarriage rate in the United States has made more likely an increasing number of people encountering the role of stepparent. At present it is estimated that there are more than fifteen million stepchildren under eighteen years of age now living in stepfamilies in this country alone (1). A great many assumptions concerning stepparents have been made by both lay persons and authorities, assumptions based primarily on folklore, present social cliches, clinical case studies, and Freudian personality theory (10, 2, 5, 7, and 11). Many of these assumptions are conflicting and confusing.

Compounding this problem are the stereotypes of the stepchild, stepmother, and stepfather which cast their shadows each day over hundreds of weddings at which the bride and/or groom are parents. At those same weddings their children become stepchildren, a word associated directly with deprivation, neglect, and mistreatment (11).

Due to the sheer numbers of people involved in remarriages in which there are stepchildren, childrearing attitudes, parental behavior patterns, and stepfamily relationships may be changing--or perhaps they were never very different from

those of the nonreconstituted family. We simply do not know. Rarely has such ignorance surrounded such an obviously current situation. An examination of the research literature reveals a dearth of systematic inquiries into attitudes, behavior patterns, and relationships between stepparents and stepchildren. Stepparents, therefore, have few nonpathological measuring sticks by which to evaluate their attitudes and behaviors and those of their children.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to investigate child rearing attitudes of both stepparents and natural parents and differences in perceived parental behavior patterns within reconstituted and nonreconstituted families.

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study were (1) to compare the child rearing attitudes of natural and stepparents, (2) to measure the child's perception of the parent's and stepparent's behavior, (3) to measure the parent's and stepparent's ability to predict the child's perception of that behavior, and (4) to compare the distortion in the perceptions of stepchildren and stepparents to the distortion present in families with natural parents.

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study the following definitions were formulated.

Parent attitude--the score a parent obtained on the Hereford Parent Attitude Survey.

Reconstituted families--families involving remarriage of one or more parents; also referred to as stepfamilies.

Nonreconstituted families--families in which both natural parents are present and no stepparent exists in the family.

Natural parents--biological parents.

Distortion of perceived parental behavior--the difference between the child's factor scores on the Child's Report of Parental Behavior Inventory-Revised (CRPBI-R) and the parent's and/or stepparent's prediction of child's factor scores on the Child's Report of Parental Behavior Inventory-Revised.

Hypotheses

To carry out the purposes of this study, the following hypotheses were tested.

1. There will be no significant differences in the child rearing attitudes of stepparents, natural parents in reconstituted families, and natural parents in nonreconstituted families as measured by the Hereford Parent Attitude Survey.

a. There will be no significant differences among the three groups with regard to the attitude of confidence concerning the parental role as measured by the Confidence scale of the Hereford Parent Attitude Survey.

b. There will be no significant differences among the three groups with regard to the attitude of causation of child behavior as measured by the Causation scale of the Hereford Parent Attitude Survey.

c. There will be no significant differences among the three groups with regard to the attitude of acceptance of childhood behavior as measured by the Acceptance scale of the Hereford Parent Attitude Survey.

d. There will be no significant differences among the three groups with regard to the attitude of understanding of the free expression of children as measured by the Understanding scale of the Hereford Parent Attitude Survey.

e. There will be no significant differences among the three groups with regard to the attitude of accepting and encouraging the individuality of the child as measured by the Trust scale of the Hereford Parent Attitude Survey.

2. The kind of family, whether intact family or reconstituted, will make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived parental behavior as measured by the CRPBI-R.

a. The kind of family will make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived parental acceptance or rejection as measured by the Acceptance vs. Rejection factor of the CRPBI-R.

b. The kind of family will make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived indirect parental control of the child as measured by the Psychological Autonomy vs. Psychological Control factor of the CRPBI-R.

c. The kind of family will make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived overt parental control as measured by the Firm Control vs. Lax Control factor of the CRPBI-R.

3. The kind of parent, whether stepparent or natural parent, will make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived parental behavior as measured by the CRPBI-R.

a. The kind of parent will make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived parental acceptance or rejection as measured by the Acceptance vs. Rejection factor of the CRPBI-R.

b. The kind of parent will make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived indirect parental control of the child as measured by the Psychological Autonomy vs. Psychological Control factor of the CRPBI-R.

c. The kind of parent will make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived overt parental control as measured by the Firm Control vs. Lax Control factor of the CRPBI-R.

4. The sex of the child or stepchild will make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived parental behavior as measured by the CRPBI-R.

a. The sex of the child or stepchild will make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived parental acceptance or rejection as measured by the Acceptance vs. Rejection factor of the CRPBI-R.

b. The sex of the child or stepchild will make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived indirect parental control of the child as measured by the Psychological Autonomy vs. Psychological Control factor of the CRPBI-R.

c. The sex of the child or stepchild will make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived overt parental control as measured by the Firm Control vs. Lax Control factor of the CRPBI-R.

5. The sex of the parent or stepparent will make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived parental behavior as measured by the CRPBI-R.

a. The sex of the parent or stepparent will make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived parental acceptance or rejection as measured by the Acceptance vs. Rejection factor of the CRPBI-R.

b. The sex of the parent or stepparent will make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived indirect parental control of the child as measured by the Psychological Autonomy vs. Psychological Control factor of the CRPBI-R.

c. The sex of the parent or stepparent will make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived overt parental control as measured by the Firm Control vs. Lax Control factor of the CRPBI-R.

6. The length of time that the reconstituted family has lived together will make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived parental behavior as measured by the CRPBI-R.

a. The length of time that the reconstituted family has lived together will make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived parental acceptance or rejection as measured by the Acceptance vs. Rejection factor of the CRPBI-R.

b. The length of time that the reconstituted family has lived together will make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived indirect parental control of the child as measured by the Psychological Autonomy vs. Psychological Control factor of the CRPBI-R.

c. The length of time that the reconstituted family has lived together will make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived overt parental control as measured by the Firm Control vs. Lax Control factor of the CRPBI-R.

7. The age of the child at the time of his entry into the stepfamily will make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived parental behavior as measured by the CRPBI-R.

a. The age of the child at the time of his entry into the stepfamily will make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived parental acceptance or rejection as measured by the Acceptance vs. Rejection factor of the CRPBI-R.

b. The age of the child at the time of his entry into the stepfamily will make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived indirect parental control of the child as measured by the Psychological Autonomy vs. Psychological Control factor of the CRPBI-R.

c. The age of the child at the time of his entry into the stepfamily will make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived overt parental control as measured by the Firm Control vs. Lax Control factor of the CRPBI-R.

Background and Significance of the Study

Both professional and popular interest in marriage, divorce, parenthood, and family relationships has been high in recent years, but there has been relatively little interest in the relationships in stepfamilies. Statistics reveal that the group of reconstituted families is large and that the number is increasing. Auerbach (1) cites an increase since 1970 of 2.6 million stepchildren under the age of eighteen living in stepfamilies. Most of the members of these stepfamilies have lived through considerably more emotional trauma than has the average nonreconstituted family, thereby possibly making them more vulnerable to difficulty in the areas of family relationships and communications. However, since there has been little actual research in the area of reconstituted families, especially with regard to attitudes and behavior patterns, clinicians can only hypothesize as to the nature of the relationships in these families. Fast and Cain (5) maintain that organizational disturbance in stepfamilies is inevitable, thereby causing family functioning to be disturbed. However, since their study was a clinical one, they admit that the results cannot be generalized to the millions of stepfamilies outside the clinic setting. Schulman (10) feels that recurring myths intrude upon the

stepfamily and make difficulty in family functioning highly probable. Again, all examples are clinical cases. The intimation is that the problems faced by the stepfamily outside the clinic setting are of the same type but less exaggerated.

A thorough search of the related literature showed that the most recent comprehensive analysis of reconstituted families outside the clinic setting was Bowerman and Irish's 1962 study (2) in which they found that stepparents were perceived by their stepchildren as unfairly favoring or disfavoring children in the family more often than natural parents, that the stepchildren more often expressed a preference for one parent or the other (either biological or stepparent) than children who live with both biological parents, that there was a more favorable adjustment by the stepchildren when the previous marriage had been broken by divorce, and that boys express fewer feelings of rejection by parents than girls. Bowerman and Irish also found that stepchildren of both sexes perceived that stepmothers unfairly favored or disfavored the children in the family more often than stepfathers. Since the mother/stepmother is usually the primary socializing agent, this last observation may be applicable not only to stepmothers but to biological mothers as well (11). Bowerman and Irish did not discuss this possibility. However, the results of the study

indicated that in general stepparents have difficulty in establishing stable patterns of interaction with their stepchildren, with stepparents perceived in a less favorable light than are natural parents.

In the fourteen years following the Bowerman and Irish study, there has been commentary published regarding counseling with stepfamilies, reasons for stepfamily problems, and suggestions for dealing with the attitudes and behavior purportedly causing these problems (4, 10, and 11). There has, however, been little research found which attempted to determine precisely the attitudes and behavior patterns of stepparents or stepchildren outside clinic situations since 1962. An important aspect of the present study is that it measures the child rearing attitudes of stepparents and the behavior of stepparents towards their stepchildren as perceived by those stepchildren, while also measuring the ability of the parents and stepparents to predict the children's perceptions.

Basic Assumptions

It was assumed that the subjects involved were representative of the general populations of parents/stepparents, children/stepchildren. It was further assumed that the subjects responded honestly to the instruments used to measure attitudes and perceived behavior.

Limitations of the Study

This study was limited to the population of third through sixth graders and their parents and stepparents who responded to the publicity concerning the study. The children were enrolled during the Spring, 1977, school term in suburban city schools in North Central and Central Texas. Appropriate caution should be utilized in assuming generalizations to samples drawn from populations different from the one used in the present study.

Treatment of the Data

A one-way Analysis of Variance design was used to test Hypothesis 1, to determine whether differences existed among the three groups, stepparents, natural parents in reconstituted families, and natural parents in nonreconstituted families, with regard to parental child rearing attitudes. If there were significant differences, the Scheffe multiple comparison test was used to find which groups were different on which specific scales of the Parent Attitude Survey.

Hypotheses 2 through 7 were tested using two multiple linear regression models, the dependent variable being the difference between the child factor scores on the CRPBI-R and the parent factor scores on the CRPBI-R. The independent variables were kind of family and parent, sex of parent, sex of child, age of child at the time of his entry into the stepfamily, and length of time that the reconstituted family had

lived together. An F ratio was calculated to show if a unique, significant contribution was made by any one of the independent variables to the prediction of the dependent variable.

The regression models were employed for each of three factor score differences: Acceptance vs. Rejection, Psychological Autonomy vs. Psychological Control, and Firm vs. Lax Control.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Auerbach, Stevanne, "Stepparents," Parents Magazine, LI(June, 1976), 57-61.
2. Bowerman, Charles E. and Donald Irish, "Some Relationships of Stepchildren to Their Parents," Marriage and Family Living, XXIV(May, 1962), 113-121.
3. Burger, Gary, James Armentrout, and Richard Rapfogel, "Estimating Factor Scores for Children's Reports of Parental Child Rearing Behaviors," Journal of Genetic Psychology, CXXIII(1973), 107-113.
4. Draughon, Margaret, "Stepmothers' Model of Identification in Relation to Mourning in the Child," Psychological Reports, XXXVI(1975), 183-189.
5. Fast, Irene and Albert Cain, "The Stepparent Role: Potential for Disturbances in Family Functioning," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, XXXVI(August, 1966), 485-491.
6. Ferguson, George, Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1971.
7. Heilpern, Edwin P., "Psychological Problems of Stepchildren," Psychoanalytic Review, XXX(January, 1943), 163-176.
8. Hereford, Carl F., Changing Parental Attitudes Through Group Discussion, Austin, Texas, University of Texas Press, 1963.
9. Schaeffer, Earl S., "Children's Reports of Parental Behavior: An Inventory," Child Development, XXXVI (June, 1965), 413-424.
10. Schulman, Gerda, "Myths That Intrude on the Adaptation of the Stepfamily," Social Casework, LIII(1972), 131-139.
11. Simon, Anne W., Stepchild in the Family: A View of Children in Remarriage, New York, Odyssey Press, 1964.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The review of the related literature is presented in the following parts: (1) parental attitudes and behavior patterns and (2) stepparent-stepchild relationships.

Parental Attitudes and Behavior Patterns

Parents' attitudes towards children are believed to be important factors in influencing various childrearing practices, including the socialization of children. It is widely assumed that valid measurement of certain attitudes might be a means by which some specific parent and child behaviors could be predicted. Therefore, there have been a number of studies conducted which have sought to determine the effects of parental attitudes upon children, the differences in parental attitudes among various classes and groups of parents and the differences in parental attitudes among the parents of various groups and kinds of children.

The results of a 1961 study by Gildea, Glidewell, and Kantor (15) indicated that children showing the lowest rate of behavior disturbance in school had mothers who saw their children's behavior as a result of many causes and who felt that they were one of those causes. Anxious, over-responsible mothers had children who showed the second lowest

rate of disturbance. Those mothers who denied any responsibility for, as well as impact upon, their children and could see one or more external influences on their children had those children who evidenced the highest disturbance rate.

The study further investigated social class differences in maternal attitudes and found that upper-middle class mothers most often felt confident of their child rearing methods, felt need for limited parental control, believed that they had influenced the outcome of any problems in the area of child rearing in their families, and felt much responsibility for the behavior of their children. Middle class mothers were reasonably confident of their methods, saw the child as being in need of moderate parental control, and felt that they were generally responsible for the behavior of their children. Lower class mothers were least confident of their child rearing methods, showed the least amount of responsibility for the behavior of their children, and saw their children as needing close parental control. However, those lower class mothers felt unable to influence the behavioral outcomes of their children.

Examining the relationship between perceived maternal child rearing experiences and projective responses to censure-control cues in male undergraduates, Heilbrun and Tiemeyer (17) discovered that subjects who perceived their mothers as less nurturant provided stronger emotional responses to censure-control cues and suggested subsequently

less socially effectual action than subjects who perceived their mothers as more nurturing.

Walsh (29) examined the association between parental attitudes of rejection and young children's behavior in a temptation situation. Rigidly controlled children who never yielded to the temptation of a forbidden toy when left alone with it tended to have rejecting mothers who avoided communication with the children, who felt that children had few rights of privacy, and who felt that children should act grown up and be obedient. Those children who displayed natural curiosity toward the forbidden toys or actually played with toys which they had been told not to touch had mothers who had accepting attitudes toward child behavior and communicated openly with their children. No significant relationships existed between the father's attitudes of rejection and the behavior of their children in a temptation situation, indicating that rejecting attitudes of fathers may not be a factor in instilling rigid inner controls in children.

In an investigation of perceived parental attitudes as determinants in developing a child's ego structure, Ausubel, Balthazar, Rosenthal, Blackman, Schpoont, and Welkowitz (2) found that children who perceived their parents as rejecting were rated less independent and less able to postpone immediate gratification than children who perceived their parents as accepting. Parental behaviors which were reflective of rejection were neglect, disavowal of responsibility,

criticism and humiliation, lack of patience, affection, and consideration of the child's needs and wishes, and physical separation from the child.

Becker (5) investigated the father's impact upon a child's development and found that if a father's conception of his ideal relationship with his child was loving, democratic, and emotionally mature, the child was rated by his mother as better adjusted, outgoing, and less demanding. Becker also found partial support for his hypothesis that a child's personality problems are related to paternal maladjustment and are independent of maternal behavior.

Other investigators have classified parental attitudes as authoritarian or permissive and have sought to correlate these attitudes with children's behavior and personality characteristics. For example, Beecher (6) concluded that children of both overly permissive and authoritarian parents fail to develop inner controls and as a result do not develop into realistic or autonomous adults.

Baragona's (3) study resulted in a negative correlation between parental authoritarian attitudes and parental acceptance of the child. Parents who differed the most (one authoritarian and the other non-authoritarian) tended to have children with the least degree of spontaneity, friendliness, belongingness, and same sex identification.

Moore (20) related parental child rearing attitudes and practices to the occurrence of dependency and autonomy

in children and found that the use of physical punishment by the mother was associated with dependency in boys but not in girls. Restrictiveness was found to be an important aspect of maternal behavior which contributed to dependency in girls. Availability and a lack of hostility in fathers combined with a low degree of demand on the child by the father was related to a high degree of autonomy in boys.

An examination of the relationship between child behavior and child rearing practices of parents led Baumrind (4) to conclude that preschool children manifesting self-reliance, self control, exploratory behavior, and contentment had parents who tended to be markedly more consistent, loving, secure in the handling of children, and more likely to accompany a directive with reason. These parents were more supportive and communicated more clearly with their children than parents of other children.

Armentrout (1) found that extremely stringent parental control was positively related to aggressiveness, destructiveness, and antisocial behavior in children. Parents who exercised stringent control over their children had children who were more likely to be aggressive and destructive when outside that direct control. Sex of the parent was also important since mothers of all children studied were more controlling and fathers were more accepting.

Clapp (11) also found that parents of children who had been judged competent, as opposed to dependent, were

significantly more permissive, less restrictive, warmer, and less hostile than those parents of dependent children. Divorce was more frequent among parents of competent children than among parents of dependent children.

In an investigation of disciplinary roles of mothers and fathers, Starr (28) obtained significant positive relationships between children's authoritarianism and strict parental discipline, the strongest relationship appearing between the child's authoritarian behavior and the discipline attitudes of the opposite sex parent.

Lang (19) found that control exercised entirely by the parent led children to experience responsibility for their behavior as external to themselves, developing an external locus of control. These children felt that reinforcements were not contingent upon their own behavior but were granted to them through the discretion of powerful others or were the result of chance, luck, or fate. Scheck, Emerick, and El-Assal (24) examined male adolescents' perceptions of parent-child relations as related to the development of internal and external locus of control (I E). They found that inconsistent discipline, overcontrol or extreme permissiveness, and lack of parental support contributed significantly to the child's experiencing responsibility and control as external to himself. The most significant contributing factor was the degree of perceived paternal acceptance and support.

Cox (12) had teachers rate children's behavior and then compared the ratings to a parent-child relations questionnaire completed by both children and parents. Results indicated that those extrafamilial measures of the child's behavior were more highly related to the child's perception of each parent's child rearing behavior than to the parent's self report. The mothers' self reports were more highly related to the child's behavior than the fathers' self reports. Helper (18) also concluded that children's reports of parents were possibly more valid measures of parental behaviors than ratings by parents themselves. Thus, the assumption cannot be made that a parent's view or another adult's view of parental behavior and attitudes is identical with a child's. Indeed, Yarrow and Campbell (32) found that children's perceptions of persons and their behavior resulted in "realities" quite different from the assessments based on observations by adults. They concluded that the coexistence of such discrepancies posed a complicated problem in understanding children's responses to interpersonal stimuli.

Serot and Teevan (26), in their study of the perception of the parent-child relationship and its relation to child adjustment, found support for the hypothesis that the emotionally well-adjusted child perceives his parent-child relationship as relatively happy while the emotionally mal-adjusted child perceives his parent-child relationship as quite unhappy. There was little or no agreement between

the parent's perceptions of the parent-child relationship and the child's perception of that relationship. The child's emotional adjustment was not significantly related to the parent's perception of the parent-child relationship.

Finally, Sears (25), in a study of forty mothers of pre-school children, compared the effectiveness of attitude scales with a combination of interviews with mothers and observations of maternal-child behavior. Interview data and observations were better for evaluating antecedent and consequent relationships of mother-child behaviors when the child's behavior was the criterion, but attitude scales were more economical and effective for group comparisons relating to maternal behavior.

In summary, research concerned with parental attitudes suggests that parental acceptance, support, consistency as well as open communication with the child are positively related to favorable emotional and social development of children. Extreme parental control, authoritarianism, and punitiveness, when lacking support, warmth, and acceptance were reported to be positively related to aggressiveness, lack of self-control, dependency, and anti-social behavior in general. Furthermore, it is important to consider the child's perception of the parent's behavior toward the child since this perception may be different from the parent's self reported child rearing attitudes.

Stepparent-Stepchild Relationships

Most of the research available before the 1960's concerning stepparent-stepchild relationships was built upon individual case studies and non-systematic inquiries and was carried out initially by German scholars. In a thorough review of the pertinent literature, Bowerman and Irish (9) cite several of the first stepchild-stepparent studies done in the 1920's by the Germans. Rihler (9), using case studies, contended that children were unable to cope successfully with the disturbance in the home situation brought about by the introduction of a stepparent. Hoenig (9), in his examination of ten different kinds of stepparent-stepchild relationships, concluded that the psychological injury done to the child when his intact family was broken caused continued disturbance in his reconstituted family. Kihn's (9) investigation of material found in five hundred children's essays led her to conclude that the entrance of a stepmother into the family caused conflict in areas of family functioning which had not theretofore been conflicted areas. She made the assertion, based on the essays, that prejudice stemming from the concept of the "wicked stepmother" in folklore caused general tension in the stepfamily.

Later, in the United States, Pflieger (23) endeavored to analyze twenty-seven case studies of stepmother-stepchild relationships in a representative sample of a middle class

clinic population. Anxiety concerning the stepfamily relationship was present to some degree in all but four of the twenty-seven women she studied.

In another clinic study White (30) reviewed twenty-two stepchildren's case studies and found that a third of the stepmothers were openly hostile, expressing dislike for the child and another third had some understanding of the child's problem but no satisfying love for the child. Half of the women had a poor relationship with their husbands and said that the child was an important cause of the conflict. It should be kept in mind that all of these children had been referred to the clinic by the courts due to severe behavior disturbance.

More recently, Smith (27) found that stepchildren furnished one-and-one-half times more delinquents than the same number of children from intact families and that more girls than boys exhibited these symptoms of delinquency. However, Smith drew conclusions without allowing for socioeconomic class differences.

Bernard's personality study (7) of 112 middle and upper class stepchildren, some of whom were interviewed and all of whom were given the Bernreuter Personality Inventory, did not show any connection between stepchildren and delinquency. She also found that stepchildren of a higher social and economic bracket do not show the disturbances of the lower socioeconomic bracket, that they are

typically not disorganized, unusual, or seriously mal-adjusted. Another part of that same study, however, showed that one-third of the divorced men and forty-four per cent of the divorced women were not affectionate toward children they had acquired through remarriage.

Nye (22) administered questionnaires to approximately 800 high school students and found that adolescents in broken homes showed better adjustment to natural parents than did children in unhappy unbroken homes and that in those broken homes into which a stepparent had been introduced there was an enhanced parent-child adjustment as a result of the marriage.

Burchinal's (10) comparisons of personality and social relationship scores for five groups of adolescents from unbroken families, those living with mothers only, and those in three kinds of stepfamilies, revealed that among boys and girls there were no significant differences in children from the five family types with the exception of one variable: adolescents from unbroken homes were absent from school the fewest number of days. Burchinal's conclusion was that inimical effects associated with divorce, separation, and remarriage were almost uniformly absent in the population studied. The population was not controlled for social status.

Goode (16) reached 425 divorced respondents, all mothers of children, through a thorough procedure designed

to secure a representative sample within a given country. He found that, although almost all mothers worried about the effects of divorce upon their children, almost all remarried mothers felt that their children's lives, emotionally and physically, had improved since the divorce and remarriage.

In an exploratory analysis from two national surveys, Wilson, Zurcher, and McAdams (31) concluded that there was no significant difference between 122 respondents who had experienced stepfather families and 742 respondents who had experienced natural parent families with regard to emotional adjustment and success of interpersonal relationships. Variables compared in this study were religious affiliation, social class, crime and delinquency, general interpersonal relationships, relationships in the marriage, and personal evaluation of satisfactory emotional adjustment.

From their clinical study of the stepparent role, based on approximately fifty case records from both inpatient and outpatient child guidance settings, Fast and Cain (14) concluded that organizational disturbance in stepfamilies is inevitable, that however strong the stepparent's determination to be a parent and however skillful his efforts, he can not succeed totally. The authors found that social norms make it inappropriate for the stepparent to assume the parent role completely. They maintained that stepparents almost always share the parent role with the previous parent, whether

the natural parent is alive or not, for the child seems to maintain a contemporary relationship to that natural parent. Fast and Cain found three manifestations of uncertainty concerning appropriate role behavior: (a) the parents' united focus on the child as a source of marital discord, (b) the denial of any problems, and (c) the stepparents' hypersensitivity to every event or comment from his stepchild as proof that he was or was not accepted as the "real" parent.

Messinger (21), in an interview study on remarriage involving seventy remarried couples with children, found that children and finances were ranked first and second among problems in the remarriage. These stepchildren, Messinger reported, provide a permanent link to ex-spouses, thereby causing conflict in the remarriage. In addition, remarried parents had difficulty adapting to the new role of stepparent to their spouse's children. Many women felt guilty about the financial burden which their children placed on their new husbands.

In a three-year study for the National Institute of Mental Health, headed by Bohanan (8), a total of 1,764 families selected from different areas, backgrounds, and living conditions, were interviewed and studied on a variety of dimensions. In the nine per cent of the families in which stepfathers were present, the children were happy and satisfied without any significant father-child conflicts. The mothers agreed with their children that stepfathers were

doing a good job; however, stepfathers saw themselves as failures as parents.

Examining the relationship of stepchildren to stepparents in a comprehensive combination of two studies involving 2,145 teenagers from stepfamilies, Bowerman and Irish (9) utilized a child-parent five-point adjustment scale and found that among seventh through twelfth graders, younger children (seventh through ninth grades) tended to have a more affectionate relationship to each parent (natural and stepparent) than older children (tenth through twelfth grades). There also seemed to be a more favorable adjustment to stepparents when the previous marriage had been broken by divorce rather than by death. Further results of the study indicated that: stepchildren expressed, more often than children from intact families, a preference for one parent or the other (biological parent or stepparent); stepparents were perceived by the children as favoring one or more children in the stepfamily over others; stepparents of the opposite sex were seen as doing this discriminating more than were stepparents of the child's own sex; stepchildren of both sexes perceived stepmothers as discriminating against them more than stepfathers. Bowerman and Irish also discovered that boys in stepfamilies expressed feelings of being rejected by parents less often than girls in stepfamilies and that children of both sexes desired to emulate their natural parents rather than their stepparents.

Duberman (13), in her 1973 study, obtained Parent Child Relationship scores from stepparents and natural parents in eighty-eight stepfamilies by obtaining ratings of "poor," "good," or "excellent" from each spouse concerning the parent-child or stepparent-child relationships within the family. Eighteen per cent of the families rated "poor" with regard to adjustment, eighteen per cent rated "good," and sixty-four per cent rated "excellent." Interest centered on the social factors which could account for the different ratings. Age of the stepfather was not a factor in his relationship with his children but it appeared meaningful for the stepmother. Stepmothers forty years of age or under had more "excellent" relationships with their children. No difference was found among categories of stepparents' educational level in the relationship with their stepchildren. Protestants, both stepmothers and stepfathers, were more successful in their relations with stepchildren than Catholics. Data also indicated that although the stepfather's relationship with his stepchildren was not influenced by the residence in the home of his own children, sixty-seven per cent of those wives whose own children resided in the home, as compared to forty-four per cent of those whose own children did not, obtained excellent step-mother-stepchild relationship ratings. Two other factors relating to the children were found to be important. First, children under thirteen years of age got along with their stepmothers better than did teenagers.

However, age was not a significant factor in stepfather-stepchild relationships. Secondly, relationships among stepchildren and parent-child relationships were better in those families in which there was at least one child born to the new marriage. In contrast to all other literature reviewed here concerning stepparents, Duberman found that, for both sexes, widowhood seemed more likely to lead to more "excellent" relations with stepchildren than divorce of the stepparent's previous spouse. The majority of stepchild-stepparent relationships were reported to be excellent; only one relationship in five was reported to be poor.

These studies as a whole would indicate that age of the stepchild at the time of his entry into the stepfamily, sex of the stepchild, sex of the stepparent, and reason for the dissolution of the previous marriage, whether death or divorce of the former spouse, are all significant factors affecting the stepparent-stepchild relationship. More recent studies carried out with non-clinic populations indicate that the majority of reconstituted families are reasonably successful in their adjustment, although there are unique problems, role definition in particular, which are prone to create additional tensions and family conflict.

Summary

Parental attitudes and child rearing practices have been shown to affect children's ego strength, behavior patterns, locus of control, and emotional and social adjustment in

general. Those attitudes most important in promoting favorable emotional and social development of children seem to be parental supportiveness, warmth, and acceptance. There is evidence that children who are rejected by their parents are likely to express emotional instability and behavioral maladjustments such as extreme dependency, aggressiveness, lack of self-control, and distrust.

Another important parental attitude area is that of control. Authoritarianism and over permissiveness tend to be reflected in either passivity or hyperaggression on the part of the child. More negative effects on the child seem to be manifested when the extremes of over or under control are in conjunction with lack of parental acceptance and supportiveness. It also is important that parents be consistent with their children and be willing to communicate with them openly, since children who experience this treatment from their parents manifest more self reliance, contentment, and self-control than those children whose parents are inconsistent and noncommunicative.

It is not only necessary that parents have positive attitudes of acceptance toward their children, that they be consistent and communicative, and that they possess democratic attitudes, but that they convey these positive attitudes to their children. It is the child's perception of parental attitudes that has been shown to be important to the child's social and emotional growth and development, and

the child's perception of the parent-child relationship has, more often than not, been shown to be different from the parent's perception of that relationship.

Basically two kinds of studies have been done involving stepparents and stepchildren: (1) those defining the problems of adjustment in stepfamilies and the reasons for the difficulties, and (2) those investigating the factors involved in the quality of the stepparent-stepchild relationship and in the adjustment of the stepfamily members. Studies of the first type have been carried out primarily with clinic populations and have concluded that anxiety and organizational disturbance is generally manifested in stepfamilies and is at least partly due to uncertainty concerning appropriate role behavior on the part of the stepparent. Hypersensitivity of the stepparent, myths concerning the stepparent, and the link, due to the presence of the stepchild, with the natural parent's ex-spouse, were all pointed to as reasons for the general tension and family conflict. There are other studies, generally more recent ones and generally those carried out with non-clinic populations, which have concluded that disturbance is not necessarily present in the stepfamily, that the quality of the parent-child relationship in stepfamilies is relatively high, and that the socioeconomic status of the stepfamily determines whether or not it will be a disturbed one. However, there does seem to be some misperception on the part of the stepparent in evaluating his

relationship with the stepchild and his success as a stepparent.

Studies investigating factors significantly affecting the quality of the stepparent-stepchild relationship have found age and sex of the stepchild and sex of stepparent to be important ones. There is some recent evidence pointing to the presence of natural children of the remarriage as favorably related to satisfactory relationships between stepfamily members. Conflicting results have been obtained concerning the significance of the reason for the remarriage eligibility of the natural parent (death or divorce of the previous spouse) in the quality of the stepparent-stepchild relationship.

In conclusion, although parental attitudes and the child's perception of those attitudes and behaviors are important to the adjustment of the child, research concerning stepparents and stepchildren has focused primarily on defining problems and investigating factors involved in the stepparent-stepchild relationship and has ignored the childrearing attitudes and practices of stepparents in general.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Armentrout, James A., "Parental Child-Rearing Attitudes and Preadolescents' Problem Behaviors," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, XXXVII(May, 1971), 278-285.
2. Ausubel, D. P., E. E. Balthazar, Irene Rosenthal, L. S. Blackman, S. H. Schpoont, and Joan Welkowitz, "Perceived Parent Attitudes on Determinants of Children's Ego Structure," Child Development, XXV (March, 1954), 173-183.
3. Baragona, Rosalie, "The Relationship Between Certain Personality Characteristics in Nursery School Children," Dissertation Abstracts, XXV(1964), 3094.
4. Baumrind, Diana, "Child Practices Anteceding Three Patterns of Preschool Behavior," Genetic Psychology Monographs, CXXV(1967), 345-388.
5. Becker, Wesley C., "The Relationship of Factors in Parental Ratings of Self and Each Other to the Behavior of Kindergarten Children as Rated by Mothers, Fathers, and Teachers," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XXIV(November, 1960), 507-527.
6. Beecher, M. and W. Beecher, Parents on the Run, New York, Matrix House, Ltd., 1955.
7. Bernard, Jessie, Remarriage: A Study in Marriage, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1956.
8. Bohanan, Paul, National Institute of Mental Health Report, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D. C., 1977.
9. Bowerman, Charles E. and D. P. Irish, "Some Relationships of Stepchildren to Their Parents," Marriage and Family Living, XXIV(May, 1962), 113-121.
10. Burchinal, Lee G., "Characteristics of Adolescents From Broken, Unbroken, and Reconstituted Families," Marriage and Family Living, XXVI(February, 1964), 44-50.

11. Clapp, William F., "Dependence and Competence in Children: Parental Treatment of Four-Year-Old Boys," Dissertation Abstracts, XXVIII(1967), 1703.
12. Cox, S. H., "Intrafamily Comparison of Loving-Rejecting Child-Rearing Practices," Child Development, XCI (June, 1970), 437-448.
13. Duberman, Lucile, "Step-Kin Relationships," Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXV(May, 1973), 283-292.
14. Fast, Irene and A. C. Cain, "The Stepparent Role: Potential for Disturbance in Family Functioning," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, XXXVI(August, 1966), 485-491.
15. Gildea, Margaret C. L., John C. Glidewell, and Mildred D. Kantor, "Maternal Attitudes and General Adjustment," in John Glidewell (ed.), Parent Attitudes and Child Behavior, Conference on Community Mental Health Research, St. Louis: Washington University Press, 1961.
16. Goode, William J., After Divorce, Glencoe, The Free Press, 1956.
17. Heilbrun, Alfred B., Jr. and Elizabeth B. Tiemeyer, "Relationships Between Perceived Maternal Child Rearing Experiences and Projective Responses to Censure-Control Cues in Normal Males," Journal of Genetic Psychology, CXII(January, 1968), 3-14.
18. Helper, M. M., "Parental Evaluation of Children and Children's Self-Evaluation," Journal of Abnormal and Social Behavior, CVI(March, 1958), 190-194.
19. Lang, Lawrence H., "Responsibility as a Function of Authority in Family Relations," Dissertation Abstracts, XXIX(1969), 3668-3669.
20. Moore, James E., "Antecedents of Dependency and Autonomy in Young Children," Dissertation Abstracts, XXVI (1965), 1966.
21. Messinger, Lillian, "Problems Relating to Remarriage," Journal of Marriage and Family Counseling, II (February, 1976), 276-284.

22. Nye, Ivan, "Child Adjustment in Broken and Unhappy, Unbroken Homes," Marriage and Family Living, XIX(November, 1957), 356-361.
23. Pflieger, Janet, "The Wicked Stepmother in a Child Guidance Clinic," Smith College Studies in Social Work, XVII(March, 1947), 125-126.
24. Scheck, Dennis, Robert Emerick, and Mohamed M. El-Assal, "Adolescents' Perceptions of Parent-Child Relations and the Development of Internal-External Control Orientation," Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXV(November, 1973), 643-653.
25. Sears, Robert R., "Comparison of Interviews with Questionnaires for Measuring Mothers' Attitudes Towards Sex and Aggression," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, II(January, 1965), 37-44.
26. Serot, Naomi M. and R. C. Teevan, "Perception of the Parent-Child Relationship and Its Relation to Child Adjustment," Child Development, XXXII(May, 1961), 373-378.
27. Smith, William, The Stepchild, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1953.
28. Starr, Bernard D., "Disciplinary Attitudes of Both Parents and Authoritarianism in Their Children," Dissertation Abstracts, XXVI(1965), 3484.
29. Walsh, Richard P., "Parental Rejecting Attitudes and Control in Children," Journal of Clinical Psychology, XXIV(February, 1968), 185-186.
30. White, Annie M., "Factors Making for Difficulty in the Stepparent Relationship with Children," Smith College Studies in Social Work, XIV(April, 1943), 242.
31. Wilson, Kenneth L., Louis Zurcher, and Diana McAdams, "Stepfathers and Stepchildren: An Exploratory Analysis from Two National Surveys," Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXVII(August, 1975), 526-536.
32. Yarrow, Marian R., and J. D. Campbell, "Person Perception in Children," Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, IX(Spring, 1963), 57-72.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This chapter presents in detail (1) the procedures involved in subject selection, (2) the instruments used, (3) a description of examiners and training sessions for them, (4) the procedures involved in collecting the data, and (5) the statistical procedures employed in analyzing the data.

Selection of the Subjects

Subjects were contacted by letter through elementary schools in Central and North Central Texas. Permission was obtained from four suburban school systems to distribute approximately 9,800 letters to children in grades three through six to be taken home and given to parents. The individual schools used in the study were carefully selected through consultation with school district personnel in order to obtain a cross section of the populations represented within the school districts with regard to socioeconomic class.

Two different letters were sent out (see Appendix 1). The letter sent home to 6,610 parents in three school systems briefly explained the purposes of the study and the amount of involvement required on the part of the subjects. The parents

who wished to participate were asked to return the bottom portion of the letter, along with their family name, address, and telephone number, to their child's school. Due to school policy, 3,200 parents of children in one school system were given letters containing an explanation of the study and a telephone number to call if they wished to participate in the study. Both parents and children from intact families and stepfamilies were solicited. Principals of the elementary schools involved were given the experimenter's telephone number and were asked to refer all calls pertaining to the study directly to the experimenter.

Every effort was made to obtain twenty each of stepmother-stepdaughter relationships, stepmother-stepson relationships, stepfather-stepdaughter relationships, and stepfather-stepson relationships in order to provide the sufficient data needed to meet the requirement of the statistic used in this study. One hundred thirty-six stepfamilies and 274 intact families responded to the invitation to participate. Of this number, ninety-four stepparents, ninety-four natural parents from stepfamilies (spouses of the stepparents), and one hundred natural parents from fifty intact families (fifty fathers and fifty mothers) were contacted by telephone and actually participated in the testing procedure. The remaining forty-two stepfamilies were not included because of difficulties they encountered

with test session scheduling, personal problems, illness, or because, after finding out more about the study, they chose not to participate. In the final analysis there were forty stepmothers and fifty-four stepfathers and their respective spouses included in the research. These included nineteen stepmother-stepson relationships, twenty-one stepmother-stepdaughter relationships, twenty-four stepfather-stepson relationships, and thirty stepfather-stepdaughter relationships.

Natural parents from intact families were chosen from a table of random numbers and were systematically called until fifty participating families were obtained.

Description of the Instruments

The Hereford Parent Attitude Survey measures parental attitudes in the five areas of "confidence in the parental role, causation of the child's behavior, acceptance of the child's behavior and feelings, mutual understanding, and mutual trust" (2, p. 43). Those items in the first scale, Confidence, are concerned with the parent's feelings of uncertainty as to what to do about problems he encounters with his children, with the implication that parenting requires suffering or sacrifice, and with a parent's feelings that he has more problems than most (2). Causation measures "the dimension of natural or inherent causation as

contrasted to environmental or parental influences" (2, p. 55), with items emphasizing the impossibility of changing a child from his predetermined way of behaving. The Acceptance scale measures parental reluctance to accept childhood behavior or normal developmental changes in the child. This scale also concerns itself with parental acceptance or rejection of children's behavior and feelings, aggressiveness, need for affection, and self-expression.

The fourth scale, Understanding, is concerned primarily with communication between parents and children, with the sharing of attitudes and feelings, and with working out problems jointly. The items that define the fifth scale, Trust, are primarily those which deal with parents' feelings that children are extensions of the parents themselves, not as individuals in their own right and therefore that they must be watched and not trusted.

There are a total of seventy-seven survey items with fifteen items assigned to each of the five scales and two additional items used as "set breakers" to reduce the tendency of some persons to form a response "set" to an Agree-Disagree type of test. One of the "set breakers" is in a statement with which nearly all parents agree, one a statement with which nearly all disagree (2). All answers are marked A, a, u, d, or D, for Strongly Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, or Strongly Disagree.

The split-half reliability coefficient for the Parent Attitude Survey as a whole was .80, placing it well within the satisfactory range of reliability for attitude measurements. The split-half reliability coefficient for the individual scales ranged from .68 for the Acceptance scale to .86 for the Understanding scale.

In order to investigate the possibility that all the scales might be measuring the same broad, undefined dimension of parent attitude, Hereford computed an interscale correlation matrix in which every scale was correlated with every other scale. The intercorrelations obtained were all positive, ranging from .33 to .62, which might be expected for scales measuring content in the same broad areas. "The correlation coefficients were high enough to indicate that all scales were measuring related parent attitudes, but not so high as to suggest duplication (2, p. 57).

The Child's Report of Parental Behavior Inventory-Revised (CRPBI-R) is a psychometric instrument specifically designed to assess parental behavior from the viewpoint of the child. It was used in the present study to ascertain how the child perceives the parent's behavior and how the parent believes the child perceives that behavior.

The CRPBI-R includes eighteen scales of either eight or sixteen items each and are labeled Acceptance, Child Centeredness, Possessiveness, Rejection, Control, Enforcement, Positive Involvement, Intrusiveness, Control Through

Guilt, Hostile Control, Inconsistent Discipline, Nonenforcement, Acceptance of Individuation, Lax Discipline, Instilling Persistent Anxiety, Hostile Detachment, Withdrawal of Relations, and Extreme Autonomy. The items are descriptions of concrete, specific, and observable parental behaviors. The subject indicates whether the item is Like, Somewhat Like, or Not like his parent's behavior on separate but identical forms for mother and father. Schaefer (5) factor analyzed the test and found three factors: (1) Acceptance vs. Rejection, the former represented by child centeredness, equalitarian treatment, emotional support, sharing, expression of affection and positive evaluation of the child, and the latter represented by irritability, neglect, ignoring, and negative evaluation; (2) Psychological Autonomy vs. Psychological Control, the former represented by the encouragement of sociability and independent thinking and the latter represented by intrusiveness, possessiveness, overprotectiveness, and control through guilt; and (3) Firm Control vs. Lax Control, the former represented by overt rule making, limit setting and enforcement and the latter by a lack of parental direction. Factor I is a bipolar dimension of parental behavior, according to which a child describes the degree to which a parent accepts or rejects him. A high score on this factor indicates a high degree of parental acceptance. Factor II represents the degree to

which the parent attempts to control the child through psychological pressure techniques. A high score on this factor indicates a high degree of indirect parental control. Factor III represents the degree to which the parent attempts to control the child's behavior by direct means. A high score on this factor indicates a high degree of firm parental control, or strictness (7). These factors were shown to be replicable regardless of the sex of parent or sex of child (5). Renson, Schaefer, and Levy (3) administered a French version of the CRPBI-R to Belgian high school students and found the same three factors, providing evidence for the cross-national validity of the test. Schludermann and Schludermann (7) tested the generalizability of the CRPBI-R factor structure for different independent samples and found that the three factor structure was "highly replicable across parents' forms, sex groups, and independent samples" (7, p. 246).

All of the above studies were done using early adolescents, late adolescents, and college students as subjects. However, an administration of the CRPBI-R to 260 fifth and sixth graders and a factor analysis of those scores by Burger, Armentrout, and Rapfogel (1) resulted in the same three factors. The investigators also compared three methods of estimating factor scores of the CRPBI-R using both the fifth and sixth grade sample and a sample drawn from undergraduate college students. It was found that all three

estimation methods, multiple regression, weighted summation of the scale scores, and unweighted summation of the scale scores, produced highly accurate factor scores. Results also indicated that accurate estimates of factor scores can be obtained with as few as three or even two scales per factor. Rather than using all scales, the authors suggested that further research with the CRPBI-R "employ measures of the factors rather than rely on assessment in terms of individual scales" (1, p. 113).

Schaeffer (4) has shown that the CRPBI R does discriminate between criterion groups. Scale validity was demonstrated by an analysis of the differences between normal and delinquent boys. The Mann-Whitney test was used to test the significance of the differences between distributions of total scores of the normal and delinquent boys for each scale. All scale differences were significant beyond the .05 level with a two-tailed test, and fourteen were significant beyond the .01 level.

Schaeffer and Bayley (6), using longitudinal data, correlated the ratings from interviews with mothers during their children's early adolescence and those children's adult retrospective reports of maternal behavior as measured by the CRPBI-R and found significantly high (.01 or > .01 level) correlations between those different methods, thereby supporting the validity of the CRPBI-R.

The median internal consistency reliability computed with Kuder-Richardson Formula 20 for the eighteen scales of the CRPBI-R was .76 (4). The reported reliabilities were higher for those scales designed to measure Acceptance vs. Rejection than for those designed to measure components of Autonomy vs. Control. The median reliabilities of groups of scales chosen to sample the major dimensions were: love and acceptance, .84; hostility and rejection, .78; autonomy, .69; and control, .66 (4).

Examiners and Their Training Procedure

Two master's level teachers, one master's level counselor, one doctoral level counselor, and one paraprofessional with prior experience in teaching children administered the CRPBI-R to the children involved in the study. These also served as rotating examiners in the adult testing sessions. All examiners participated in a two-hour training session in which the general purposes of the study and the CRPBI-R and Parent Attitude Survey were explained fully. Directions for reading the tests to the children were given by the experimenter and specific items on the CRPBI-R were explained as to their exact meaning. Examiners were given specific examples to use on thirteen of the CRPBI-R items which were thought to be difficult ones for the children, especially eight and nine year olds, to

understand. Examiners were told to explain any statements on the test to children who had questions. Some role playing and discussion of items were included in the training session.

Collecting the Data

The initial contact with each parent was made by telephone, and at this time the parent was told that the study involved approximately one hour of his time, his spouse's time, and his child's time. Parents were told that their child would be completing the CRPBI-R on both the mother and father in the family and that each parent would be asked to complete the CRPBI-R as he felt his child would. In addition, the parents were told that they would be completing the Parent Attitude Survey. Questions concerning the study were frankly answered, but the hypotheses were not shared with parents.

At this time information concerning names and ages of the parents and names, ages, and sexes of the children involved was garnered. Stepfamilies were also asked how long the parents had been married, what length of time the stepchild had been in the family, which parent was the stepparent, the age of the child at the time he became a part of the stepfamily, and the reason for the remarriage eligibility of the natural parent (death or divorce of former spouse). Testing times and places were then set.

Testing places used were various area churches, junior college classrooms, and several area homes. Testing times varied according to the availability of subjects and examiners. At no time were more than five children tested in one session. Usually the testing was done with groups of three and four children in one room. The children were given the following instructions.

Here is a questionnaire form. Put your first and last name at the top of the page if it has not already been written there.

This is a questionnaire about the mother or stepmother (father or stepfather) in the family where you live now. Each sentence will be read aloud to you, you will be given a few seconds to think, and then you will be asked to mark the answer that most closely describes or tells about your mother or stepmother (father or stepfather) and the way she (he) acts toward you.

If you think the sentence is like your mother or stepmother (father or stepfather), cross out the L. If you think the sentence is sort of like your mother or stepmother (father or stepfather), cross out the SL. If you think the sentence is not like your mother or stepmother (father or stepfather), cross out the NL.

Your parents will not see your answers, so please mark each item just the way you really feel.

If you lose your place, or if I do not explain an item and you do not understand, please stop me and I will help you. Are there any questions? Let's do the first one.

The same set of instructions were read at the beginning of testing for father or stepfather. There was a substitution of the words father or stepfather for the words mother or stepmother.

The examiner read the items aloud to the children on either the mother or father form of the CRPBI-R, took a short break for refreshments, and then read aloud the remaining mother or father form. Mother and father forms of the CRPBI-R were alternately read first during testing sessions.

At the same time, in another room, parents of the children completed the CRPBI-R as they felt their child would and the Parent Attitude Survey. Parents were given the Parent Attitude Survey and asked to read and follow the instructions. The example was read aloud by the examiner. Concerning the CRPBI-R, parents were given the following instructions.

Your child is in the next room completing this parental behavior questionnaire as he sees each of you. It is your job to try to predict what he will say about you. Do not mark what you think you do. Try to mark each item as you feel your child will mark it. If

you feel that your child will think a certain item is like you, cross out L. If you feel that your child will think an item is somewhat like you, cross out SL. If you feel that your child will think an item is not like you, cross out NL. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to ask. There is no time limit.

Please put your name at the top of each form if it is not already written there and indicate whether you are a mother or stepmother, a father or stepfather.

Treatment of the Data

Totals of the five scale scores from the Parent Attitude Survey were computed and used as raw data representing each parent's or stepparent's child rearing attitudes along five different dimensions of confidence, causation, acceptance, understanding, and trust. A one-way analysis of variance was used to determine the significance of the differences among the three groups--stepparents, natural parents in reconstituted families, and natural parents in intact families. If the F was significant at the .05 level, the Scheffe multiple comparison test was used to find which groups were different on what specific scales of the Parent Attitude Survey. The .05 level of significance was then used again to retain or reject the hypothesis related to the analysis of variance.

Using the raw scores from the scales of the CRPBI-R, factor scores were computed by means of the unweighted

summation method (1). Total scores on scales 1 (Acceptance), 2 (Childcenteredness), and 13 (Acceptance of Individuation) were summed to obtain scores for Factor I (Acceptance vs. Rejection). Total scores on scales 9 (Control through Guilt), 10 (Hostile Control), and 15 (Instilling Persistent Anxiety) were summed to obtain scores for Factor II (Psychological Autonomy vs. Psychological Control). Total scores on scales 11 (Inconsistent Discipline), 12 (Nonenforcement), and 14 (Lax Discipline) were summed to obtain scores for Factor III (Firm vs. Lax Control). The absolute differences were then found between the child's factor scores and the parent's factor scores for use as the dependent variables in each of two separate multiple regression analyses. The independent variables used as predictors in the analysis of data for all three groups, stepparents, natural parents in stepfamilies, and natural parents in intact families, were kind of family (intact or stepfamily), kind of parent (natural or stepparent), sex of parent, and sex of child. The independent variables used as predictors in the analysis carried out on only stepparents were sex of parent, sex of child, length of time the stepfamily had lived together, and age of the stepchild at the time of his entry into the stepfamily. An F was calculated in both cases to show if a unique, significant contribution was made by any one of the independent variables to the prediction of

the dependent variable. The .05 level was used as the criterion of significance for the acceptance or rejection of the hypotheses related to the multiple linear regression.

The statistical computations of the analysis of variance and multiple linear regression were completed at the Computing Center, North Texas State University.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Burger, Gary, James Armentrout, and Richard Rapfogel, "Estimating Factor Scores for Children's Reports of Parental Child Rearing Behaviors," Journal of Genetic Psychology, CXXIII(May, 1973), 107-113.
2. Hereford, C. F., Changing Parental Attitudes Through Group Discussion, Austin, Texas, University of Texas Press, 1963.
3. Renson, Gisele, E. S. Schaefer, B. I. Levy, "Cross-National Validity of a Spherical Conceptual Model for Parent Behavior," Child Development, XXXIX(Winter, 1968), 1129-1235.
4. Schaefer, Earl S., "Children's Reports of Parental Behavior: An Inventory," Child Development, XXXVI (June, 1965), 413-424.
5. _____, "Configurational Analysis of Children's Reports of Parent Behavior," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XXIX(June, 1965), 552-557.
6. _____ and Nancy Bayley, "Validity and Consistency of Mother-Infant Observations, Adolescent Maternal Interviews, and Adult Retrospective Reports of Maternal Behavior," Proceedings, 75th Annual Convention, APA, 1967, pp. 147-148.
7. Schluderman, Edward and Shirin Schluderman, "Replicability of Factors in Children's Report of Parent Behavior (CRPBI)," Journal of Psychology, LXXVI (November, 1970), 239-249.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this chapter is to present, analyze, and discuss the findings of this investigation. The data will be examined as they relate to each hypothesis.

This study was designed to compare the childrearing attitudes of natural parents from intact families, natural parents in stepfamilies and stepparents, and to compare those parents' ability to predict their children's perception of parental behavior. The analysis of variance and multiple linear regression were employed to make those comparisons, and the .05 level of significance was established as the basis upon which the hypotheses would be tested.

Hypothesis 1 states that the three groups will not differ significantly with respect to child rearing attitudes as measured by the Hereford Parent Attitude Survey.

Table I reflects the means of the scores obtained by the three groups on the Confidence scale of the Parent Attitude Survey. The possible range for all scales is -30 to +30 (5).

TABLE I
 MEANS OF SCORES OBTAINED ON CONFIDENCE SCALE
 OF THE PARENT ATTITUDE SURVEY

Group	Number	Means
Natural-Intact	100	5.28000
Natural- Reconstituted	94	5.26596
Stepparents	94	3.54255

The analysis of variance data related to the scores on the Confidence scale of the Parent Attitude Survey are reflected in Table II.

TABLE II
 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE DATA OBTAINED ON
CONFIDENCE SCALE OF PARENT
ATTITUDE SURVEY

Source of Variance	df	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	P
Between Groups	2	189.6591	2.6199	0.0746
Within Groups	285	10,315.8409
Total	287	10,505.5000

The F ratio of 0.0746, reported in Table II, does not attain significance at the .05 level; therefore, the Scheffé F test was not performed. These results lend support to Sub-Hypothesis 1a.

Table III reflects the means of the scores obtained by the three groups on the Causation scale of the Parent Attitude Survey.

TABLE III
MEANS OF SCORES OBTAINED ON CAUSATION SCALE
OF PARENT ATTITUDE SURVEY

Group	Number	Means
Natural-Intact	100	14.75000
Natural-Reconstituted	94	14.87234
Stepparents	94	12.98936

Table IV shows the analysis of variance data related to the scores on the Causation scale of the Parent Attitude Survey.

TABLE IV
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE DATA OBTAINED
ON CAUSATION SCALE OF PARENT ATTITUDE SURVEY

Source of Variance	df	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	P
Between Groups	2	210.4453	3.0909	0.0470
Within Groups	285	9702.2074
Total	287	9912.6528

The F ratio of 3.0909, reported in Table IV, attains significance at the .05 level. Therefore, a Scheffé F test

was performed, the results of which are presented in Table V.

TABLE V
SCHEFFÉ F TEST FOR CAUSATION SCALE
OF PARENT ATTITUDE SURVEY

Group Comparison	F Value
Natural-Intact vs. Natural-Reconstituted	0.0107
Natural-Intact vs. Stepparents	2.206
Natural-Reconstituted vs. Stepparents	2.4476

None of the F values are significant at the .05 level, lending support to Sub-Hypothesis 1b.

Table VI reflects the means of the scores obtained by the three groups on the Acceptance scale of the Parent Attitude Survey.

TABLE VI
MEANS OF SCORES OBTAINED ON ACCEPTANCE SCALE
OF PARENT ATTITUDE SURVEY

Group	Number	Means
Natural-Intact	100	10.49000
Natural- Reconstituted	94	8.69149
Stepparents	94	7.60638

The analysis of variance data related to the scores on the Acceptance scale of the Parent Attitude Survey are shown in Table VII.

TABLE VII
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE DATA OBTAINED
ON ACCEPTANCE SCALE OF PARENT
ATTITUDE SURVEY

Source of Variance	df	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	P
Between Groups	2	413.1005	6.4864	0.0018
Within Groups	285	9075.4794
Total	287	9488.5799

The F ratio of 6.4864 attains significance at the .002 level, demanding that the Scheffé test be performed, the results of which are presented in Table VIII.

TABLE VIII
SCHEFFÉ F TEST FOR ACCEPTANCE SCALE
OF PARENT ATTITUDE SURVEY

Group Comparison	F Value
Natural-Intact vs. Natural-Reconstituted	2.4609
Natural-Intact vs. Stepparents	6.3263
Natural-Reconstituted vs. Stepparents	0.8689

The F value of 6.3263 reaches significance at the .01 level; therefore, Sub-Hypothesis 1c is rejected. There is a

significant difference between stepparents and natural parents from intact families, with regard to the Acceptance scale of the Parent Attitude Survey. The other F ratios are not significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Table IX reflects the means of the scores obtained by the three groups on the Understanding scale of the Parent Attitude Survey.

TABLE IX
MEANS OF SCORES OBTAINED ON UNDERSTANDING
SCALE OF PARENT ATTITUDE SURVEY

Group	Number	Means
Natural-Intact	100	15.08000
Natural-Reconstituted	94	13.68085
Stepparents	94	11.87234

The analysis of variance data related to the scores on the Understanding scale of the Parent Attitude Survey are reflected in Table X.

TABLE X
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE DATA OBTAINED
ON UNDERSTANDING SCALE OF
PARENT ATTITUDE SURVEY

Source of Variance	df	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	P
Between Groups	2	500.0658	5.4296	0.0048
Within Groups	285	13124.2536
Total	287	13624.3194

The F ratio reaches a level of significance beyond that necessary for the application of the Scheffé F test for multiple comparisons. The results of the Scheffé are presented in Table XI.

TABLE XI
SCHEFFÉ F TEST FOR UNDERSTANDING SCALE
OF PARENT ATTITUDE SURVEY

Group Comparison	F Value
Natural-Intact vs. Natural Reconstituted	1.0299
Natural-Intact vs. Stepparents	5.4131
Natural-Reconstituted vs. Stepparents	1.6691

The F value of 5.4131 reaches significance at the .01 level, therefore, Sub-Hypothesis 1d is rejected. There is significant difference between stepparents and natural parents from intact families with regard to the Understanding scale of the Parent Attitude Survey. The other F values obtained are not significant at the .05 confidence level.

Table XII reflects the means of the scores obtained by the three groups on the Trust scale of the Parent Attitude Survey.

TABLE XII
 MEANS OF SCORES OBTAINED ON TRUST SCALE
 OF PARENT ATTITUDE SURVEY

Group	Number	Means
Natural-Intact	100	11.19000
Natural-Reconstituted	94	11.19149
Stepparents	94	11.47872

The analysis of variance data related to the scores on the Trust scale of the Parent Attitude Survey are reflected in Table XIII.

TABLE XIII
 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE DATA OBTAINED ON TRUST SCALE
 OF PARENT ATTITUDE SURVEY

Source of Variance	df	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	P
Between Groups	2	5.2521	0.0627	0.9393
Within Groups	285	11939.4006
Total	285	11944.6528

The F ratio of 0.0627 does not attain significance at the .05 level, making the Scheffe F test unnecessary. These results lend support to Sub-Hypothesis 1e.

Since there were significant differences among the three groups on both Acceptance and Understanding scales of the Parent Attitude Survey, Hypothesis 1 is rejected.

Hypothesis 2 states that the kind of family, natural or reconstituted, will make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived parental behavior as measured by the three factors of the CRPBI-R. Three sub-hypotheses relate to the distortion obtained on each of those three factors. In order to determine the effects of kind of family upon the prediction of distortion of perceived parental behavior, a multiple linear regression technique was applied to four predictor variables. Table XIV contains the regression results for the full model as applied to the Acceptance vs. Rejection factor of the CRPBI-R.

TABLE XIV

REGRESSION RESULTS FOR FULL MODEL AS APPLIED
TO THE ACCEPTANCE VS. REJECTION FACTOR--
THREE GROUPS CONSIDERED

Variable	X wt.	R ²
X ₁ Kind of Family	-1.6694	0.0453
X ₂ Kind of Parent	7.4699	. .
X ₃ Sex of Child	-1.0985	. .
X ₄ Sex of Parent	-2.1770	. .
Constant	3.2908	. .

The equation for the full model is of the form:

$$y = a_1X_1 + a_2X_2 + a_3X_3 + a_4X_4 + C$$

The four predictor variables included in this full model are:

X_1 = Kind of Family
 X_2 = Kind of Parent
 X_3 = Sex of Child
 X_4 = Sex of Parent

To determine the value of kind of family on prediction of distortion, this predictor variable was dropped and a restricted model regression equation was computed. The restricted model is of the form:

$$y = a_1X_1 + a_2X_2 + a_3X_3 + C.$$

A comparison was made between the full model and the restricted model. Table XV shows the results of this comparison.

TABLE XV

COMPARISON OF FULL MODEL WITH RESTRICTED MODEL
 WITH REGARD TO ACCEPTANCE VS. REJECTION FACTOR

DF	R^2	F	P
Numerator = 1	Full Model = 0.0453
Denominator = 284	Restricted Model = 0.0436	0.51	0.5151

This comparison for the Acceptance vs. Rejection factor produced an F of 0.51. This F is not significant at the .05 level; therefore, the exclusion of the variable which represents kind of family, stepfamily or intact family, does not make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived parental acceptance or rejection

as measured by the Acceptance vs. Rejection factor of the CRPBI-R. Sub-Hypothesis 2a is rejected.

Table XVI contains the regression results for the full model as applied to the Psychological Autonomy vs. Psychological Control factor of the CRPBI-R.

TABLE XVI

REGRESSION RESULTS FOR FULL MODEL AS APPLIED
TO PSYCHOLOGICAL AUTONOMY VS. PSYCHOLOGICAL
CONTROL FACTOR --THREE GROUPS
CONSIDERED

Variable	X wt.	R ²
X ₁ Kind of Family	3.8346	0.0319
X ₂ Kind of Parent	1.1602	. .
X ₃ Sex of Child	1.2846	. .
X ₄ Sex of Parent	2.1914	. .
Constant	-13.0931	. .

Table XVII shows the results of the comparison of the full model with the restricted model obtained when predictor variable X₁ was dropped out.

TABLE XVII

COMPARISON OF FULL MODEL WITH RESTRICTED MODEL WITH
REGARD TO PSYCHOLOGICAL AUTONOMY VS. PSYCHOLOGICAL
CONTROL FACTOR

DF	R ²	F	P
Numerator = 1	Full Model = 0.0319
Denominator = 284	Restricted Model = 0.0194	3.66	0.0534

This comparison produced an F of 3.66, which, although it approaches significance, is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore, the exclusion of the variable which represents kind of family does not make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived indirect parental control as measured by the Psychological Autonomy vs. Psychological Control factor of the CRPBI-R. Sub-Hypothesis 2b is rejected.

Table XVIII contains the regression results for the full model as applied to the Firm vs. Lax Control factor of the CRPBI-R.

TABLE XVIII

REGRESSION RESULTS FOR FULL MODEL AS APPLIED TO
FIRM VS. LAX CONTROL FACTOR--THREE
GROUPS CONSIDERED

Variable	X wt.	R ²
X ₁ Kind of Family	1.6822	0.0112
X ₂ Kind of Parent	-0.1783	. .
X ₃ Sex of Child	-1.0960	. .
X ₄ Sex of Parent	-0.1101	. .
Constant	2.0834	. .

Table XIX shows the results of the comparison of the full model with the restricted model obtained when predictor variable X₁ was dropped out.

TABLE XIX

COMPARISON OF FULL MODEL WITH RESTRICTED MODEL
WITH REGARD TO FIRM VS. LAX CONTROL FACTOR

DF	R ²	F	P
Numerator = 1	Full Model = 0.0112
Denominator = 284	Restricted Model = 0.0048	1.82	0.1745

This comparison for the Firm vs. Lax Control factor produced an F of 1.82. This F is not significant at the .05 level; therefore, the exclusion of the variable which represents kind of family does not make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived overt parental control as measured by the Firm vs. Lax Control factor of the CRPBI-R. Hypothesis 2 is rejected on the basis of the rejection of all three sub-hypotheses.

Hypothesis 3 states that kind of parent, natural or step-parent, will make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived parental behavior as measured by the three factors of the CRPBI-R. Three sub-hypotheses relate the distortion obtained on each of those three factors. Table XX reflects the comparison of the full model (shown in Table XIV) with the restricted model as applied to the Acceptance vs. Rejection factor of the CRPBI-R after variable X₂ was dropped out.

TABLE XX

COMPARISON OF FULL MODEL WITH RESTRICTED MODEL
WITH REGARD TO ACCEPTANCE VS.
REJECTION FACTOR

DF	R ²	F	P
Numerator = 1	Full Model = 0.0453
Denominator = 284	Restricted Model = 0.0126	9.70	0.0024

This comparison produced an F of 9.70, which is significant at the .002 level. Therefore, the exclusion of the variable which represents kind of parent does make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived parental acceptance or rejection as measured by the Acceptance vs. Rejection factor of the CRPBI-R. Sub-Hypothesis 3a is accepted. In this case, however, it should be noted that only five per cent of the variance is accounted for by the full model, leaving 95 per cent unaccounted for.

In order to ascertain which kind of parent distorts acceptance or rejection more, it is necessary to refer to Table XXI, which reflects the correlations between the predictor variables and the dependent variables of distortion of perceived parental behavior on each of the three factors of the CRPBI-R.

TABLE XXI
CORRELATION MATRIX FOR PREDICTOR VARIABLES AND
DISTORTION OF PERCEIVED PARENTAL BEHAVIOR
ON THE THREE CRPBI-R FACTORS

<u>CRPBI-R</u> Factors	Kind of Family	Kind of Parent	Sex of Child	Sex of Parent
Acceptance	0.06	0.19**	-0.03	-0.09
Control	0.15*	0.10	0.05	0.07
Strictness	0.08	0.04	-0.06	-0.01

*Significant at the .05 level for $df = 288$.

**Significant at the .01 level for $df = 288$.

The kind of family was coded 1 for intact family, 2 for stepfamily. The kind of parent was coded 1 for natural parent, 2 for stepparent. The sex of both child and parent was coded 1 for male, 2 for female.

As can be seen, there is a significant, positive correlation between a greater amount of distortion and inclusion in the stepparent group. Natural parents are better able to predict their children's perceptions regarding parental acceptance or rejection than are stepparents. The correlation of 0.19 is statistically significant at the .002 level.

Table XXII reflects the results of the comparison of the full model as applied to the Psychological Autonomy vs. Psychological Control factor of the CRPBI-R with the restricted model obtained when variable X_2 was dropped out.

TABLE XXII

COMPARISON OF FULL MODEL WITH RESTRICTED MODEL
WITH REGARD TO PSYCHOLOGICAL AUTONOMY VS.
PSYCHOLOGICAL CONTROL FACTOR

DF	R ²	F	P
Numerator = 1	Full Model = 0.0319
Denominator = 284	Restricted Model = 0.0308	0.32	0.5781

This comparison produced an F of 0.32, which is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore, the exclusion of the variable which represents kind of parent does not make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived indirect parental control as measured by the Psychological Autonomy vs. Psychological Control factor of the CRPBI-R. Sub-Hypothesis 3b is rejected.

Table XXIII reflects the results of the comparison of the full model as applied to the Firm vs. Lax Control factor of the CRPBI-R with the restricted model obtained when variable X₂ was dropped out.

TABLE XXIII

COMPARISON OF FULL MODEL WITH RESTRICTED MODEL
AS APPLIED TO FIRM VS. LAX CONTROL FACTOR

DF	R ²	F	P
Numerator = 1	Full Model = 0.0112
Denominator = 284	Restricted Model = 0.0111	0.02	0.8836

This comparison produced an F of 0.02, which is not significant. Therefore, the exclusion of the variable which represents kind of parent does not make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived overt parental control as measured by the Firm vs. Lax Control factor of the CRPBI-R. Sub-Hypothesis 3c is rejected. Hypothesis 3 is accepted on the basis of the acceptance of Sub-Hypothesis 3a.

Hypothesis 4 states that the sex of the child or step-child will make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived parental behavior as measured by the CRPBI-R. Three sub-hypotheses relate to the distortion obtained on each of those three factors. In order to fully determine the effects of sex of child upon this prediction, two multiple regression techniques were employed, one described above and used to determine the effects when the three different groups were considered together and one used when only stepparents were considered. Table XXIV reflects the comparison of the first full model

TABLE XXIV

COMPARISON OF FULL MODEL WITH RESTRICTED MODEL WITH REGARD TO ACCEPTANCE VS. REJECTION FACTOR--
THREE GROUPS

DF	R ²	F	P
Numerator = 1	Full Model = 0.0453
Denominator = 284	Restricted Model = 0.0126	0.33	0.5757

(shown in Table XIV) with the restricted model as applied to the Acceptance vs. Rejection factor of the CRPBI-R after variable X_3 was dropped out.

This comparison produced an F of 0.33, which is not significant. Therefore, the exclusion of the variable which represents sex of child does not make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived parental acceptance or rejection when all three groups are considered together.

In order to investigate the effects of sex of child upon prediction when only stepparents were considered, a multiple linear regression technique was applied to four predictor variables, two of which were the same as the full model considering all three groups and two of which were different. Table XXV contains the regression results for this full model as applied to the Acceptance vs. Rejection factor of the CRPBI-R.

TABLE XXV

REGRESSION RESULTS FOR FULL MODEL AS APPLIED TO
ACCEPTANCE VS. REJECTION FACTOR--
STEPPARENTS ONLY

Variable	X wt.	R ²
X ₁ Sex of Stepchild	-4.5774	0.0462
X ₂ Sex of Stepparent	-7.1285	. .
X ₃ Length of Time in Stepfamily	0.1602	. .
X ₄ Age of Child	0.5574	. .
Constant	22.3748	. .

The equation for this full model is of the form:

$y = a_1X_1 + a_2X_2 + a_3X_3 + a_4X_4 + C$. The four predictor variables included in this full model are:

X_1 = Sex of stepchild

X_2 = Sex of stepparent

X_3 = Length of time child has been included in stepfamily

X_4 = Age of child at time of entry into stepfamily.

The restricted model, computed when one variable was dropped out is of the form:

$y = a_1X_1 + a_2X_2 + a_3X_3 + C$.

Table XXVI contains the results of the comparison of the restricted model, with the full model for the Acceptance vs. Rejection factor of the CRPBI-R, including only stepparents.

TABLE XXVI

COMPARISON OF FULL MODEL WITH RESTRICTED MODEL WITH REGARD TO ACCEPTANCE VS. REJECTION FACTOR--
STEPPARENTS ONLY

DF	R ²	F	P
Numerator = 1	0.0462
Denominator = 90	0.0303	1.50	0.2218

This comparison produced an F of 1.50 which is not significant. Therefore, the exclusion of the variable which represents sex of child does not make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived parental acceptance or rejection as measured by the

Acceptance vs. Rejection factor of the CRPBI-R when only stepparents are considered. Sub-Hypothesis 4a is therefore rejected.

Table XXVII reflects the results of the comparison of the full model (shown in Table XIV) as applied to the Psychological Autonomy vs. Psychological Control factor of the CRPBI-R with the restricted model obtained when variable X_3 was dropped out. All three groups were considered here.

TABLE XXVII

COMPARISON OF FULL MODEL WITH RESTRICTED MODEL
WITH REGARD TO PSYCHOLOGICAL AUTONOMY VS.
PSYCHOLOGICAL CONTROL FACTOR--
THREE GROUPS

DF	R^2	F	P
Numerator = 1	Full Model = 0.0319
Denominator = 284	Restricted Model = 0.0298	0.61	0.5594

This comparison produced an F of 0.61 which is not significant. Therefore, the exclusion of the variable which represents sex of child does not make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived indirect parental control when all three groups are considered together.

Table XXVIII contains the regression results for the full model as applied to the Psychological Autonomy vs. Psychological Control factor of the CRPBI-R when only stepparents are considered.

TABLE XXVIII

REGRESSION RESULTS FOR FULL MODEL AS APPLIED TO
PSYCHOLOGICAL AUTONOMY VS. PSYCHOLOGICAL
CONTROL FACTOR--STEPPARENTS ONLY

Variable	X wt.	R ²
X ₁ Sex of Stepchild	2.4581	0.0997
X ₂ Sex of Stepparent	6.6513	. .
X ₃ Length of Time in Stepfamily	-2.8156	. .
X ₄ Age of Child	-2.5390	. .
Constant	17.4143	. .

Table XXIX contains the results of the comparison of the restricted model, computed when variable X₁ was dropped out, with the full model for the Psychological Autonomy vs. Psychological Control factor for stepparents only.

TABLE XXIX

COMPARISON OF FULL MODEL WITH RESTRICTED MODEL
WITH REGARD TO PSYCHOLOGICAL AUTONOMY VS.
PSYCHOLOGICAL CONTROL FACTOR--
STEPPARENTS ONLY

DF	R ²	F	P
Numerator = 1	0.0997
Denominator = 90	0.0925	0.72	0.5962

This comparison produced an F of 0.72 which is not significant. The exclusion of the variable which represents sex of child does not make a unique, significant contribution to

the prediction of the distortion of perceived indirect parental control when only stepparents are considered. Therefore, Sub-Hypothesis 4b is rejected.

Table XXX reflects the results of the comparison of the full model (shown in Table XIV) as applied to the Firm vs. Lax Control factor of the CRPBI-R with the restricted model obtained when variable X_3 was dropped out. All three groups were considered here.

TABLE XXX
COMPARISON OF FULL MODEL WITH RESTRICTED MODEL
WITH REGARD TO FIRM VS. LAX CONTROL
FACTOR--THREE GROUPS

DF	R^2	F	P
Numerator = 1	Full Model = 0.0112
Denominator = 90	Restricted Model = 0.0072	1.15	0.2836

This comparison produced an F of 1.15, which is not significant. The exclusion of the variable which represents sex of child does not make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of distortion of perceived overt parental control when all three groups are considered together.

Table XXXI contains the regression results for the full model as applied to the Firm vs. Lax Control factor of the CRPBI-R when only stepparents are considered.

TABLE XXXI

REGRESSION RESULTS FOR FULL MODEL AS APPLIED TO
FIRM VS. LAX CONTROL FACTOR--
 STEPPARENTS ONLY

Variable	X wt.	R ²
X ₁ Sex of Stepchild	-1.0798	0.0161
X ₂ Sex of Stepparent	1.5704	. .
X ₃ Length of Time in Stepfamily	-0.2517	. .
X ₄ Age of Child	-0.0513	. .
Constant	3.8618	. .

Table XXXII reflects the results of the comparison of the restricted model, computed when variable X₁ was dropped out, with the full model shown above for Firm vs. Lax Control factor.

TABLE XXXII

COMPARISON OF FULL MODEL WITH RESTRICTED MODEL
 WITH REGARD TO FIRM VS. LAX CONTROL
 FACTOR--STEPPARENTS ONLY

DF	R ²	F	P
Numerator = 1	0.0161
Denominator = 90	0.0125	0.33	0.5749

This comparison produced an F of 0.33, which is not significant. The exclusion of the variable which represents sex of child does not make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived overt

parental control as measured by the Firm vs. Lax Control factor of the CRPBI-R when only stepparents are considered. Therefore, Sub-Hypothesis 4c is rejected. Since all sub-hypotheses have been rejected, Hypothesis 4 is rejected.

Hypothesis 5 states that the sex of the parent or stepparent will make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived parental behavior as measured by the three factors of the CRPBI-R. The three sub-hypotheses are directly related to those three factors. Again, two multiple regression analyses were employed in order to test this hypothesis fully, one to determine the effects when three groups were considered together and one when only stepparents were considered. Table XXXIII reflects the results of the comparison of the first full model (shown in Table XIV) with the restricted model as applied to the Acceptance vs. Rejection factor of the CRPBI-R after variable X₄ was dropped out.

TABLE XXXIII

COMPARISON OF FULL MODEL WITH RESTRICTED MODEL
WITH REGARD TO ACCEPTANCE VS. REJECTION
FACTOR--THREE GROUPS

DF	R ²	F	P
Numerator = 1	Full Model = 0.0453
Denominator = 284	Restricted Model = 0.0410	1.26	0.2611

This comparison produced an F of 1.26, which is not significant. The exclusion of the variable which represents

sex of parent does not make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived parental acceptance or rejection when all three groups are considered together.

Table XXXIV reflects the results of the comparison of the restricted model related to stepparents only, computed when variable X_2 was dropped out, with the full model for the Acceptance vs. Rejection factor of the CRPBI-R.

TABLE XXXIV

COMPARISON OF FULL MODEL WITH RESTRICTED MODEL
WITH REGARD TO ACCEPTANCE VS. REJECTION
FACTOR--STEPPARENTS ONLY

DF	R^2	F	P
Numerator = 1	Full Model = 0.0462
Denominator = 90	Restricted Model = 0.0145	2.99	0.0832

This comparison produced an F of 2.99, which approaches, but does not reach significance, at the .05 level. The exclusion of the variable which represents sex of stepparent does not make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived parental acceptance or rejection when only stepparents are considered; therefore, Sub-Hypothesis 5a is rejected.

Table XXXV reflects the results of the comparison of the first full model (shown in Table XIV) with the restricted model as applied to the Psychological Autonomy vs. Psychological Control factor of the CRPBI-R after variable X_4 was dropped out.

TABLE XXXV

COMPARISON OF FULL MODEL WITH RESTRICTED MODEL
WITH REGARD TO PSYCHOLOGICAL AUTONOMY VS.
PSYCHOLOGICAL CONTROL FACTOR--
THREE GROUPS

DF	R ²	F	P
Numerator = 1	Full Model = 0.0319
Denominator = 284	Restricted Model = 0.0259	1.76	0.1826

This comparison produced an F of 1.76, which is not significant. The exclusion of the variable which represents sex of parent does not make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived indirect parental control when all three groups are considered together.

Table XXXVI reflects the results of the comparison of the restricted model with the full model for the Psychological Autonomy vs. Psychological Control factor with only stepparents considered.

TABLE XXXVI

COMPARISON OF FULL MODEL WITH RESTRICTED MODEL
WITH REGARD TO PSYCHOLOGICAL AUTONOMY VS.
PSYCHOLOGICAL CONTROL FACTOR--
STEPPARENTS ONLY

DF	R ²	F	P
Numerator = 1	Full Model = 0.0997
Denominator = 90	Restricted Model = 0.0564	4.33	0.0379

This comparison produced an F of 4.33, significant at a level beyond the .05 level. The exclusion of the variable which represents sex of parent does make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived indirect parental control when only stepparents are considered. Therefore, Sub-Hypothesis 5b is accepted.

In order to determine whether stepmothers or stepfathers are more likely to misperceive, it is necessary to refer to Table XXXVII, which reflects the correlations between the predictor variables and the dependent variables of distortion of perceived parental behavior on each of the three factors of the CRPBI-R.

TABLE XXXVII

CORRELATION ON MATRIX FOR PREDICTOR VARIABLES AND
DISTORTION OF PERCEIVED PARENTAL BEHAVIOR
ON THE THREE CRPBI-R FACTORS
STEPPARENTS ONLY

<u>CRPBI-R</u> Factors	Sex of Stepchild	Sex of Stepparent	Length	Age
Acceptance	-0.12	-0.17	0.02	-0.02
Control	0.09	0.17	-0.14	0.03
Strictness	-0.05	0.10	-0.07	0.07

The sexes of the stepchild and stepparent were coded 1 for males, 2 for females. The length of time that each stepfamily had lived together was coded in number of years, with

months rounded off to the nearest year. Age of child was coded in years, with months rounded off to the nearest year. As can be seen, there is a small positive, though not significant, correlation between a greater amount of distortion with regard to indirect control and stepmothers.

Table XXXVIII reflects the results of the comparison of the full model (Firm vs. Lax Control factor) with the restricted model obtained when predictor variable X_4 was dropped out. All three groups were considered here.

TABLE XXXVIII

COMPARISON OF FULL MODEL WITH RESTRICTED MODEL
WITH REGARD TO FIRM VS. LAX CONTROL
FACTOR--THREE GROUPS

DF	R^2	F	P
Numerator = 1	Full Model = 0.0112
Denominator = 284	Restricted Model = 0.0111	0.01	0.9112

This comparison for the Firm vs. Lax Control factor produced an insignificant F of only 0.01. The exclusion of the variable which represents sex of parent does not make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of distortion of perceived overt parental control when all three groups are considered together.

Table XXXIX reflects the results of the comparison of the restricted model with the full model for the Firm vs. Lax Control with only stepparents considered.

TABLE XXXIX

COMPARISON OF FULL MODEL WITH RESTRICTED MODEL
WITH REGARD TO FIRM VS. LAX CONTROL
FACTOR--STEPPARENTS ONLY

DF	R ²	F	P
Numerator = 1	Full Model = 0.0161
Denominator = 90	Restricted Model = 0.0099	0.57	0.5422

This comparison produced an F of 0.57, which is not significant at the .05 level. The exclusion of the variable which represents sex of parent does not make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived overt parental control when only stepparents are considered. Therefore, Sub-Hypothesis 5c is rejected. On the basis of the acceptance of Sub-Hypothesis 5b, Hypothesis 5 is accepted. Sex of the stepparent does make a significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived parental behavior with regard to indirect parental control.

Hypothesis 6 states that the length of time that the reconstituted family has lived together will make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived parental behavior as measured by the three CRPBI-R factors. Three sub-hypotheses relate directly to the

distortion on each of those factors. Only the regression model applied to stepparents was used to test this hypothesis. Table XL reflects the results of the comparison of the restricted model, computed when variable X_3 was dropped out, with the full model (shown in Table XXV) for the Acceptance vs. Rejection factor of the CRPBI-R.

TABLE XL

COMPARISON OF FULL MODEL WITH RESTRICTED MODEL
WITH REGARD TO ACCEPTANCE VS. REJECTION
FACTOR--STEPPARENTS ONLY

DF	R^2	F	P
Numerator = 1	Full Model = 0.0462
Denominator = 90	Restricted Model = 0.0461	0.01	0.9101

This comparison produced an F of 0.01, which is not significant at the .05 level. The exclusion of the variable representing the length of time that the stepfamily has lived together does not make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived parental acceptance or rejection as measured by the CRPBI-R. Therefore, Sub-Hypothesis 6a is rejected.

Table XLI reflects the comparison of the full model with the restricted model, computed when variable X_3 is dropped out, as applied to the Psychological Autonomy vs. Psychological Control factor of the CRPBI-R.

TABLE XLI

COMPARISON OF FULL MODEL WITH RESTRICTED MODEL
 WITH REGARD TO PSYCHOLOGICAL AUTONOMY VS.
PSYCHOLOGICAL CONTROL FACTOR--
 STEPPARENTS ONLY

DF	R^2	F	P
Numerator = 1	Full Model = 0.0997
Denominator = 90	Restricted Model = 0.0393	6.04	0.0151

This comparison produced an F of 6.04, which is significant at the .02 level of confidence, .05 confidence level necessary for acceptance of Sub-Hypothesis 6b. The exclusion of the variable which represents length of time the stepfamily has lived together does contribute significantly to the prediction of the distortion of perceived indirect parental control. As Table XXXVII shows, the correlation between length of time together and the amount of distortion with regard to control is a negative one. The longer a stepfamily has lived together, the better the step-parent is able to predict indirect parental control as perceived by the stepchild.

Table XLII reflects the comparison of the full model with the restricted model as applied to the Firm vs. Lax Control factor of the CRPBI-R. In this case variable X_3 has again been dropped out.

This comparison produced an F of 0.11, which does not reach significance. Sub-Hypothesis 6c is rejected on

TABLE XLII
 COMPARISON OF FULL MODEL WITH RESTRICTED MODEL
 WITH REGARD TO FIRM VS. LAX CONTROL
 FACTOR--STEPPARENTS ONLY

DF	R^2	F	P
Numerator = 1	Full Model = 0.0161
Denominator = 90	Restricted Model = 0.0099	0.11	0.7354

The grounds that length of time stepfamily has lived together does not significantly contribute to the prediction of distortion of perceived overt parental control as measured by the Firm vs. Lax Control factor of the CRPBI-R. Hypothesis 6 is, however, accepted on the basis of the acceptance of Sub-Hypothesis 6b. Length of time the stepfamily has lived together does make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of some perceived parental behavior.

Hypothesis 7 states that the age of the child at the time of his entry into the stepfamily will make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of distortion of perceived parental behavior as measured by the CRPBI-R. Three sub-hypotheses relate directly to the distortion present for the three factors of the CRPBI-R. Only the regression model applied to stepparents was used to test this hypothesis. Table XLIII reflects the results of the comparison of the restricted model, computed when variable X_4 was dropped out,

with the full model (shown in Table XXXI) for the Acceptance vs. Rejection factor of the CRPBI-R.

TABLE XLIII

COMPARISON OF FULL MODEL WITH RESTRICTED MODEL
WITH REGARD TO ACCEPTANCE VS. REJECTION
FACTOR--STEPPARENTS ONLY

DF	R^2	F	P
Numerator = 1	Full Model = 0.0462
Denominator = 90	Restricted Model = 0.0461	0.01	0.9101

This comparison produced an F of 0.01, which does not approach significance. The age of the child at the time of his entry into the stepfamily does not make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of distortion of perceived parental acceptance or rejection as measured by the CRPBI-R. Sub-Hypothesis 7a must, therefore, be rejected.

Table XLIV reflects the comparison of the full model with the restricted model, computed when variable X_4 was

TABLE XLIV

COMPARISON OF FULL MODEL WITH RESTRICTED MODEL
WITH REGARD TO PSYCHOLOGICAL AUTONOMY VS.
PSYCHOLOGICAL CONTROL FACTOR--
STEPPARENTS ONLY

DF	R^2	F	P
Numerator = 1	Full Model = 0.0997
Denominator = 90	Restricted Model = 0.0441	5.56	0.0194

dropped out, as applied to the Psychological Autonomy vs. Psychological Control factor of the CRPBI-R.

This comparison produced an F of 5.56, significant at the .02 level; therefore, Sub-Hypothesis 7b is accepted. The age of the child at the time of his entry into the stepfamily does make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived indirect parental control as measured by the Psychological Autonomy vs. Psychological Control factor of the CRPBI-R. In order to determine the nature of the relationship one must refer to Table XXXVII, where it can be seen that there is positive correlation between the amount of distortion and the age of the child at the time of his entry into the stepfamily.

Table XLV reflects the results of a comparison of the full model with the restricted model as applied to the Firm vs. Lax Control factor of the CRPBI-R.

TABLE XLV

COMPARISON OF FULL MODEL WITH RESTRICTED MODEL
WITH REGARD TO FIRM VS. LAX CONTROL
FACTOR--STEPPARENTS ONLY

DF	R^2	F	P
Numerator = 1	Full Model = 0.0161
Denominator = 90	Restricted Model = 0.0149	0.11	0.7354

This comparison produced an F of 0.11, which does not approach significance at the .05 level. Since the age of

the child at the time of his entry into the stepfamily does not contribute significantly to the prediction of the distortion of perceived overt parental control as measured by the CRPBI-R, Sub-Hypothesis 7c must be rejected. However, on the basis of the acceptance of Sub-Hypothesis 7b, Hypothesis 7 is accepted.

Discussion

An examination of the analysis of variance tables reveals data which supported three and rejected two of the sub-hypotheses of Hypothesis 1, which stated that there would be no significant differences with regard to parental attitudes among the groups of natural parents in intact families, natural parents in stepfamilies and stepparents. Because there were significant differences between natural parents in intact families and stepparents on both the Acceptance and Understanding scales of the Parent Attitude Survey, Hypothesis 1 was rejected. Stepparents had lower means on all of the scales, excepting Trust, and significantly lower means on the Acceptance and Understanding scales. In this study stepparents are more likely than natural parents in intact families to be rejecting of childhood behavior, normal developmental changes in the child, aggressiveness in the child, the need for affection, and the need for self-expression. They are also more likely to feel uncomfortable with communication and joint participation with the child in

decision making than are natural parents in intact families. Although natural parents in stepfamilies also had lower means on those two scales than did parents in intact families, the difference was not significant at the .05 level.

With regard to Hypotheses 2 through 7, all were supported to a limited extent by the findings of this study with the exception of Hypotheses 2 and 4. Hypothesis 2 stated that the kind of family, natural or reconstituted, would make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived parental behavior as measured by the CRPBI-R. Tables XV, XVII, and XIX show that kind of family did not have a significant effect on the prediction for any of the three factors of the CRPBI-R when all three of the groups were considered together.

Hypothesis 4 stated that the sex of the child would make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of distortion of perceived parental behavior as measured by the CRPBI-R. Tables XXIV, XXVI, XXVII, XXIX, XXX, and XXXII show that the sex of the child did not have a significant effect on prediction for any of the three factors of the CRPBI-R when all three of the groups were considered together or when stepparents were considered alone.

Hypothesis 3 stated that the kind of parent would make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of distortion of perceived parental behavior as measured by the

CRPBI-R. Table XXI shows that the kind of parent has a significant effect on prediction for the Acceptance vs. Rejection factor of the CRPBI-R. As can be deduced from Table XVIII, there is more misperception among stepparents regarding their children's perceptions of parental acceptance or rejection than among parents from intact families. Since stepparents also differ from natural parents in intact families with regard to attitudes of acceptance and understanding (communication) as was seen in Tables VII and XI, this particular finding is not surprising. Bohanan's (1) report of inaccurate perceptions by stepfathers concerning their relationships with their stepchildren also lends support to this finding.

Hypothesis 5 stated that the sex of the parent or stepparent would make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived parental behavior as measured by the CRPBI-R. Table XXXVI contains data which lends support to this hypothesis. There is an F of 4.33, significant $< .05$ level. In Table XXXVII, the correlation matrix, it can be seen that stepmothers are more likely to misperceive their children's perceptions regarding indirect parental control than are stepfathers. By indirect control is meant those means of controlling one's children through psychological pressure techniques. Further statistical analysis would be necessary to discover whether the

stepmothers over or underestimated their stepchildren's factor scores. However, Bowerman and Irish (2) also found that stepmothers experience some difficulty in the area of discipline and control since their research pointed out the fact that stepmothers are more often than stepfathers accused by their stepchildren of discriminating unfairly against the children.

Hypothesis 6 stated that the length of time that the reconstituted family had lived together would make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of the distortion of perceived parental behavior as measured by the CRPBI-R. Table XLI contains data which lends support to this hypothesis. There is an F of 6.04, significant at a level $< .02$. Table XXXVII shows that the longer length of time is negatively related to the greater amount of distortion on the indirect control factor for stepparents. The longer a stepchild has lived with his stepparent, the better able that stepparent is to predict the child's perceptions with regard to indirect control.

Hypothesis 7 stated that the age of the child at the time of his entry into the stepfamily would make a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of distortion of perceived parental behavior as measured by the CRPBI-R. Table XLIV, concerned with the indirect control factor, shows an F of 5.56, significant at the .02 level, lending support

to this hypothesis. Table XXXVII allows one to see what kind of relationship exists between age of child and amount of distortion. The relationship is a positive one, meaning that the older the child at the time of his entry into the stepfamily, the greater the distortion of perceived indirect parental control. This finding is supported somewhat by the investigation of Bowerman and Irish (2), who found that younger children accepted a stepparent more than older children and by Duberman (3) who found that the younger the stepchild, the better the stepmother-stepchild relationship.

Hypotheses 5, 6, and 7 were all accepted because of greater distortion by one of the groups on the Psychological Autonomy vs. Psychological Control factor of the CRPBI-R. This is the factor dealing with psychological pressure techniques applied by the parent in order to control the child. It is the most negative of the three factors with regard to the statement of its items, and a high factor score here indicates a high degree of indirect control through guilt, hostility, instilling persistent anxiety, hostile detachment, and withdrawal of relations by the parent. In all cases the greater distortion was on the part of stepfamilies, generally between stepparents' and stepchildren's perceptions, although longer time together did tend to alleviate some of the misperception, as did entry into the stepfamily at an earlier age.

It should be pointed out that none of the variables accounted for more than five per cent of the variance in either of the two regression models, leaving the majority of the variance unaccounted for. This is evident upon an examination of Tables XIV and XVI. This means that the variables used, although they can be used to predict distortion in some facets of perceived parental behavior, are not extremely good ones. There may be better ones, such as the reason for remarriage eligibility (death or divorce), the kind of relationship (satisfactory or unsatisfactory) of the child and the previous parent, or the presence in the stepfamily of natural children born to the new remarriage, or it may be that most of the distortion must be accounted for by individual differences.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bohanan, Paul, National Institute of Mental Health Report, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D. C., 1977.
2. Bowerman, Charles E. and Donald Irish, "Some Relationships of Stepchildren to Their Parents," Marriage and Family Living, XXIV(May, 1962), 113-121.
3. Duberman, Lucille, "Step-Kin Relationships," Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXV(May, 1973), 283-292.
4. Ferguson, George, Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1971.
5. Hereford, Carl F., Changing Parental Attitudes Through Group Discussion, Austin, Texas, University of Texas Press, 1963.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Most of the studies which have involved parent attitudes have focused on the effects of varying attitudes upon children. Heilbrun and Tiemeyer (12), Clapp (8), and Ausubel, et al. (2) have all found parental acceptance and support to be positively related to favorable social and emotional development in children. Parental communicativeness has been found by Walsh (19) and Baumrind (3) to be important to the development of competent children. Extreme parental authoritarianism and punitiveness have been linked by Becker (4), Moore (14), Armentrout (1), and Lang (13) to aggressiveness or dependency, lack of inner controls, and generally inappropriate social behavior in children. Cox (9), Serot and Teevan (17), and Yarrow and Campbell (22) have all emphasized the importance of the child's perceptions of his parents' child rearing attitudes, since it is this perception which will ultimately affect the child's development.

Early investigations concerning stepparents by White (20) and Pflieger (16), those not controlled for social class, such as that of Smith (18), and those concerned with clinic populations, such as the Fast and Cain (11) study, have concluded that anxiety, marital discord, childhood disturbance,

and family disorganization are all a part of the existence of the stepfamily. More recent studies and those involving non-clinic populations such as those by Bernard (5), Nye (15), Burchinal (7), and Wilson (21) have reported little difference in stepchildren and those from intact families with regard to social and emotional stability. Studies investigating factors involved in the stepparent-stepchild relationship, those of Bowerman and Irish (6) and Duberman (10), have found age and sex of the stepchild and sex of the stepparent to be important. The reason for the remarriage eligibility of the child's natural parent (death or divorce) was also found to be an important factor in the relationship between stepparent and stepchild, but the investigators obtained conflicting results concerning this.

In general, recent studies have indicated that the majority of reconstituted families are reasonably successful in their adjustment, although there are some factors which affect the relationship of stepchildren and stepparents. There has been no study found which directly investigated the child rearing attitudes of stepparents, attitudes deemed so important by researchers of parental attitudes.

This investigation concerned childrearing attitudes of natural and stepparents and differences in perceived parental behavior patterns within reconstituted and intact families. The purposes of the study were (1) to compare the childrearing attitudes of natural parents in intact families,

natural parents in reconstituted families, and stepparents and (2) to discover whether the three groups differ in their ability to predict their children's or stepchildren's perceptions of parental behavior.

The subjects who participated in this study were fifty children and their parents from intact families, ninety-four stepchildren and their stepparents, and ninety-four natural parents of those stepchildren. These ninety-four natural parents were the spouses of the stepparents involved. All had volunteered to complete the test instruments in one and one-half hour sessions.

Test data consisted of parents' scores on each of the five scales of the Parent Attitude Survey, children's factor scores on the CRPBI-R, and parents' factor scores on the CRPBI-R. Demographic data gathered for use as variables included the age of the child at the time of his entry into the stepfamily and the length of time that the stepfamily had lived together.

One-way analysis of variance design was employed to test Hypothesis 1, comparing the differences among the three groups on each of the five scales of the Parent Attitude Survey. If an F was obtained which was significant at the .05 level or beyond, the Scheffé test of multiple comparison was used to find which groups were different.

Two multiple linear regression models were used to test Hypotheses 2 through 7, which were concerned with the factors

important to the prediction of the distortion of perceived parental behavior. Distortion was the dependent variable and was defined as the difference between the child's factor scores and the parent's factor scores on the CRPBI-R. The independent variables in the first regression model, applied to all three groups of stepparents, natural parents in reconstituted families, and natural parents in intact families, were kind of family, kind of parent, sex of parent, and sex of child. The independent variables in the second regression model applied to stepparents only were sex of stepchild, sex of stepparent, length of time that the stepfamily had lived together, and age of child at the time of his entry into the stepfamily. An F was calculated to show if a unique, significant contribution was made by any of the independent variables to the prediction of the dependent variable. The regression models were employed three times for each of the main hypotheses, once for each of the three factor score differences on the CRPBI-R: Acceptance vs. Rejection, Psychological Autonomy vs. Psychological Control, and Firm vs. Lax Control.

The analysis of variance data resulted in the rejection of Hypothesis 1, which predicted no differences in the three groups with regard to childrearing attitudes. There were significant differences on the Acceptance and Understanding scales of the Parent Attitude Survey between stepparents and parents from intact families. Stepparents were more likely to be less accepting of childhood behavior,

aggressiveness, needs for affection, and self-expression on the part of the child. They were also more likely to avoid communication and joint decision making with the child.

The multiple linear regression analysis supported to a limited extent all of the remaining hypotheses with the exception of Hypothesis 2, which stated that the kind of family would contribute to the prediction of distortion of perceived parental behavior, and Hypothesis 4, which stated the sex of the child/stepchild would contribute to the prediction of distortion of perceived parental behavior.

Hypothesis 3, which stated that the kind of parent would significantly contribute to the prediction of distortion of perceived parental behavior, was supported in that kind of parent affected the distortion of parental acceptance or rejection as measured by the Acceptance vs. Rejection factor of the CRPBI-R.

Hypothesis 5, which stated that the sex of the parent/stepparent would contribute significantly to the prediction of the distortion of perceived parental behavior, gained some measure of support in that sex of the stepparent contributed significantly to the prediction of the distortion of indirect control as measured by the Psychological Autonomy vs. Psychological Control factor of the CRPBI-R.

Hypothesis 6, which stated that the length of time living together in a stepfamily would contribute

significantly to the prediction of distortion, also gained support in that the length of time a stepparent and stepchild had lived together did affect the amount of distortion of indirect parental control as measured by the Psychological Autonomy vs. Psychological Control factor of the CRPBI-R.

Hypothesis 7, which stated that the age of the stepchild at the time of his entry into the stepfamily would contribute significantly to the prediction of the distortion of perceived parental behavior, gained some measure of support since age did contribute to the prediction of distortion of perceived indirect parental control as measured by the Psychological Autonomy vs. Psychological Control factor of the CRPBI-R.

Stepparents and stepchildren were more likely than natural parents and natural children to produce higher distortion on parental acceptance or rejection. Stepmothers and stepchildren were more likely than stepfathers and stepchildren to produce higher distortion levels on indirect parental control. Distortion level was lower the longer the stepparent and stepchild had lived together and the younger the child at the time he entered the stepfamily.

Conclusions

The following conclusions are presented as a result of the findings of this study.

1. The stepparents in this study were more likely to have childrearing attitudes lower in acceptance and willingness to communicate than natural parents in intact families.
2. Stepparents were less able to predict their stepchildren's perceptions of parental acceptance or rejection than natural parents.
3. Stepfathers were better able to predict their stepchildren's perceptions of indirect parental control than stepmothers.
4. Ability to predict one's stepchild's perceptions of indirect parental control increased the longer the stepfamily had lived together.
5. Ability to predict one's stepchild's perceptions of indirect parental control was better if the stepchild was of a young age at the time of his entry into the stepfamily.
6. Since only one to five per cent of the variance was accounted for by all of the predictor variables, it must be concluded that either there are better predictor variables than the ones used here, or that most of the distortion should be accounted for by individual differences in parents and families.

Recommendations

On the basis of the findings of this investigation, the following recommendations are made.

1. Since the sample in this study was suburban, middle class; and parental attitudes have been shown to vary with social class, further research might extend into other social and economic classes.

2. In addition, a wider sample with more predictor variables might add greater predictability. Specifically, these might include age of stepparent, education of stepparent, presence in the stepfamily of natural children of the new remarriage, and reason for remarriage eligibility of natural parent (death or divorce), which could not be included here because of a lack of those parents whose former spouses had died.

3. Since this sample included only elementary aged children, further research should include older and younger children.

4. Stated parental attitudes, such as those measured by the Parent Attitude Survey, may also vary with sex and age of stepparent, presence of natural children of the remarriage, and age of the stepchild at the time of his entry into the stepfamily, as well as other variables. Further research might provide enlightenment in this area.

5. Because this study was concerned with prediction of children's perceptions, whatever they might be, it left unanswered many questions dealing with whether stepparents' actual behavior is more or less controlling or accepting than that of natural parents. Further research will add to the data in this area.
6. Finally, longitudinal research is most important if family therapists are ever to gain insight into the quickly growing phenomenon of stepfamilies.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Armentrout, J. A., "Parental Child-Rearing Attitudes and Preadolescents' Problem Behaviors," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, XXVII(March, 1971), 278-285.
2. Ausubel, D. P., E. E. Balthazer, I. Rosenthal, L. S. Blackman, S. H. Schpoont, and J. Welkowitz, "Perceived Parent Attitudes as Determinants of Children's Ego Structure," Child Development, XXV(March, 1954), 173-183.
3. Baumrind, D., "Child Practices Anteceding Three Patterns of Preschool Behavior," Genetic Psychology Monographs, CXXV(1967), 345-388.
4. Becker, W. C., "The Relationship of Factors in Parental Ratings of Self and Each Other to the Behavior of Kindergarten Children as Rated by Mothers, Fathers, and Teachers," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XXIV(November, 1960), 507-527.
5. Bernard, J., Remarriage: A Study in Marriage, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1956.
6. Bowerman, C. E. and D. P. Irish, "Some Relationships of Stepchildren to Their Parents," Marriage and Family Living, XXIV(May, 1962), 113-121.
7. Burchinal, L. G., "Characteristics of Adolescents From Broken, Unbroken, and Reconstituted Families," Marriage and Family Living, XXVI(February, 1964), 44-50.
8. Clapp, W. F., "Dependence and Competence in Children: Parental Treatment of Four-Year-Old Boys," Dissertation Abstracts, XXVIII(1967), 1703.
9. Cox, S. H., "Intrafamily Comparison of Loving-Rejecting Child-Rearing Practices," Child Development, XCI(June, 1970), 437-448.
10. Duberman, L., "Step-Kin Relationships," Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXV(May, 1973), 283-292.

APPENDIX I

APPENDIX II

11. Fast, I. and A. C. Cain, "The Stepparent Role: Potential for Disturbance in Family Functioning," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, XXXVI(August, 1966), 485-491.
12. Heilbrun, A. B. and E. B. Tiemeyer, "Relationships Between Perceived Maternal Child Rearing Experiences and Projective Responses to Censure-Control Cues in Normal Males," Journal of Genetic Psychology, CXII(January, 1968), 3-14.
13. Lang, L. H., "Responsibility as a Function of Authority in Family Relations," Dissertation Abstracts, XXIX(1969), 3668-3669.
14. Moore, J. E., "Antecedents of Dependency and Autonomy in Young Children," Dissertation Abstracts, XXVI (1965), 1966.
15. Nye, Ivan, "Child Adjustment in Broken and Unhappy, Unbroken Homes," Marriage and Family Living, XIX (1957), 356-361.
16. Pflieger, J., "The Wicked Stepmother in a Child Guidance Clinic," Smith College Studies in Social Work, XVII(March, 1947), 125-126.
17. Serot, N. M. and R. C. Teevan, "Perception of the Parent-Child Relationship and Its Relation to Child Adjustment," Child Development, XXXII(May, 1961), 373-378.
18. Smith, W., The Stepchild, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1953.
19. Walsh, R. P., "Parental Rejecting Attitudes and Control in Children," Journal of Clinical Psychology, XXIV (February, 1968), 185-186.
20. White, A. M., "Factors Making for Difficulty in the Stepparent Relationship with Children," Smith College Studies in Social Work, XIV(April, 1943), 242.
21. Wilson, K. L., L. Zurcher, and D. McAdams, "Stepfathers and Stepchildren: An Exploratory Analysis from Two National Surveys," Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXVII(August, 1975), 526-536.
22. Yarrow, M. R. and J. D. Campbell, "Person Perception in Children," Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, IX(Spring, 1963), 57-72.

APPENDIX III

Dear Parent,

There is a study being done at this time to find out if there are differences in natural parents and stepparents with regard to child rearing attitudes and behavior. If you would like to be a part of this study, please call 267-0340 and leave your name, address, and telephone number. Also, tell the operator whether yours is a family with at least one stepparent or whether there are only two natural parents. You will be contacted again by phone if you are chosen to take part in this study.

The study itself will only take a small portion of your time, during which you will be asked to complete an attitude survey and a behavior questionnaire. These will be completed at a location convenient to you.

This study is being done by

Judith Ann Keith
Counselor and Associate Professor of Psychology
Tarrant County Junior College, Northeast Campus
North Texas State University Doctoral Student

* The cooperation of the school district with this study does not constitute an endorsement.

APPENDIX IV

Dear Parent,

There is a study being done at this time to find out if there are differences in natural parents and stepparents with regard to child rearing attitudes and behavior. If you would like to be a part of this study, please fill out the bottom portion of this sheet and return it to your child's school. You will be contacted by phone if you are chosen to take part in this study.

The study itself will only take a small portion of your time, during which you will be asked to complete an attitude survey and a behavior questionnaire. These will be completed at a location convenient to you.

This study is being done by

Judith Ann Keith
Counselor and Associate Professor, Psychology
Tarrant County Junior College, Northeast Campus
North Texas State University Doctoral Student

Last Name of Family _____
Check here if yours is a family with at least one
stepparent _____
Check here if yours is a family with no stepparents, only
two natural parents _____
Phone number of family _____
Address of family _____

PLEASE RETURN BY FRIDAY OF THIS WEEK.

5. The earlier a child is weaned from its emotional ties to its parents the better it will handle its own problems. A a u d D
6. Most of the time giving advice to children is a waste of time because they either don't take it or don't need it. A a u d D
7. It is hard to let children go and visit people because they might misbehave when parents aren't around. A a u d D
8. Fewer people are doing a good job of child-rearing now than 30 years ago. A a u d D
9. With all a child hears at school and from friends, there's little a parent can do to influence him. A a u d D
10. If a little girl is a tomboy, her mother should try to get her interested in dolls and playing house. A a u d D
11. A child has a right to his own point of view and ought to be allowed to express it, just as parents express theirs. A a u d D
12. If children are quiet for a while you should immediately find out why. A a u d D
13. It's a rare parent who can be even-tempered with the children all day. A a u d D
14. Psychologists now know that what a child is born with determines the kind of person he becomes. A a u d D
15. One reason that it is sad to see children grow up is because they need you more when they are babies. A a u d D
16. The trouble with trying to understand children's problems is they usually just make up a lot of stories to keep you interested. A a u d D

17. A mother has a right to know everything going on in her child's life because her child is a part of her. A a u d D
18. Most parents aren't sure what is the best way to bring up children. A a u d D
19. A child may learn to be a juvenile delinquent from playing games like cops and robbers and war too much. A a u d D
20. There is no reason why a child should not learn to keep his clothes clean very early in life. A a u d D
21. If a parent sees that a child is right and the parent is wrong, they should admit it and try to do something about it. A a u d D
22. A child should be allowed to try out what it can do at times without the parents watching. A a u d D
23. It's hard to know what to do when a child is afraid of something that won't hurt him. A a u d D
24. Most all children are just the same at birth; it's what happens to them afterwards that is important. A a u d D
25. Playing with a baby too much should be avoided since it excites them and they won't sleep. A a u d D
26. Children shouldn't be asked to do all the compromising without a chance to express their side of things. A a u d D
27. Parents should make it their business to know everything their children are thinking. A a u d D
28. Raising children isn't as hard as most parents let on. A a u d D
29. There are many things that influence a young child that parents don't understand and can't do anything about. A a u d D

30. A child who wants too much affection may become a "softie" if it is given to him. A a u d D
31. Family life would be happier if parents made children feel they were free to say what they think about anything. A a u d D
32. Children must be told exactly what to do and how to do it or they will make mistakes. A a u d D
33. Parents sacrifice most of their fun for their children. A a u d D
34. Many times parents are punished for their own sins through the bad behavior of their children. A a u d D
35. If you put too many restrictions on a child, you will stunt his personality. A a u d D
36. Most children's fears are so unreasonable it only makes things worse to let the child talk about them. A a u d D
37. It is hard to know when to let boys and girls pal together when they can't be seen. A a u d D
38. I feel I am faced with more problems than most parents. A a u d D
39. Most of the bad traits children have (like nervousness or bad temper) are inherited. A a u d D
40. A child who misbehaves should be made to feel guilty and ashamed of himself. A a u d D
41. Family conferences, which include the children, don't usually accomplish much. A a u d D
42. It's a parent's duty to make sure he knows a child's innermost thoughts. A a u d D
43. It's hard to know whether to be playful rather than dignified with children. A a u d D

44. A child that comes from bad stock
doesn't have much chance of amounting
to anything. A a u d D
45. A child should be weaned away from the
bottle or breast as soon as possible. A a u d D
46. There's a lot of truth in the saying,
"Children should be seen and not heard." A a u d D
47. If rules are not closely enforced,
children will misbehave and get into
trouble. A a u d D
48. Children don't realize that it mainly
takes suffering to be a good parent. A a u d D
49. Some children are so naturally head-
strong that a parent can't really do
much about them. A a u d D
50. One thing I cannot stand is a child's
constantly wanting to be held. A a u d D
51. A child's ideas should be seriously
considered in making family decisions. A a u d D
52. More parents should make it their job
to know everything their child is
doing. A a u d D
53. Few parents have to face the problems
I find with my children. A a u d D
54. Why children behave the way they do is
too much for anyone to figure out. A a u d D
55. When a boy is cowardly, he should be
forced to try things he is afraid of. A a u d D
56. If you let children talk about their
troubles they end up complaining even
more. A a u d D
57. An alert parent should try to learn
all his child's thoughts. A a u d D
58. It's hard to know when to make a rule
and stick by it. A a u d D

59. Not even psychologists understand exactly why children act the way they do. A a u d D
60. Children should be toilet-trained at the earliest possible time. A a u d D
61. A child should always accept the decision of his parents. A a u d D
62. Children have a right to activities which do not include their parents. A a u d D
63. A parent has to suffer much and say little. A a u d D
64. If a child is born bad there's not much you can do about it. A a u d D
65. There's no acceptable excuse for a child hitting another child. A a u d D
66. Children should have a share in making family decisions just as the grown-ups do. A a u d D
67. Children who are not watched will get in trouble. A a u d D
68. It's hard to know what healthy sex ideas are. A a u d D
69. A child is destined to be a certain kind of person no matter what the parents do. A a u d D
70. It's a parent's right to refuse to put up with a child's annoyances. A a u d D
71. Talking with a child about his fears most often makes the fear look more important than it is. A a u d D
72. Children have no right to keep anything from their parents. A a u d D
73. Raising children is a nerve-wracking job. A a u d D
74. Some children are just naturally bad. A a u d D

75. A child should be taught to avoid fighting no matter what happens. A a u d D
76. Children don't try to understand their parents. A a u d D
77. A child should never keep a secret from his parents. A a u d D

PARENT ATTITUDE SURVEY SCORING KEY
CONFIDENCE SCALE

Item Number	Item Direction*
1**	
3	-
8	-
13	-
18	-
23	-
28	+
33	-
38	-
43	-
48	-
53	-
58	-
63	-
68	-
73	-

*A plus sign indicates that agreement with the statement receives a positive score; a minus sign indicates that agreement with the statement receives a negative score. The extremes of this five-point scale are scored +2 or -2, depending on the item direction. Agree and Disagree choices are scored +1 or -1; Undecided is scored 0. The algebraic sum of the item scores in each area serves as the scale score for that area.

**Buffer item; not scored.

PARENT ATTITUDE SURVEY SCORING KEY
CAUSATION SCALE

Item Number	Item Direction
4	-
9	-
14	-
19	-
24	+
29	-
34	-
39	-
44	-
49	-
54	-
59	-
64	-
69	-
74	-

PARENT ATTITUDE SURVEY SCORING KEY
ACCEPTANCE SCALE

Item Number	Item Direction
2*	
10	-
15	-
20	-
25	-
30	-
35	+
40	-
45	-
50	-
55	-
60	-
65	-
70	-
75	-

*Buffer item; not scored

PARENT ATTITUDE SURVEY SCORING KEY
UNDERSTANDING SCALE

Item Number	Item Direction
6	-
11	+
16	-
21	+
26	+
31	+
36	-
41	-
46	-
51	+
56	-
61	-
66	+
71	-
76	-

PARENT ATTITUDE SURVEY SCORING KEY
TRUST SCALE

Item Number	Item Direction
7	-
12	-
17	-
22	+
27	-
32	-
37	-
42	-
47	-
52	-
57	-
62	+
67	-
72	-
77	-

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE
NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

PARENT BEHAVIOR INVENTORY

INSTRUCTIONS

We are interested in learning more about the different experiences people have had in their families. We are, therefore, asking a number of people to report their experiences during childhood.

would have around the age of sixteen. If you did not grow up with your real mother or father, but someone took the place of that parent in your life, please describe that person.

If you are under sixteen and have lived at home up to this time, answer the questions as they describe what happens there. If you left home before the age of sixteen, answer as you would have before you left home. If you are over sixteen and have always lived at home up to that time, answer as you

First answer the questions about yourself and your family listed on the next page. Then read each item on the following pages and circle the answer that most closely describes the way each of your parents acts toward you. BE SURE TO MARK EACH ITEM FOR EACH PARENT.

If you think the item is LIKE your parent, circle L.

If you think the item is SOMEWHAT LIKE your parent, circle SL.

If you think the item is NOT LIKE your parent, circle NL.

Form for Father	Like	Some- what Like	Not Like
Makes me feel better after talking over my worries with him.	L	SL	NL
Likes to talk to me and be with me much of the time.	L	SL	NL
Isn't very patient with me.	L	SL	NL
Sees to it that I know exactly what I may or may not do.	L	SL	NL
Says I'm very good natured.	L	SL	NL
Wants to know exactly where I am and what I am doing.	L	SL	NL
Decides what friends I can go around with.	L	SL	NL
Soon forgets a rule he has made.	L	SL	NL
Doesn't mind if I kid him about things.	L	SL	NL
Is easy with me.	L	SL	NL
Doesn't talk with me very much.	L	SL	NL
Will not talk to me when I displease him.	L	SL	NL
Seems to see my good points more than my faults.	L	SL	NL
Doesn't let me go places because something might happen to me.	L	SL	NL
Thinks my ideas are silly.	L	SL	NL
Is very strict with me.	L	SL	NL
Tells me I'm good looking.	L	SL	NL
Feels hurt when I don't follow advice.	L	SL	NL
Is always telling me how I should behave.	L	SL	NL
Usually doesn't find out about my misbehavior.	L	SL	NL
Enjoys it when I bring friends to my home.	L	SL	NL
Worries about how I will turn out, because he takes anything bad I do seriously.	L	SL	NL
Spends very little time with me.	L	SL	NL
Allows me to go out as often as I please.	L	SL	NL
Almost always speaks to me with a warm and friendly voice.	L	SL	NL
Is always thinking of things that will please me.	L	SL	NL
Says I'm a big problem.	L	SL	NL
Believes in having a lot of rules and sticking to them.	L	SL	NL
Tells me how much he loves me.	L	SL	NL
Is always checking on what I've been doing at school or at play.	L	SL	NL
Keeps reminding me about things I am not allowed to do.	L	SL	NL

Punishes me for doing something one day, but ignores it the next.	L	SL	NL
Allows me to tell him if I think my ideas are better than his.	L	SL	NL
Lets me off easy when I do something wrong.	L	SL	NL
Almost never brings me a surprise or present.	L	SL	NL
Sometimes when he disapproves, doesn't say anything but is cold and distant for a while.	L	SL	NL
Understands my problems and my worries.	L	SL	NL
Seems to regret that I am growing up and am spending more time away from home.	L	SL	NL
Forgets to help me when I need it.	L	SL	NL
Sticks to a rule instead of allowing a lot of exceptions.	L	SL	NL
Likes to talk about what he has read with me.	L	SL	NL
Thinks I'm not grateful when I don't obey.	L	SL	NL
Tells me exactly how to do my work.	L	SL	NL
Doesn't pay much attention to my misbehavior.	L	SL	NL
Likes me to choose my own way to do things.	L	SL	NL
If I break a promise, doesn't trust me again for a long time.	L	SL	NL
Doesn't seem to think of me very often.	L	SL	NL
Doesn't tell me what time to be home when I go out.	L	SL	NL
Enjoys talking things over with me.	L	SL	NL
Gives me a lot of care and attention.	L	SL	NL
Sometimes wishes he didn't have any children.	L	SL	NL
Believes that all my bad behavior should be punished in some way.	L	SL	NL
Hugs and kisses me often.	L	SL	NL
Asks me to tell everything that happens when I'm away from home.	L	SL	NL
Doesn't forget very quickly the things I do wrong.	L	SL	NL
Sometimes allows me to do things that he says are wrong.	L	SL	NL
Wants me to tell him about it if I don't like the way he treats me.	L	SL	NL
Can't say no to anything I want.	L	SL	NL
Thinks I am just someone to "put up with."	L	SL	NL
Speaks to me in a cold, matter-of-fact voice when I offend him.	L	SL	NL

Enjoys going on drives, trips or visits with me.	L	SL	NL
Worries about me when I'm away.	L	SL	NL
Forgets to get me things I need.	L	SL	NL
Gives hard punishments.	L	SL	NL
Feels hurt by the things I do.	L	SL	NL
Tells me how to spend my free time.	L	SL	NL
Doesn't insist that I do my homework.	L	SL	NL
Lets me help to decide how to do things we're working on.	L	SL	NL
Says some day I'll be punished for my bad behavior.	L	SL	NL
Doesn't seem to enjoy doing things with me.	L	SL	NL
Gives me as much freedom as I want.	L	SL	NL
Smiles at me very often.	L	SL	NL
Often gives up something to get something for me.	L	SL	NL
Is always getting after me.	L	SL	NL
Sees to it that I'm on time coming home from school or for meals.	L	SL	NL
Tries to treat me as an equal.	L	SL	NL
Keeps a careful check on me to make sure I have the right kind of friends.	L	SL	NL
Keeps after me about finishing my work.	L	SL	NL
Depends upon his mood whether a rule is enforced or not.	L	SL	NL
Makes me feel free when I'm with him.	L	SL	NL
Excuses my bad conduct.	L	SL	NL
Doesn't show that he loves me.	L	SL	NL
Is less friendly with me if I don't see things his way.	L	SL	NL
Is able to make me feel better when I am upset.	L	SL	NL
Becomes very involved in my life.	L	SL	NL
Almost always complains about what I do.	L	SL	NL
Punishes me when I don't obey.	L	SL	NL
Always listens to my ideas and opinions.	L	SL	NL
Tells me how much he has suffered for me.	L	SL	NL
Would like to be able to tell me what to do all the time.	L	SL	NL
Doesn't check up to see whether I have done what he told me.	L	SL	NL
Asks me what I think about how we should do things.	L	SL	NL
Thinks and talks about my misbehavior long after it's over.	L	SL	NL
Doesn't share many activities with me.	L	SL	NL
Lets me go any place I please without asking.	L	SL	NL

Enjoys doing things with me.	L	SL	NL
Makes me feel like the most important person in his life.	L	SL	NL
Gets cross and angry about little things I do.	L	SL	NL
Believes in punishing me to correct and improve my manners.	L	SL	NL
Often has long talks with me about the causes and reasons for things.	L	SL	NL
Wants to know with whom I've been when I've been out.	L	SL	NL
Is unhappy that I'm not better in school than I am.	L	SL	NL
Only keeps rules when it suits him.	L	SL	NL
Really wants me to tell him just how I feel about things.	L	SL	NL
Lets me stay up late if I keep asking.	L	SL	NL
Almost never goes on Sunday drives or picnics with me.	L	SL	NL
Will avoid looking at me when I've disappointed him.	L	SL	NL
Enjoys working with me in the house or yard.	L	SL	NL
Usually makes me the center of his attention at home.	L	SL	NL
Often blows his top when I bother him.	L	SL	NL
Almost always punishes me in some way when I am bad.	L	SL	NL
Often praises me.	L	SL	NL
Says if I loved him, I'd do what he wants me to do.	L	SL	NL
Gets cross and nervous when I'm noisy around the house.	L	SL	NL
Seldom insists that I do anything.	L	SL	NL
Tries to understand how I see things.	L	SL	NL
Says that some day I'll be sorry that I wasn't better as a child.	L	SL	NL
Complains that I get on his nerves.	L	SL	NL
Lets me dress in any way I please.	L	SL	NL
Comforts me when I'm afraid.	L	SL	NL
Enjoys staying at home with me more than going out with friends.	L	SL	NL
Doesn't work with me.	L	SL	NL
Insists that I must do exactly as I'm told.	L	SL	NL
Encourages me to read.	L	SL	NL
Asks other people what I do away from home.	L	SL	NL
Loses his temper with me when I don't help around the house.	L	SL	NL

Frequently changes the rules I am supposed to follow.	L	SL	NL
Allows me to have friends at my home often.	L	SL	NL
Does not insist I obey if I complain or protest.	L	SL	NL
Hardly notices when I am good at home or at school.	L	SL	NL
If I take someone else's side in an argument, is cold and distant to me.	L	SL	NL
Cheers me up when I am sad.	L	SL	NL
Does not approve of my spending a lot of time away from home.	L	SL	NL
Doesn't get me things unless I ask over and over again.	L	SL	NL
Sees to it that I obey when he tells me something.	L	SL	NL
Tells me where to find out more about things I want to know.	L	SL	NL
Tells me of all the things he has done for me.	L	SL	NL
Wants to control whatever I do.	L	SL	NL
Does not bother to enforce rules.	L	SL	NL
Makes me feel at ease when I'm with him.	L	SL	NL
Thinks that any misbehavior is very serious and will have future consequences.	L	SL	NL
Is always finding fault with me.	L	SL	NL
Allows me to spend my money in any way I like.	L	SL	NL
Often speaks of the good things I do.	L	SL	NL
Makes his whole life center about his children.	L	SL	NL
Doesn't seem to know what I need or want.	L	SL	NL
Sees to it that I keep my clothes neat, clean, and in order.	L	SL	NL
Is happy to see me when I come from school or play.	L	SL	NL
Questions me in detail about what my friends and I discuss.	L	SL	NL
Doesn't give me any peace until I do what he says.	L	SL	NL
Insists I follow a rule one day and then forgets about it the next.	L	SL	NL
Gives me the choice of what to do whenever possible.	L	SL	NL
I can talk him out of an order, if I complain.	L	SL	NL
Often makes fun of me.	L	SL	NL

If I've hurt his feelings, stops talking to me until I please him again.	L	SL	NL
Has a good time at home with me.	L	SL	NL
Worries that I can't take care of myself unless he is around.	L	SL	NL
Acts as though I'm in the way.	L	SL	NL
If I do the least little thing that I shouldn't, punishes me.	L	SL	NL
Hugged or kissed me goodnight when I was small.	L	SL	NL
Says if I really cared for him, I would not do things that cause him to worry.	L	SL	NL
Is always trying to change me.	L	SL	NL
Lets me get away without doing work I had been given to do.	L	SL	NL
Is easy to talk to.	L	SL	NL
Says that sooner or later we always pay for bad behavior.	L	SL	NL
Wishes I were a different kind of person.	L	SL	NL
Lets me go out any evening I want.	L	SL	NL
Seems proud of the things I do.	L	SL	NL
Spends almost all of his free time with his children.	L	SL	NL
Tells me to quit "hanging around the house" and go somewhere.	L	SL	NL
I have certain jobs to do and am not allowed to do anything else until they are done.	L	SL	NL
Is very interested in what I am learning at school.	L	SL	NL
Almost always wants to know who phoned me or wrote to me and what they said.	L	SL	NL
Doesn't like the way I act at home.	L	SL	NL
Changes his mind to make things easier for himself.	L	SL	NL
Lets me do things that other children my age do.	L	SL	NL
Can be talked into things easily.	L	SL	NL
Often seems glad to get away from me for a while.	L	SL	NL
When I upset him, won't have anything to do with me until I find a way to make up.	L	SL	NL
Isn't interested in changing me, but likes me as I am.	L	SL	NL
Wishes I would stay at home where he could take care of me.	L	SL	NL
Makes me feel I'm not loved.	L	SL	NL
Has more rules than I can remember, so is often punishing me.	L	SL	NL
Says I make him happy.	L	SL	NL

When I don't do as he wants, says I'm not grateful for all he has done for me.	L	SL	NL
Doesn't let me decide things for myself.	L	SL	NL
Lets me get away with a lot of things.	L	SL	NL
Tries to be a friend rather than a boss.	L	SL	NL
Will talk to me again and again about anything bad I do.	L	SL	NL
Is never interested in meeting or talk- ing with my friends.	L	SL	NL
Lets me do anything I like to do.	L	SL	NL

NIH-71 (Formerly PHS-4092)
Rev. 1-64

Form for Mother	Like	Some- what Like	Not Like
Makes me feel better after talking over my worries with her.	L	SL	NL
Likes to talk to me and be with me much of the time.	L	SL	NL
Isn't very patient with me.	L	SL	NL
Sees to it that I know exactly what I may or may not do.	L	SL	NL
Says I'm very good natured.	L	SL	NL
Wants to know exactly where I am and what I am doing.	L	SL	NL
Decides what friends I can go around with.	L	SL	NL
Soon forgets a rule she has made.	L	SL	NL
Doesn't mind if I kid her about things.	L	SL	NL
Is easy with me.	L	SL	NL
Doesn't talk with me very much.	L	SL	NL
Will not talk to me when I displease her.	L	SL	NL
Seems to see my good points more than my faults.	L	SL	NL
Doesn't let me go places because something might happen to me.	L	SL	NL
Thinks my ideas are silly.	L	SL	NL
Is very strict with me.	L	SL	NL
Tells me I'm good looking.	L	SL	NL
Feels hurt when I don't follow advice.	L	SL	NL
Is always telling me how I should behave.	L	SL	NL
Usually doesn't find out about my misbehavior.	L	SL	NL
Enjoys it when I bring friends to my home.	L	SL	NL
Worries about how I will turn out, because she takes anything bad I do seriously.	L	SL	NL
Spends very little time with me.	L	SL	NL
Allows me to go out as often as I please.	L	SL	NL
Almost always speaks to me with a warm and friendly voice.	L	SL	NL
Is always thinking of things that will please me.	L	SL	NL
Says I'm a big problem.	L	SL	NL
Believes in having a lot of rules and sticking to them.	L	SL	NL
Tells me how much she loves me.	L	SL	NL
Is always checking on what I've been doing at school or at play.	L	SL	NL
Keeps reminding me about things I am not allowed to do.	L	SL	NL
Punishes me for doing something one day, but ignores it the next.	L	SL	NL

Allows me to tell her if I think my ideas are better than hers.	L	SL	NL
Lets me off easy when I do something wrong.	L	SL	NL
Almost never brings me a surprise or present.	L	SL	NL
Sometimes when she disapproves, doesn't say anything but is cold and distant for a while.	L	SL	NL
Understands my problems and my worries.	L	SL	NL
Seems to regret that I am growing up and am spending more time away from home.	L	SL	NL
Forgets to help me when I need it.	L	SL	NL
Sticks to a rule instead of allowing a lot of exceptions.	L	SL	NL
Likes to talk about what she has read with me.	L	SL	NL
Thinks I'm not grateful when I don't obey.	L	SL	NL
Tells me exactly how to do my work.	L	SL	NL
Doesn't pay much attention to my misbehavior.	L	SL	NL
Likes me to choose my own way to do things.	L	SL	NL
If I break a promise, doesn't trust me again for a long time.	L	SL	NL
Doesn't seem to think of me very often.	L	SL	NL
Doesn't tell me what time to be home when I go out.	L	SL	NL
Enjoys talking things over with me.	L	SL	NL
Gives me a lot of care and attention.	L	SL	NL
Sometimes wishes she didn't have any children.	L	SL	NL
Believes that all my bad behavior should be punished in some way.	L	SL	NL
Hugs and kisses me often.	L	SL	NL
Asks me to tell everything that happens when I'm away from home.	L	SL	NL
Doesn't forget very quickly the things I do wrong.	L	SL	NL
Sometimes allows me to do things that she says are wrong.	L	SL	NL
Wants me to tell her about it if I don't like the way she treats me.	L	SL	NL
Can't say no to anything I want.	L	SL	NL
Thinks I am just someone to "put up with."	L	SL	NL
Speaks to me in a cold, matter-of-fact voice when I offend her.	L	SL	NL
Enjoys going on drives, trips or visits with me.	L	SL	NL

Worries about me when I'm away.	L	SL	NL
Forgets to get me things I need.	L	SL	NL
Gives hard punishments.	L	SL	NL
Believes in showing her love for me.	L	SL	NL
Feels hurt by the things I do.	L	SL	NL
Tells me how to spend my free time.	L	SL	NL
Doesn't insist that I do my homework.	L	SL	NL
Lets me help to decide how to do things we're working on.	L	SL	NL
Says some day I'll be punished for my bad behavior.	L	SL	NL
Doesn't seem to enjoy doing things with me.	L	SL	NL
Gives me as much freedom as I want.	L	SL	NL
Smiles at me very often.	L	SL	NL
Often gives up something to get something for me.	L	SL	NL
Is always getting after me.	L	SL	NL
Sees to it that I'm on time coming home from school or for meals.	L	SL	NL
Tries to treat me as an equal.	L	SL	NL
Keeps a careful check on me to make sure I have the right kind of friends.	L	SL	NL
Keeps after me about finishing my work.	L	SL	NL
Depends upon her mood whether a rule is enforced or not.	L	SL	NL
Makes me feel free when I'm with her.	L	SL	NL
Excuses my bad conduct.	L	SL	NL
Doesn't show that she loves me.	L	SL	NL
Is less friendly with me if I don't see things her way.	L	SL	NL
Is able to make me feel better when I am upset.	L	SL	NL
Becomes very involved in my life.	L	SL	NL
Almost always complains about what I do.	L	SL	NL
Punishes me when I don't obey.	L	SL	NL
Always listens to my ideas and opinions.	L	SL	NL
Tells me how much she has suffered for me.	L	SL	NL
Would like to be able to tell me what to do all the time.	L	SL	NL
Doesn't check up to see whether I have done what she told me.	L	SL	NL
Asks me what I think about how we should do things.	L	SL	NL
Thinks and talks about my misbehavior long after its over.	L	SL	NL
Doesn't share many activities with me.	L	SL	NL
Lets me go any place I please without asking.	L	SL	NL
Enjoys doing things with me.	L	SL	NL

Makes me feel like the most important person in her life.	L	SL	NL
Gets cross and angry about little things I do.	L	SL	NL
Believes in punishing me to correct and improve my manners.	L	SL	NL
Often has long talks with me about the causes and reasons for things.	L	SL	NL
Wants to know with whom I've been when I've been out.	L	SL	NL
Is unhappy that I'm not better in school than I am.	L	SL	NL
Only keeps rules when it suits her.	L	SL	NL
Really wants me to tell her just how I feel about things.	L	SL	NL
Lets me stay up late if I keep asking.	L	SL	NL
Almost never goes on Sunday drives or picnics with me.	L	SL	NL
Will avoid looking at me when I've disappointed her.	L	SL	NL
Enjoys working with me in the house or yard.	L	SL	NL
Usually makes me the center of her attention at home.	L	SL	NL
Often blows her top when I bother her.	L	SL	NL
Almost always punishes me in some way when I am bad.	L	SL	NL
Often praises me.	L	SL	NL
Says if I loved her, I'd do what she wants me to do.	L	SL	NL
Gets cross and nervous when I'm noisy around the house.	L	SL	NL
Seldom insists that I do anything.	L	SL	NL
Tries to understand how I see things.	L	SL	NL
Says that some day I'll be sorry that I wasn't better as a child.	L	SL	NL
Complains that I get on her nerves.	L	SL	NL
Lets me dress in any way I please.	L	SL	NL
Comforts me when I'm afraid.	L	SL	NL
Enjoys staying at home with me more than going out with friends.	L	SL	NL
Doesn't work with me.	L	SL	NL
Insists that I must do exactly as I'm told.	L	SL	NL
Encourages me to read.	L	SL	NL
Asks other people what I do away from home.	L	SL	NL
Loses her temper with me when I don't help around the house.	L	SL	NL
Frequently changes the rules I am supposed to follow.	L	SL	NL

Allows me to have friends at my home often.	L	SL	NL
Does not insist I obey if I complain or protest.	L	SL	NL
Hardly notices when I am good at home or in school.	L	SL	NL
If I take someone else's side in an argument, is cold and distant to me.	L	SL	NL
Cheers me up when I am sad.	L	SL	NL
Does not approve of my spending a lot of time away from home.	L	SL	NL
Doesn't get me things unless I ask over and over again.	L	SL	NL
Sees to it that I obey when she tells me something.	L	SL	NL
Tells me where to find out more about things I want to know.	L	SL	NL
Tells me of all the things she has done for me.	L	SL	NL
Wants to control whatever I do.	L	SL	NL
Does not bother to enforce rules.	L	SL	NL
Makes me feel at ease when I'm with her.	L	SL	NL
Thinks that any misbehavior is very serious and will have future consequences.	L	SL	NL
Is always finding fault with me.	L	SL	NL
Allows me to spend my money in any way I like.	L	SL	NL
Often speaks of the good things I do.	L	SL	NL
Makes her whole life center about her children.	L	SL	NL
Doesn't seem to know what I need or want.	L	SL	NL
Sees to it that I keep my clothes neat, clean, and in order.	L	SL	NL
Is happy to see me when I come from school or play.	L	SL	NL
Questions me in detail about what my friends and I discuss.	L	SL	NL
Doesn't give me any peace until I do what she says.	L	SL	NL
Insists I follow a rule one day and then forgets about it the next.	L	SL	NL
Gives me the choice of what to do whenever possible.	L	SL	NL
I can talk her out of an order, if I complain.	L	SL	NL
Often makes fun of me.	L	SL	NL
If I've hurt her feelings, stops talking to me until I please her again.	L	SL	NL
Has a good time at home with me.	L	SL	NL

Worries that I can't take care of myself unless she is around.	L	SL	NL
Acts as though I'm in the way.	L	SL	NL
If I do the least little thing that I shouldn't, punishes me.	L	SL	NL
Hugged and kissed me goodnight when I was small.	L	SL	NL
Says if I really cared for her I would not do things that cause her to worry.	L	SL	NL
Is always trying to change me.	L	SL	NL
Lets me get away without doing work I had been given to do.	L	SL	NL
Is easy to talk to.	L	SL	NL
Says that sooner or later we always pay for bad behavior.	L	SL	NL
Wishes I were a different kind of person.	L	SL	NL
Lets me go out any evening I want.	L	SL	NL
Seems proud of the things I do.	L	SL	NL
Spends almost all of her free time with her children.	L	SL	NL
Tells me to quit "hanging around the house" and go somewhere.	L	SL	NL
I have certain jobs to do and am not allowed to do anything else until they are done.	L	SL	NL
Is very interested in what I am learning at school.	L	SL	NL
Almost always wants to know who phoned me or who wrote to me and what they said.	L	SL	NL
Doesn't like the way I act at home.	L	SL	NL
Changes her mind to make things easier for herself.	L	SL	NL
Lets me do things that other children my age do.	L	SL	NL
Can be talked into things easily.	L	SL	NL
Often seems glad to get away from me for a while.	L	SL	NL
When I upset her, won't have anything to do with me until I find a way to make up.	L	SL	NL
Isn't interested in changing me, but likes me as I am.	L	SL	NL
Wishes I would stay at home where she could take care of me.	L	SL	NL
Makes me feel I'm not loved.	L	SL	NL
Has more rules than I can remember, so is often punishing me.	L	SL	NL
Says I make her happy.	L	SL	NL
When I don't do as she wants, says I'm not grateful for all she has done for me.	L	SL	NL
Doesn't let me decide things for myself.	L	SL	NL

Lets me get away with a lot of things.	L	SL	NL
Tries to be a friend rather than a boss.	L	SL	NL
Will talk to me again and again about anything bad I do.	L	SL	NL
Is never interested in meeting or talking with my friends.	L	SL	NL
Lets me do anything I like to do.	L	SL	NL

NIH-71 (Formerly PHS-4092)
Rev. 1-64

APPENDIX V

SCORING SHEET FOR THE CHILD'S REPORT OF PARENT BEHAVIOR INVENTORY Case No. _____

To score: Assign the value 3 to L, 2 to SL and score in sequential order down the columns

	Check one:		Page 1	Page 2	Page 3	Page 4	TOTAL
	() Father	() Mother					
1. Acceptance							
2. Childcenteredness							
3. Possessiveness							
4. Rejection							
5. Control							
6. Enforcement							
7. Positive Involvement							
8. Intrusiveness							
9. Control through Guilt							
10. Hostile Control							

()	Father	()	Mother	Page 1	Page 2	Page 3	Page 4	TOTAL
11.	Inconsistent Discipline							
12.	Nonenforcement							
13.	Acceptance of Individuation							
14.	Lax Discipline							
15.	Instilling Persistent Anxiety							
16.	Hostile Detachment							
17.	Withdrawal of Relations							
18.	Extreme Autonomy							

SCALE AND FACTOR CATEGORIES OF CRPBI-R ITEMS

<u>CRPBI-R</u> Item Content	Scale	Factor
Makes me feel better after talking over my worries with him.	1	I
Likes to talk to me and be with me much of the time.	2	I
Decides what friends I can go around with.	10	II
Soon forgets a rule he has made.	11	III
Doesn't mind if I kid him about things.	13	I
Is easy with me.	14	III
Seems to see my good points more than my faults.	1	I
Feels hurt when I don't follow advice.	9	II
Is always telling me how I should behave.	10	II
Usually doesn't find out about my misbehavior.	12	III
Enjoys it when I bring friends to my home.	13	I
Worries about how I will turn out, because he takes anything bad I do seriously.	15	II
Almost always speaks to me with a warm and friendly voice.	1	I
Is always thinking of things that will please me.	2	II
Keeps reminding me about things I am not allowed to do.	10	II
Punishes me for doing something one day, but ignores it the next.	11	III
Allows me to tell him if I think my ideas are better than his.	13	I
Lets me off easy when I do something wrong.	14	III
Understands my problems and my worries.	1	I
Thinks I'm not grateful when I don't obey.	9	II
Tells me exactly how to do my work.	10	II
Doesn't pay much attention to my misbehavior.	12	III
Likes me to choose my own way to do things.	13	I
If I break a promise, doesn't trust me again for a long time.	15	II
Enjoys talking things over with me.	1	I
Gives me a lot of care and attention.	2	I
Doesn't forget very quickly the things I do wrong.	10	II
Sometimes allows me to do things that he says are wrong.	11	III
Wants me to tell him about it if I don't like the way he treats me.	13	I

<u>CRPBI-R</u> Item Content	Scale	Factor
Can't say no to anything I want.	14	III
Enjoys going on drives, trips or visits with me.	1	I
Feels hurt by the things I do.	9	II
Tells me how to spend my free time.	10	II
Doesn't insist that I do my homework.	12	III
Lets me help to decide how to do things we're working on.		
Says some day I'll be punished for my bad behavior.	15	II
Smiles at me very often.	1	I
Often gives up something to get something for me.	2	I
Keeps after me about finishing my work.	10	II
Depends upon his mood whether a rule is enforced or not.	11	III
Makes me feel free when I'm with him.	13	I
Excuses my bad conduct.	14	III
Is able to make me feel better when I am upset.	1	I
Tells me how much he has suffered for me.	9	II
Would like to be able to tell me what to do all the time.	10	II
Doesn't check up to see whether I have done what he told me.	12	III
Asks me what I think about how we should do things.	13	I
Thinks and talks about my misbehavior long after it's over.	15	II
Enjoys doing things with me.	1	I
Makes me feel like the most important person in his life.	2	I
Is unhappy that I'm not better in school than I am.	10	II
Only keeps rules when it suits him.	11	III
Really wants me to tell him just how I feel about things.	13	I
Lets me stay up late if I keep asking.	14	III
Enjoys working with me in the house or yard.	1	I
Says if I loved him, I'd do what he wants me to do.	9	II
Gets cross and nervous when I'm noisy around the house.	10	II
Seldom insists that I do anything.	12	III
Tries to understand how I see things.	13	I
Says that some day I'll be sorry that I wasn't better as a child.	15	II
Comforts me when I'm afraid.	1	I

<u>CRPBI-R</u> Item Content	Scale	Factor
Enjoys staying at home with me more than going out with friends.	2	I
Loses his temper with me when I don't help around the house.	10	II
Frequently changes the rules I am supposed to follow.	11	III
Allows me to have friends at my home often.	13	I
Does not insist I obey if I complain or protest.	14	III
Cheers me up when I am sad.	1	I
Tells me of all the things he has done for me.	9	II
Wants to control whatever I do.	10	II
Does not bother to enforce rules.	12	III
Makes me feel at ease when I'm with him.	13	I
Thinks that any misbehavior is very serious and will have future consequences.	15	II
Often speaks of the good things I do.	1	I
Makes his whole life center about his children.	2	I
Doesn't give me any peace until I do what he says.	10	II
Insists I follow a rule one day and then forgets about it the next.	11	III
Gives me the choice of what to do whenever possible.	13	I
I can talk him out of an order, if I complain.	14	III
Has a good time at home with me.	1	I
Says if I really cared for him, I would not do things that cause him to worry.	9	II
Is always trying to change me.	10	II
Lets me get away without doing work I had been given to do.	12	III
Is easy to talk to.	13	I
Says that sooner or later we always pay for bad behavior.	15	II
Seems proud of the things I do.	1	I
Spends almost all of his free time with his children.	2	I
Doesn't like the way I act at home.	10	II
Changes his mind to make things easier for himself.	11	III
Lets me do things that other children my age do.	13	I
Can be talked into things easily.	14	III
Isn't interested in changing me, but likes me as I am.	1	I

<u>CRPBI-R</u> Item Content	Scale	Factor
When I don't do as he wants, says I'm not grateful for all he has done for me.	9	II
Doesn't let me decide things for myself.	10	II
Tries to be a friend rather than a boss.	13	I
Lets me get away with a lot of things.	12	III
Will talk to me again and again about anything bad I do.	15	II

NIH-71 (Formerly PHS-4092)
Rev. 1-64

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Beecher, M. and W. Beecher, Parents on the Run, New York, Matrix House, Ltd., 1955.
- Bernard, Jessie, Remarriage: A Study in Marriage, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1956.
- Ferguson, George, Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1971.
- Goode, William J., After Divorce, Glencoe, The Free Press, 1956.
- Hereford, C. F., Changing Parental Attitudes Through Group Discussion, Austin, Texas, University of Texas Press, 1963.
- Simon, Anne W., Stepchild in the Family: A View of Children in Remarriage, New York, Odyssey Press, 1964.
- Smith, William, The Stepchild, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1953.

Articles

- Armentrout, James A., "Parental Child-Rearing Attitudes and Preadolescents' Problem Behaviors," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, XXXVII(May, 1971), 278-285.
- Auerbach, Stevanne, "Stepparents," Parents Magazine, LI(June, 1976), 57-61.
- Ausubel, D. P., E. E. Balthazar, Irene Rosenthal, L. S. Blackman, S. H. Schpoont, and Joan Welkowitz, "Perceived Parent Attitudes as Determinants of Children's Ego Structure," Child Development, XXV (March, 1954), 173-183.
- Baragona, Rosalie, "The Relationship Between Certain Personality Characteristics in Nursery School Children," Dissertation Abstracts, XXV(1964), 3094.

- Baumrind, Diana, "Child Practices Anteceding Three Patterns of Preschool Behavior," Genetic Psychology Monographs, CXXV(1967), 345-388.
- Becker, Wesley C., "The Relationship of Factors in Parental Ratings of Self and Each Other to the Behavior of Kindergarten Children as Rated by Mothers, Fathers, and Teachers," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XXIV(November, 1960), 507-527.
- Bohanan, Paul, National Institute of Mental Health Report, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D. C., 1977.
- Bowerman, Charles E. and D. P. Irish, "Some Relationships of Stepchildren to Their Parents," Marriage and Family Living, XXIV(May, 1962), 113-121.
- Burchinal, Lee G., "Characteristics of Adolescents from Broken, Unbroken, and Reconstituted Families," Marriage and Family Living, XXVI(February, 1964), 44-50.
- Burger, Gary, James Armentrout, and Richard Rapfogel, "Estimating Factor Scores for Children's Reports of Parental Child Rearing Behaviors," Journal of Genetic Psychology, CXXIII(May, 1973), 107-113.
- Clapp, William F., "Dependence and Competence in Children: Parental Treatment of Four-Year-Old Boys," Dissertation Abstracts, XXVIII(1967), 1703.
- Cox, S. H., "Intrafamily Comparison of Loving-Rejecting Child-Rearing Practices," Child Development, XCI(June, 1970), 437-448.
- Draughon, Margaret, "Stepmothers' Model of Identification in Relation to Mourning in the Child," Psychological Reports, XXXVI(1975), 183-189.
- Duberman, Lucile, "Step-Kin Relationships," Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXV(May, 1973), 283-292.
- Fast, Irene and A. C. Cain, "The Stepparent Role: Potential for Disturbance in Family Functioning," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, XXXVI(August, 1966), 485-491.

- Gildea, Margaret C. L., John C. Glidewell, and Mildred D. Kantor, "Maternal Attitudes and General Adjustment," in John Glidewell (ed.), Parent Attitudes and Child Behavior, Conference on Community Mental Health Research, St. Louis, Washington University Press, 1961.
- Heilbrun, Alfred B., Jr. and Elizabeth B. Tiemeyer, "Relationships Between Perceived Maternal Child Rearing Experiences and Projective Responses to Censure-Control Cues in Normal Males," Journal of Genetic Psychology, CXII(January, 1968), 3-14.
- Heilpern, Edwin P., "Psychological Problems of Stepchildren," Psychoanalytic Review, XXX(January, 1943), 163-176.
- Helper, M. M., "Parental Evaluation of Children and Children's Self-Evaluation," Journal of Abnormal and Social Behavior, CVI(March, 1958), 190-194.
- Lang, Lawrence H., "Responsibility as a Function of Authority in Family Relations," Dissertation Abstracts, XXIX(1969), 3668-3669.
- Moore, James E., "Antecedents of Dependency and Autonomy in Young Children," Dissertation Abstracts, XXVI(1965), 1966.
- Messinger, Lillian, "Problems Relating to Remarriage," Journal of Marriage and Family Counseling, II(February, 1976), 276-284.
- Nye, Ivan, "Child Adjustment in Broken and Unhappy, Unbroken Homes," Marriage and Family Living, XIX (November, 1957), 356-361.
- Pflegger, Janet, "The Wicked Stepmother in a Child Guidance Clinic," Smith College Studies in Social Work, XVII (March, 1947), 125-126.
- Renson, Gisele, E. S. Schaefer, B. I. Levy, "Cross-National Validity of a Spherical Conceptual Model for Parent Behavior," Child Development, XXXIX(Winter, 1968), 1129-1235.
- Schaefer, Earl S., "Children's Reports of Parental Behavior: An Inventory," Child Development, XXXVI(June, 1965), 413-424.
- _____, "Configurational Analysis of Children's Reports of Parent Behavior," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XXIX(June, 1965), 552-557.

- _____ and Nancy Bayley, "Validity and Consistency of Mother-Infant Observations, Adolescent Maternal Interviews, and Adult Retrospective Reports of Maternal Behavior," Proceedings, 75th Annual Convention, APA, 1967, pp. 147-148.
- Scheck, Dennis, Robert Emerick, and Mohamed M. El-Assal, "Adolescents' Perceptions of Parent-Child Relations and the Development of Internal-External Control Orientation," Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXV(November, 1973), 643-653.
- Schluderman, Edward, and Shirin Schluderman, "Replicability of Factors in Children's Report of Parent Behavior (CRPBI)," Journal of Psychology, LXXVI(November, 1970), 239-249.
- Schulman, Gerda, "Myths That Intrude on the Adaptation of the Stepfamily," Social Casework, LIII(1972), 131-139.
- Sears, Robert R., "Comparison of Interviews with Questionnaires for Measuring Mothers' Attitudes Towards Sex and Aggression," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, II(January, 1965), 37-44.
- Serot, Naomi M. and R. C. Teevan, "Perception of the Parent-Child Relationship and Its Relation to Child Adjustment," Child Development, XXXII(May, 1961), 373-378.
- Starr, Bernard D., "Disciplinary Attitudes of Both Parents and Authoritarianism in Their Children," Dissertation Abstracts, XXVI(1965), 3484.
- Walsh, Richard P., "Parental Rejecting Attitudes and Control in Children," Journal of Clinical Psychology, XXIV (February, 1968), 185-186.
- White, Annie M., "Factors Making for Difficulty in the Stepparent Relationship with Children," Smith College Studies in Social Work, XIV(April, 1943), 242.
- Wilson, Kenneth L., Louis Zurcher, and Diana McAdams, "Stepfathers and Stepchildren: An Exploratory Analysis from Two National Surveys," Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXVII(August, 1975), 526-536.
- Yarrow, Marian R. and J. D. Campbell, "Person Perception in Children," Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, IX(Spring, 1963), 57-72.