

DEVELOPMENT OF A PARENTAL ATTITUDE RESEARCH SCALE
FOR USE WITH THE LOWER AND MIDDLE CLASSES

by

RONALD E. CROMWELL

B. S., Kansas State University, 1968

A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Family and Child Development

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1969

Approved by:


Major Professor

LD
2668
T4
1969
C685
C.2

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express his sincere appreciation to his major professor Dr. Stephan R. Bollman, whose guidance, encouragement, and resourcefulness aided this study.

The writer also wishes to thank Dr. Carroll E. Kennedy and Dr. David G. Danskin for serving on the writer's committee. Appreciation is expressed to Dr. Marjorie Stith and Dr. Beverly Schmalzried for their many helpful suggestions. Appreciation is also expressed to the Department of Family and Child Development who provided financial support to this study.

Finally, the writer would like to express warm felt gratitude to his wife Noel and daughter Angella for their tireless support and understanding during the course of this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Major Focuses of Study	
The Problem	
Subjects	
Statistical Analysis	
II. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	6
Social Development	
Research on Parental Attitudes	
Importance of the Mother	
Importance of the Social Class	
Social Class Differences	
III. PROCEDURE AND METHOD	24
Empirical Evidence for the Validity of this Approach	
Implications Used for this Research	
The Research Model	
Instrument Development	
Subscales	
Word Reading Level	
Scoring	
Administration of the Parental Attitude Research Scale	
IV. FINDINGS	43
Biographical Information on Subjects	
Item Analysis	
Factor Analysis	

V. DISCUSSION	62
Personal Communication	
Implications for Research	
Limitations	
Other Observations	
VI. SUMMARY	69
REFERENCES	74
APPENDIX A: PARS SUBSCALES AND ITEMS.	78
APPENDIX B: PARENTAL ATTITUDE RESEARCH SCALE	88
APPENDIX C: SCORE SHEET	96
APPENDIX D: ITEM ANALYSIS DATA	98
APPENDIX E: PARI RESEARCH MODEL	104

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Child-rearing Patterns Characteristic of Families with Children who are Emotionally Healthy Compared to Relevant Patterns Characteristic of Very Poor Families . .	17
2. Child-rearing Patterns Characteristic of Families with Children who are Educationally Achieving Compared with Relevant Patterns Characteristic of Very Poor Families .	19
3. Child-rearing Patterns Characteristic of Families with Children who are Socially Successful Compared with Relevant Patterns Characteristic of Very Poor Families . . .	20
4. Child-rearing Patterns Characteristic of Families with Children who are of "Good Character" Compared with Relevant Patterns Characteristic of Very Poor Families . . .	21
5. Parents' Age at Interviewing	44
6. Respondents' Ages at Marriage	45
7. Marital Status of Subjects	46
8. Occupational Level of Subjects	47
9. Ages and Number of Children	48
10. Number of Years of Education	50
11. Educational Level of Subjects	51
12. Annual Income Before Taxes	51
13. Class Sensitive Items	52
14. Non-class Sensitive Items	54
15. Factor Structure and Significant Loadings.	56
16. Factor Structure and Correlated Items	58

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

It is within the family, the basic unit of society, that a child's personality develops and socialization occurs. Here the child learns to relate to others and develops the attitudes which become components of his personality. A child's wonder and curiosity, the need to know and understand his environment, may be thwarted or enhanced by the family. The child's motivations, his desire for achievement, and his later success are related to his early family experiences. The various attitudes are transferred to the child by way of child-rearing practices and socialization processes of the family. It is assumed for this research that parental attitudes associated with child-rearing practices and socialization processes can be objectively measured. It is further assumed that this information will be applicable to the understanding of family life patterns.

The importance of maternal attitudes to the development of the child generally has been accepted. Bettelheim (1952) has pointed out that a general attitude may influence a great variety of parental behaviors. For example, he found that when parents who rigidly attempt to impose accelerated developmental goals upon children are told that early toilet-training is undesirable, they delay such training. These same parents continue to accelerate the child in talking, walking, reading, and other important areas of development.

Major Focuses of Study

This study attempts to assess maternal attitudes. According to Schaefer and Bell (1965), many researchers have assumed implicitly that objective attitude measures could give valid information on maternal attitudes. The potential usefulness of such objective measurements in prediction and identification of family life patterns justifies their development. This assumption that objectively measured parental attitudes will aid in prediction and identification of family life patterns is a motivation for this study.

A specific purpose of this study is to identify the underlying parental attitudes which can be used to describe the living patterns of young families. The disadvantaged family has been a major concern of this study. This research project developed out of an interest in a federal project entitled, "NC-90: Factors Affecting Patterns of Living of Disadvantaged Families."¹ Because there was not an instrument available which could be used in assessing disadvantaged living patterns and middle-class living patterns, it became necessary to create one.

One-fifth of all American families are living in poverty. Whether or not middle-class American values are, or should be, the determining values for the mass of children is, at this point, an academic issue. A major concern of this study is to contrast and compare attitudes and values of the lower-class and the middle-class family. It is assumed that information leading to

¹North Central Regional Project-90: Factors Affecting Patterns of Living of Disadvantaged Families. Associate Professor Stephen Bollman, Department of Family and Child Development, Project Chairman, 1968-69.

answers of academic importance will aid in answering societal questions. Knowledge regarding living patterns of all American families may aid in working with families.

The Problem

Much research which is independent of social class has been collected, but there has not been an attempt to conceptualize this knowledge into a single research instrument. Researchers have not utilized available information concerning child-rearing attitudes and family life processes. Radin and Glasser (1965) point out the difficulties in researching a culturally deprived group with a middle-class instrument. They conclude that serious doubts as to reliability and validity must be raised when asking middle-class questions with middle-class language patterns to a lower-class sample. Their research and practical information served as a guide to the research instrument that was developed for this study. In the body of this thesis, the labels "culturally deprived," "disadvantaged," "lower-class," and "low-income" families will be used interchangeably.

Because this research desired to look at low-income families as well as middle-class families simultaneously, it became evident that an instrument must be developed that would be applicable to both classes. At this time there is not an instrument available that has been standardized on a population consisting of both lower-class and middle-class families.

Available research evidence on child-rearing patterns of the lower-class and the middle-class stimulated development of the Parental Attitude Research

Scale (PARS)² This research scale is an outgrowth of the Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI)³ which was developed by Schaefer and Bell (1958).

The PARS is the instrument which is the focus for this study. Development and standardization of this instrument is a primary purpose of this research.

Subjects

The instrument has been standardized on a population of 100. Fifty (50) subjects included in this population were low-income families. A low-income family is one in which the annual family income before taxes is less than \$5,000. Most of the low-income families were interviewed at a federal housing project in Topeka, Kansas. All interviews were given individually and orally in the respondents' homes. Mothers with children living in the home were preferred as subjects.

Fifty (50) subjects were from the middle-class population. Most of the subjects had preschool-age children in nursery schools in the Manhattan, Kansas, area. A middle-class family was defined as a family whose annual income before taxes exceeded \$8,000. The middle-class respondents were not interviewed. They answered the questionnaire in their homes and mailed the completed instrument to the researchers.

²The Parental Attitude Research Scale will hereafter be referred to as the PARS.

³The Parental Attitude Research Instrument will hereafter be referred to as the PARI.

Statistical Analysis

The middle-class and lower-class samples were combined for a factor analysis. This factor analysis was performed on a 46 item pooling. Pearson correlation coefficients also were computed along with means and standard deviations. On the 125 items an item analysis was computed to determine what, if any, class differences existed and to compare these findings with class differences found by other investigators. Also included in the item analysis program were means, standard deviations, and cumulative percentages.

The information sheet of the instrument was coded and the responses were compared between classes. Means and standard deviations along with cumulative frequencies and percentages also were computed.

CHAPTER II

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

In this chapter the conceptual framework used as rationale for developing the PARS will be presented. The chapter develops a rationale for the development of homogeneous measures of concepts concerning parental attitudes. This rationale focuses on research from both the middle and the lower classes. Major propositions presented in this chapter are (a) the family is the most important agent in the socialization process of the child, (b) parental attitudes toward child-rearing and family processes are an important influence on the socialization and personality development of the child, (c) maternal attitudes have the greatest affect upon the development of the child, (d) maternal attitudes vary with the socioeconomic class, and (e) social class differences must be considered in instrument development.

The five major headings of this chapter are (1) Social Development, (2) Research on Parental Attitudes, (3) Importance of the Mother, (4) Importance of the Social Class, and (5) Social Class Differences. Each section contributes a framework to the development of the PARS which focuses on socialization, maternal attitudes, and social class differences in attitude development. The basic assumptions of this study are that maternal attitudes can be objectively measured and that an instrument sensitive to social class differences can be developed.

Social Development

The family is the most important socialization agent in the life of a child. Socialization is the process by which persons acquire the knowledge, skills and attitudes that make them functioning members of their society. Freeman and Schowel (1953) also have described the family as the most influential agent in the socialization process.

Child (1954, p. 657) also has added to the concept of family socialization by defining social development as the "process by which an individual born with potentialities of enormously wide range, is led to develop actual behavior which is confined within a much narrower range--the range of what is customary and acceptable for him according to the standards of his group." While the child is learning to become a social person, he must have a stable model to copy, and he must copy it with a minimum of variation (Hurlock, 1964). The attitudes and behavior models of the family are of primary importance in the social development of the child.

If the child is to learn to live socially with others, he must, first, have ample opportunities for contact with others. A child is not born social or asocial. He learns social behavior from his parents and the social group with which he is most closely associated. This idea is best described by Harris (1946, p. 11). "Socialization does not proceed in a vacuum." The family provides the early opportunities for this socialization to take place; therefore, the family plays a great role in providing social contact.

The child's attitudes toward others and social experiences, as well as

the ability to get along with other people, will depend largely on the learning experiences encountered in early childhood. These experiences will, in turn, depend upon the opportunities he has for socializing both within and outside the family setting. As an explanation of this point, Bossard and Boll (1960) found that if the learning experiences within the home are favorable, the child will develop into a social person. If they are unfavorable, the child will be less social than children his age, and he may even become antisocial.

The social behavior and attitudes of a child reflect the treatment he has received in the home. For instance, Hurlock (1964) found that the child who is rejected may carry the resulting attitude of martyrdom outside the home and even into adult life.

Of all the factors in the early years of life which influence the child's social behavior and attitudes, perhaps the most important is the type of child-rearing methods of his parents. Because child-rearing attitudes play an important role in the social development of the child, much research has focused on assessing parental attitudes.

Research on Parental Attitudes

There is a current interest in the influence of child-rearing methods and parental attitudes upon the socialization and personality development of children. This interest developed primarily through psychotherapeutic work with adults and the clinical studies of families by child guidance clinics.

A review of previous studies which utilized an objective measurement of parental attitudes is the major concern of this section. Available literature

cites empirical evidence for the validity of the objective measurement approach to the study of parent-child relationships. This section of the chapter will concentrate on presenting a number of research studies on the relationships between parental attitudes and the socialization and personality development of children using objective instruments.

Stodgill (1936) was among the first to attempt an objective measurement of parental attitudes. He developed two questionnaires which measured attitudes toward parental control and attitudes toward social behavior of children. Read (1945) also did an early study of the relationship between parental attitudes and social behavior of children, but her research approach utilized a behavior inventory. She concluded that liberalism in views on parental control is related to child behavior. Anderson (1946) reported a study in which it was found that parent's attitudes are related to the leadership status and social acceptance of the child by the school group. He also found that several parental attitudes are directly related to the social adjustment of the child. One of the more publicized research efforts was undertaken by Shoben (1949). He administered an inventory of attitudes toward child-rearing to 50 mothers of children in mental hygiene clinics and 50 mothers of normal children. On cross-validation with comparable groups there were significant relationships between parental attitude scales and children's behavior.

Orlansky (1949) revealed the need to study the total pattern of experiences of children rather than specifics. Parental attitudes in relation to the home environment were reported to be major areas for more research work. Radke (1946) constructed a parental attitudes instrument including scales on

number and type of restrictions, freedom, severity or mildness of punishment, rapport between parent and child, the relative responsibility of the parent for the child's discipline, and sibling compatibility or incompatibility. The relationship between scales indicated that unfavorable conduct of children is related to autocratic, restrictive and severe discipline attitudes of the parents.

Symonds (1949) offered a significant contribution to objective measurement when he found the quality of the parent-child relationship is of crucial importance in the future personality development of the child. Mead's theory (1934, p. 138) of the genesis of the self is a concise statement of this point of view: "The individual experiences himself as such, not directly, but indirectly, from the particular standpoints of other individual members of the same social group, or from the generalized standpoint of the social group as a whole to which he belongs." All of these studies indicate that the attitudes of the parent and the practices which make these attitudes reality are related directly to the social and personality development of the child.

Studies by Mark (1953), Freeman and Grayson (1955), Shapiro (1952), Goldstein and Carr (1956) and Crotty (1957), all support the hypothesis that objectively-measured attitudes toward child rearing are related to personality development and socialization of children. Thus, there is a need for the development of a comprehensive conceptualization and quantification of this domain which would provide a research instrument for future studies.

Importance of the Mother

Maternal attitudes seem to have a great affect upon the child. Yet, no

one specific member of the family nor any one aspect of family life is responsible for socializing the child. Watson (1965) reported that within the family setting the mother appears to be the most significant person to the child. Even in infancy, the father is a secondary source of learning, as are other individuals of the immediate family. Because the most extensive and intense social interactions of the child during crucial developmental stages occur within the family setting and especially with the mother, "the mother-child relationship would be of major importance in social development" (Schaefer and Bell, 1964, p. 123). Thus, the attitudes of the mother are most influential in the socialization and personality development of the child.

Trends in personality theory also provide a rationale for the study of maternal attitudes. Bronfenbrenner (1953) has noted a convergence upon a set of related concepts which implies a tendency for a mother to act in a specified way. These tendencies have been called need-dispositions, beliefs, values, attitudes and dynamic systems. Development of measures of those components of her personality which are relevant to her role as a mother would permit prediction of her behavior with her child and the future personality and social adjustment of the child. One assumption of this study is that such need-dispositions can to some degree be determined by measuring the attitudes of the mother toward child-rearing and the family. It is further assumed that these attitudes are related directly to the type of relationship which a mother develops with her child.

Importance of the Social Class

In the Social Development section of this chapter it was reported that specific early influences in the child's home life are highly important to socialization and personality development. The following section points out that the type of early influences are to a marked degree influenced by the socioeconomic class of the child's parents. Children who come from a socioeconomic background that provides opportunities for healthy physical and psychological development make better social adjustments than children from poorer socioeconomic backgrounds (MacDonald, McGuire, and Havinghurst, 1949).

Numerous studies of maternal child-rearing attitudes and practices have indicated there is a relationship between these practices and socioeconomic status (Bayley and Schaefer, 1960). If this is true, then it becomes necessary to take socioeconomic factors into account when evaluating the effects of maternal attitudes on children's social and personality development. This study assumes social class to be significantly different as to require an attitude instrument standardized with a lower socioeconomic class.

The research finding that socioeconomic status influences socialization patterns endured a great deal of controversial argument. The history of this controversy presents an interesting picture and adds to the importance of current research.

The controversy reached a climax in 1946 with the publication of Davis and Havinghurst's influential paper "Social Class and Color Differences in

Child Rearing" (Bronfenbrenner, 1958). The paper cited statistical evidence to support the thesis that middle-class parents "place their children under a stricter regimen, with more frustration of their impulses than do lower-class parents" (Davis and Havinghurst, 1948, p. 708). During the next eight years, the Davis-Havinghurst conclusion was taken as the definite statement of class differences in socialization patterns. In 1954 came the counter-revolution; Maccoby and Gibbs published the first report of a study of child-rearing practices in the Boston area which contradicted the Chicago findings. In general, middle-class parents were found to be more "permissive" than parents in the lower-class (Maccoby and Gibbs, 1954).

In response, one year later, Havinghurst and Davis presented a re-analysis of their data for a subsample more comparable in age to the subjects of the Boston study. They concluded that "the disagreements between the findings of the two studies are substantial and large" (Havinghurst and Davis, 1955, p. 440). They also speculated these differences might be attributed either to genuine changes in child-rearing practices over time or to technical difficulties of sampling and item equivalence.

A somewhat different view was taken by Sears, Maccoby, and Levin (1957) in their final report of the Boston study. They argued that Davis and Havinghurst's interpretation of the Chicago data as reflecting greater permissiveness was unwarranted. What Davis and Havinghurst had interpreted as "permissiveness" later was termed "reflection of rejection" by Sears and co-workers. Other research began to indicate the lower-class parent was much more strict than the middle-class parent. Middle-class mothers

generally were more permissive and less punitive toward their young children than were the working-class mothers (Sears, Maccoby, and Levin, 1957).

Theories of parental influence upon the development of children and a review of the research on the relationship of parental attitudes to the personality and social adjustment of children suggested the need for the development of a set of homogeneous measures of parental attitudes (Schaefer and Bell, 1958).

Chilman (1965a) urged researchers to take the attitudinal differences between classes into consideration when developing instruments to measure these attitudes. "Ideally, to compare disadvantaged and middle-class child-rearing attitudes, an instrument which have been standardized on both populations should be utilized" (Radin and Glasser, 1965, p. 374). These ideas have been an important concern of this research.

Nearly all research reviewed regarding measurement of child-rearing and family life attitudes had a middle-class orientation. Explicitly as well as implicitly, many agents of educational and social institutions that deal with lower-class individuals attempt to "middle-classize" them. Miller and Riessman (1961) believe this attempt is founded on the fact that most people do not understand the lower-class behaviors and attitudes. A major purpose of this study is to identify some of these behaviors and attitudes.

A review of the research which contrasts and compares social-class and child-rearing attitudes has served as justification for developing categories of attitudinal measurement. The research which points out social class differences was very important in formulating the conceptual framework

for this study.

Social Class Differences

In an earlier section the proposition was presented which stated maternal attitudes vary with the socioeconomic class. It now becomes necessary to view the social class differences that were considered so important in developing the PARS.

Chilman (1965b) presented a review of several studies which reported findings contrasting and comparing child-rearing and family-life patterns between socioeconomic classes. This review was reported while Chilman was the head social science analyst for the welfare division of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Tables one through four represent a concise analysis of 59 research studies which she presented in her (1965b) article. Details regarding the patterns identified by Chilman are reported in tabular form in this chapter (see Tables 1-4). In addition to the tables, Chilman's review of recent research will be presented in short form to show areas of concern. Chilman's review of the recent body of knowledge is discussed under patterns that research reveals to be related to (1) the child's emotional health, (2) educational achievement, (3) social acceptability, and (4) "good moral character," i.e., ability to resist temptation and to be responsible and honest.

As a stimulant both to further study and to action programs, the following material is presented with the recognition that many of the findings summarized here may be changed or modified with time and further research. It also should

be noted that because a pattern has been found to be more characteristic of poor families than of more affluent ones, this pattern is not necessarily predominant in these families.

Child's Emotional Health

Considering child-rearing patterns related to emotional health, it is reported that middle-class parents are more apt to use practices that are associated with the positive emotional adjustment of the child. The following patterns are more typical of disadvantaged families:

1. Use of harsh physical punishment rather than a more reasoned verbal style of discipline.
2. Judgment of the child's behavior more on the basis of its immediate outcomes as these outcomes affect the parent, rather than on the basis of fundamental principles of desirable behavior or on a consideration of the causes of the child's actions.
3. A tendency towards early, abrupt training for independence rather than a more gradual process.
4. A fatalistic attitude toward life with a tendency toward magical thinking, rather than a more optimistic and planned approach with confidence in the individual's ability to do something about his own situation.
5. An emphasis on "keeping out of trouble," rather than a creative individualistic approach to life with values held for personal fulfillment and individual happiness.
6. Alienation from, rather than trust in, authority figures and the predominant social structure.
7. An authoritarian, rather than democratic, attitude toward family life and child rearing.

If the above patterns and attitudes are compared to those that research reveals to be consistent with positive emotional adjustment of children, then

the higher rates of deviant behavior and mental illness of the very poor can be more readily understood. A detailed summary can be seen in Table 1.

TABLE 1

CHILD-REARING PATTERNS CHARACTERISTIC OF FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN WHO ARE EMOTIONALLY HEALTHY COMPARED TO RELEVANT PATTERNS CHARACTERISTIC OF VERY POOR FAMILIES

Middle Class	Lower Class
1. Respect for child as individual whose behavior has multiple causes.	1. Misbehavior regarded as such in terms of concrete outcomes; reasons not considered.
2. Commitment to slow development of child; parent has perceived worth of ultimate goal of rearing successful child.	2. Lack of goal commitment; impulse gratification, fatalism, no long range goals, main concern is to "stay out of trouble."
3. Discipline chiefly verbal, mild, consistent; more emphasis on rewarding good behavior than punishing bad behavior.	3. Discipline harsh, inconsistent, physical, makes use of ridicule; based on whether child's behavior annoys parent.
4. Open, free, verbal communication between parent and child; control largely verbal.	4. Limited verbal communication; control largely physical.
5. Democratic child-rearing methods, with both parents in equalitarian but not necessarily interchangeable roles.	5. Authoritarian methods; mother chief child care agent; father, when in home, mainly a punitive figure.
6. Parents feel very competent.	6. Low parental self-esteem.
7. Intimate, warm relationship between child and parent; gradual independence.	7. Large families; more impulsive, narcissistic parent behavior.
8. Presence of father in home.	8. Father out of home in many cases.
9. Free verbal communication about sex; acceptance of slow growth toward impulse control and satisfaction in marriage; sex education by both father and mother.	9. Repressive, punitive attitude about sex; sex questioning and experimentation. Sex viewed as an exploitative relationship by both parents.
10. Acceptance of child's drive for aggression, but channeling it into socially approved outlets.	10. Alternating encouragement and restriction of aggression; primarily related to consequences of aggression for parents.

None of this is meant to imply that the child-rearing patterns of the very poor are the only, or even the most important, reasons for the higher rates of emotional and mental disturbance found in such families. Obviously, the deprivation of the poverty environment itself plays a very important role. This environment also helps to create the child-rearing patterns outlined above. In fact, the continuing interaction of the impoverished environment with the family life styles of the very poor might be said to form the hub of the cycle of poverty.

Educational Achievement

When the relevant child-rearing patterns of the very poor are compared with those which are found to be conducive to educational achievement, the contrast is striking (see Table 2). While it would be premature and an over simplification to conclude that disadvantaged families tend to rear their children for failure in school, evidence accumulated to date points in this direction. Many practices and attitudes already mentioned apply to this point. Especially relevant to academic success are the following:

1. The greater tendency of the poor to rely on physical, rather than verbal communication.
2. Restrictive attitudes of parents towards participation in a wide range of experiences in the larger world.
3. Distrust of authority figures, including those at school.
4. A limited concept of time and a lack of long-range-goal commitment.
5. Concrete rather than abstract ways of thinking.
6. A simplistic and magical approach to phenomena rather than a more complex style based on scientific evidence.

TABLE 2

CHILD-REARING PATTERNS CHARACTERISTIC OF FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN WHO ARE EDUCATIONALLY ACHIEVING COMPARED WITH RELEVANT PATTERNS CHARACTERISTIC OF VERY POOR FAMILIES

Middle Class	Lower Class
1. Child given freedom within consistent limits to explore and experiment.	1. Child has very limited freedom for exploration and experimentation.
2. Wide range of parent-guided experiences, offering much stimulation to learn.	2. Constricted lives led by parents; fear and distrust of the unknown.
3. Goal-commitment and belief in long-range success potential.	3. Fatalistic, apathetic attitudes. Complete feeling of failure.
4. Gradual training for and value placed on independence.	4. Tendency for abrupt transition to independence.
5. Educational-occupational success of parents; model as continuing "learners" themselves.	5. Tendency for educational-occupational failure; reliance on personal versus skill attributes for vocational worth.
6. Reliance on objective evidence.	6. Magical, rigid thinking.
7. Much verbal communication.	7. Little verbal communication.

The cultural deprivation of the very poor refers to many of the characteristics of very poor families as given above. The cumulative affect of such child-rearing practices on the child's school preparation is quite obvious.

Social Acceptability

Disadvantaged parents also have a tendency to rear their children in ways which are prejudicial to their social acceptability in the usual middle-class group, as indicated in Table 3. Lower-class children are given a negative preparation for being socially acceptable and possessing what might

be popularly described as a "good moral character."

TABLE 3

CHILD-REARING PATTERNS CHARACTERISTIC OF FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN WHO ARE SOCIALLY SUCCESSFUL COMPARED WITH RELEVANT PATTERNS CHARACTERISTIC OF VERY POOR FAMILIES

Middle Class	Lower Class
1. Social skills in dress, manners, speech, etc., according to middle-class norms.	1. Little skill in prevalent middle-class behavior.
2. Sensitivity to feelings and attitudes of others.	2. Slight awareness of subtleties of interpersonal relations.
3. Ability to be flexible in behavior and conform to group.	3. Tendency to be rigid and non-conforming to middle-class norms.
4. Good impulse control.	4. Poor impulse control.
5. Cheerful, happy, self-assured attitude.	5. Low self-esteem, distrust, tendency to hostile aggression and/or withdrawal.

Under the heading of social acceptability there is not only the part played by middle-class manners, speech and dress, but also skill in the subtlety of interpersonal relations, control of aggressive impulses, and a sense of inner self-confidence that helps a child to accept himself and others. The very poor not only lack the money to keep up a middle-class appearance, but also their life style is less likely to be conducive to impulse control, to skill in understanding the behavior of others, to capacity for verbal communication, and to a sense of self-esteem.

Good Moral Character

A sense of worthlessness and failure does not facilitate development of a middle-class conscience or, to put it another way, a "good moral character." Such a character is frequently defined in research studies as an ability to withstand temptations, to behave consistently within middle-class norms, to be honest, responsible and law abiding (see Table 4).

TABLE 4

CHILD-REARING PATTERNS CHARACTERISTIC OF FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN WHO ARE OF "GOOD CHARACTER" COMPARED WITH RELEVANT PATTERNS CHARACTERISTIC OF VERY POOR FAMILIES

Middle Class	Lower Class
1. Democratic child-rearing attitudes.	1. Authoritarian methods.
2. Mild, reasonable, consistent discipline.	2. Harsh, physical, inconsistent discipline.
3. Child's capacity for moral judgment, according to basic principles, is viewed as a slowly developing ability.	3. Reasons for child's misbehavior tend not to be considered; specific behavioral outcomes rather than principles considered.
4. Moral values are discussed and clarified.	4. Little verbal communication and discussion.
5. Parents generally try to set example by their own behavior.	5. Parental behavior more apt to be impulse and gratification oriented.

Ego strength has been found to promote this kind of ability for self-control; so have democratic child-rearing methods. The autocratic and harshly punitive parent-styles more characteristic of the very poor are less likely to build the kind of individual self-control that is esteemed in our society.

Family life styles more characteristic of the very poor already have been

presented in the foregoing discussion. Values and attitudes of the very poor toward relations between parents also carry negative components for our generally middle-class society. The higher rates of family breakdown of the poor through separation, divorce and illegitimacy are well known. Again, adverse environmental pressures play a vital part in producing these rates. Cultural patterns also are operating that threaten marital stability and satisfaction. These include:

1. Generally negative attitudes toward sex, with both men and women tending to see it as a way to exploit each other.
2. Sharply differentiated male and female worlds.
3. Authoritarian patterns in the man-woman relationship with the husband dominant if he is at home.
4. Little verbal communication.
5. Poor control of aggressive feelings.

Other factors already mentioned, such as lack of goal commitment, fatalism, apathy, and constricted life experiences, also have a part in adversely affecting the relationships between adult men and women.

In summary, the review of literature suggests that the socialization and personality development of the child is related to maternal child-rearing attitudes and family life patterns. These attitudes and family life patterns are affected by the socioeconomic status of the family. Social adjustment is contingent upon the opportunities for socialization in the environment.

The literature revealed a need for a conceptualization and quantification of the knowledge on parental attitudes. Especially important to this study is the sparse use of information on lower-class child-rearing attitudes and family

life patterns. There has not been a parental attitudes research instrument that has used a disadvantaged population as part of its standardization sample. When a researcher wishes to contrast and compare disadvantaged and middle-class child-rearing attitudes, an instrument that has been standardized using both populations should be used. The procedure of developing the PARS for use with lower socioeconomic subjects will be presented in the following chapter.

CHAPTER 3

PROCEDURE AND METHOD

The large body of sociological literature on social class has become particularly important since our nation declared "the war on poverty." Especially relevant to action programs attempting to break the cycle of financial dependency are studies of the socialization process among lower socioeconomic groups. One of the most prevalent tools used in studies with populations other than middle-class has been the parental attitude questionnaire. Yet, when this type of research instrument is employed with a culturally deprived population, questions of reliability and validity must be raised.

Little has been done to unite the information that is available on middle-class and lower-class attitudes. This study was attempted to compare and contrast child-rearing attitudes and practices with the use of a single research instrument. It is assumed that by utilizing the available research evidence appropriate to the middle-class and the lower-class, and by unifying this information into a single instrument, an adequate research tool will be developed. The procedure for developing and administering such an instrument constitutes the body of this chapter.

Empirical Evidence for the Validity of this Approach

The research of Schaefer and Bell (1958) was used as a major reference for this study. Their study suggested the need for development of measures of specific attitude concepts composed of homogeneous groups of items. Their clinical studies compared and contrasted parental attitudes with differential personality development of children. Each study suggested a need for a workable instrument.

A number of researchers have influenced the procedure in developing the instrument used in this study. This section will attempt to conceptualize what some testing experts have said about the need for homogeneous groupings of items. These items would be used to develop an inventory.

Theoretically, such an inventory would be more useful than a test composed of individual items or one which would give only one score of pathogenicity of parental attitude. This opinion is supported by Holzinger (1944, p. 156); "a single average as a complete summarization is justified only if the data are of rank one, that is, if only one common factor is involved."

Cronbach (1954) also suggests it is often advisable to obtain less reliable measures of a number of relevant variables containing specific variance rather than to investigate a limited number of very reliably measured variables. This research finding did influence this study. Items were written which were believed to be relevant and homogeneous.

A study by Brogden (1951) has demonstrated that differentiation between groups can be significantly increased by using several predictors which are

related independently to a criterion, even if the predictors correlate as much as .80 with one another. Guttman's (1950) criticisms of heterogeneous composite scores also suggest the use of only one composite score in the area of parental attitudes would tend to reduce differentiating power of a parental attitudes research instrument. He also felt that only one composite score would tend to obscure interpretation of results.

Implications Used for this Research

The implications for this research resulting from the previous mentioned studies were three in number. (1) More than one item should be written to assess a single child-rearing attitude. (2) Several predictors should be used to increase differentiation between groups. (3) Homogeneous groups of items are better predictors and differentiators than heterogeneous composite scores.

With these research considerations in mind, a conceptual analysis of the domain of parental attitudes was carried out as a basis for developing measures of attitudes.

The Research Model

To simplify development of an instrument which would be applicable to both the lower-class and the middle-class, a standard instrument was chosen as a model. (See Appendix E.)

Development of the PARI

In 1958, Schaefer and Bell reviewed questionnaire studies which attempted

to relate parent attitudes to the personality development of children. Concluding that more precise measurements of parental attitudes were necessary before such relationships could begin to be explored, they set out to construct an improved instrument.

Items from previous scales (Schoben, 1950; Mark, 1953) were sorted by three clinical psychologists into psychologically homogeneous subscales. The discrimination abilities of these items then were examined and found inadequate. They assumed this shortcoming was due to reliance on items describing popular attitudes which were therefore endorsed by most respondents. Hoping to improve the discrimination abilities, Schaefer and Bell reworded many items so they were stated contrary to popularly approved attitudes. Some positive statements of typically approved attitudes were retained to serve as rapport scales, so that respondents would not react negatively to all items. Next, other rationally consistent items were added until there were 32 subscales, each consisting of five to ten logically consistent items. Three different versions of the PARI were tested. Based on the results from these studies, the final formulation consisted of 23 attitude subscales, each containing five items, which maximized the subscale's internal consistency' reliability. The fourth and final form of the PARI served as the research model in this study.

Description of the PARI

The 115 items are third-person statements of attitudes to be rated by the respondent on a four-point scale: "strongly agree," "mildly agree," "mildly

disagree," and "strongly disagree." Those items which were worded as typically approved attitudes were scored: strongly agree=4 points, . . . strongly disagree=1 point. Examples of such items are:

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

Parents should adjust to the children some rather than always expecting the children to adjust to the parents.

Items worded the opposite of popular attitudes are scored on a reversed scale: strongly disagree = 4 points, . . . strongly agree = 1 point. Example of these items include:

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

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

Thus, higher scores on the PARI indicate agreement with those attitudes toward child-rearing which are considered more enlightened.

Evaluation of the PARI

Although Schaefer and Bell offered some evidence of reliability in their initial presentation of the PARI (1958), they left the validation process up to others. With one exception, researchers eagerly employed the PARI without attempting to first critically evaluate it. Zuckerman (1958) proceeded to document several weaknesses of the instrument which slowed down the wide use of it. Because the research instrument developed for this study consists of some of the original PARI items, a brief overview of the PARI's reliability and validity follows.

Reliability. Both test-retest and internal consistency reliability coefficients are available for the PARI subscales. Schaefer and Bell (1958) calculated test-retest reliabilities for the 23 subscales on a sample of 60 student nurses who were retested after an interval of three months. They concluded their reliabilities were most adequate, while noting the reliabilities of the rapport subscales were considerably lower than the others. Zuckerman (1958) also calculated test-retest reliabilities. He indicated satisfactory stability for most subscales and also found lower reliabilities for the rapport scales.

Internal consistency reliabilities were presented by Schaefer and Bell. Equivalent values were obtained by using two separate samples of sixty primiparae and sixty multiparae.

Validity. Zuckerman's evaluation of the PARI pointed out two major sources of variance other than content: (A) an acquiescence response set (ARS), and (B) educational level of the respondent. When considering exactly what the PARI measures, these factors must be taken into account. The label "acquiescence response set" has been applied to errors in measurement due to a respondent's tendency to answer "yes" regardless of the content. Because most items in the PARI are stated in one direction, it is believed that an ARS may influence the validity of the instrument. Radin and Glasser (1965) reported that future questionnaires developed for use with a lower-class population should not have all the items in a subscale stated in one direction. This is an area of concern in development of the PARS. Also of concern in developing the PARS is the ambiguity of the questions. Adams

and Kirby (1963) found that the ambiguity of the statement is the major variable in determining the extent of the response set present; the more ambiguous the item the greater the impact of the response set. Language usage and sentence construction was controlled in development of the PARS so as to eliminate as much response set as possible.

The second major source of variance other than content, educational level of the respondent, appears almost as influential as the ARS in affecting the validity of the PARI. Zuckerman, Barrett, and Bragiel (1960) estimate that 30 percent of the variance in the PARI is accounted for by the mother's education. Most middle-class instruments do not take this factor into account when scoring the responses. This is another area where language and sentence structure of the items is an important factor in the validity of the instrument. It is felt that the PARS has eliminated much of the variance due to educational level of the respondent by controlling the language of the instrument.

Becker and Krug (1963) presented a review of the validity of the PARI.

The following conclusions appear warranted from their summary:

1. Studies attempting to relate PARI scores to child behavior have tended to give negative results. Some theoretically meaningful results have been obtained using homogeneous samples of upper-middle-class families.
2. Studies which have reported differences in PARI scores for different groups of mothers (i.e., mothers of delinquents, of schizophrenics, of clinic children, etc.) have generally failed to find such differences once education is controlled.
3. On the positive side, a few attempts to correlate PARI scores and direct observations of parent behavior have suggested good construct validity.

Becker and Krug recognize that the PARI has generated a great deal of useful

research but emphasize that the weaknesses of the PARI are so great that it should be replaced by other instruments. The following section describes the development of the PARS which is assumed to be a satisfactory replacement for the original PARI.

Instrument Development

The selection of concepts for development was based upon a search of the literature for hypotheses which would give additional information relevant to parent-child relationships. A focus for this study centers around concepts which are applicable to both the lower-class and the middle-class.

The procedure for developing new items or rewriting original items from the research guide was as follows. After developing a concept from the writings of others, an attempt was made to operationally define the concept by writing items designed to measure the concept.

The PARI is basically a middle-class instrument that has been standardized on a middle-class sample. Because the focus for this research project is to develop an instrument applicable to both the middle- and the lower-class populations, a great deal of individual value judgment was used in selection of items. The most prevalent factor in deciding which items to use was the review of literature. The review of literature served to point out direct areas of agreement or disagreement in parental attitudes between socioeconomic classes.

On the basis of information derived from the review of the literature and value judgments, 13 items were taken directly from the PARI. An additional 60 items were rewritten from basic ideas presented in that instrument. Fifty-two

new items were written. Twenty-five subscales serve as focal points for the items. Each subscale consists of five homogeneous items relevant to the subscale concept. The resulting trial instrument contains 125 items. (See Appendix B.)

Subscales

Marital Adjustment. As a result of the hypothesis that information on marital adjustment would assist greatly in understanding the home environment of the child, several scales were developed which measure relevant concepts. The scale Marital Conflict contains items which were intended to reveal the existence of tensions indirectly through obtaining the respondents' judgments about how much quarreling and dissension might be expected in marriages in general.

The scale Irritability was developed around items which indicate that children "get on any woman's nerves" and that any mother would "blow her top" frequently in the difficult job of raising children. This scale may be related to several sources of tension but it seems feasible that it would also reflect tensions in the marital relationship.

The scale Inconsiderateness of the Husband contains items which state how inconsiderate husbands in general are. This scale is intended to permit projection of feeling about the spouse. Children in the home will be affected by the husband-wife relationship.

Items in the scale Seclusion of the Mother were written to assess general dissatisfaction of the homemaking role. Also this scale may determine the

social adjustment of the mother and give some information on the social development of the child. If the child's mother dislikes her role as a mother, the child undoubtedly will be affected by the attitude the mother portrays.

Ascendence of the Mother was developed to measure the extent to which the woman plans to dominate the family. Mother domination may be a very significant contributor to marital conflict. In most middle-class homes the father is considered the leader of the family; this may not be true of the low-income families.

Family Communication. The two scales, Encouraging Verbalization and Avoidance of Communication, were written to determine whether the parent would permit or encourage the child to talk about his anxieties, conflicts, hostilities and disagreements with parental policies.

Restriction. The scales Restriction of New Experiences and Excluding Outside Influences investigate family ethnocentrism and a fear of the child learning new things. The more new experiences the child is allowed to face, the better the chance for socialization. The scales which measure attitudes toward communication and exploration should help assess the warmth and permissiveness of the parent-child relationship.

Alienation from Authority Figures also is relevant to this general area of restriction. This scale was developed to measure the degree of distrust of authority figures and the presence of a restrictive parental attitude.

Control. Fostering Dependency was designed to measure another aspect

of parental overprotection or overpossessiveness. The child who is over-protected may not have the opportunities for socialization that many children experience.

The scales Breaking the Will, Strictness, and Approval of Activity gather information as to the degree of control the parent has over the child. The degree to which the mother feels control and punishment is an effective method of influencing the child's behavior and appears to be very important in the future personality development of the child.

Acceleration of Development shows the willingness of the parent to give up control over the child and the degree to which early independence is stressed.

Suppression. Suppression of Sex and Suppression of Aggression were developed to further investigate the concept of parental control and protection. Also important in this scale is the general concept of restriction. It is expected that these scales will research slightly different attitudes than the control scales.

Equality. The scales Authoritarianism, Equalitarianism, and Comradeship and Sharing were written to measure the degree of democracy and equality within the family. These areas will investigate the home environment of the child and give information regarding child-rearing attitudes.

Low-Income Scales. The scales Fatalism, Concrete vs. Abstract Thinking, Family Goals, Judgment of Others, and Intrinsic vs. Extrinsic Values

are scales which were included to directly assess social class differences in attitudes. Research evidence supports the ideas that low-income families are more fatalistic, have short-range family goals, judge others from a personal quality standpoint rather than on the more impersonal qualities, and are more intrinsically motivated. The low-income families also are reported to think in concrete terms rather than the abstract.

Although each scale offers the opportunity to contrast and compare parental attitudes between classes, these scales are expected to be more discriminating.

Word Reading Level

There was a systematic effort to write the items in a way that the lower-class could understand them. "The language of this type of instrument is a major problem when used with a culturally disadvantaged population, particularly when the researcher wishes to compare his test results with a middle-class sample" (Radin and Glasser, 1965, p. 375). Many people in the culturally deprived group are illiterate or have limited ability to read.

To aid in item writing and item rewriting of original PARI items, a remedial reading teacher⁴ was consulted. This individual holds a Master of Science degree in special education and has fourteen years' experience working with culturally deprived children. Each item was analyzed for difficulty in reading

⁴Mrs. Phyllis Jones, Director of Remedial Reading, Junction City Junior High School. M. S. in Special Education from Emporia State Teachers' College, Emporia, Kansas.

level. The vocabulary and sentence level was limited to a very simple level.

The statements were written towards assessment of the mothers' attitudes. Most items could be answered by the father, but it is suggested that a special father form be developed if this is an area of interest for further research.

Each scale contains five items written to assess a homogeneous parental attitude. It may not be necessary to have five items to measure an attitude. It is expected that further research and trial samples will eliminate items. Each of the 125 statements in the instrument are four-point, forced choice items.

Scoring

A team of judges aided in developing item direction. Item direction refers to a scoring procedure which establishes a "best" answer for each statement in the instrument. The item direction is strongly biased toward the traditional middle-class child-rearing approach. Because there are four choices in answering, the "best" response is given a value of four. The "best" response is always a "strongly agree," or a "strongly disagree." The forced choice responses range from "strongly agree," "mildly agree," "mildly disagree," and "strongly disagree." If the item direction scoring technique points to the response "strongly agree" as the "best" answer, this response would receive a value of four; "mildly agree," a three; "mildly disagree," a two; and "strongly disagree," a one. A total subscale score is easily attained by adding the single item scores. (See Appendix C.)

Because the item direction is based on middle-class child-rearing attitudes, it is expected that the middle-class respondents will receive higher subscale scores than the lower-class respondents.

The subscale items are arranged in rotating cylinder order. For a single subscale the items contained within it will occur every twenty-five statements. For example, items in the Encouraging Verbalization subscale appear as statements number 1, 26, 51, 76, 101, in the PARS. (See Appendix A.)

Administration of the Parental Attitude Research Scale

The PARI was standardized as a pencil and paper test. Previously mentioned concerns reported in the Word Reading Level section influenced the decision to administer the PARS orally to the lower-class respondents. The middle-class subjects did respond to the PARS as a pencil and paper test. The following sections explain this procedure.

Method of Study

The method of administering the instrument varied with the socioeconomic level of the respondent. Low-income respondents were the major concern of this study, and they were the most difficult to research. The middle-class sample served as the control group as traditional child-rearing attitudes and practices are most often related to this group.

Research interviewing was conducted during the months of February and March, 1969. A predetermined goal of 100 completed forms was established before the study formally began. This sample number was established because

the research team felt it would be the minimum number for an adequate standardization sample. One half (50) of the sample was to be taken from a disadvantaged population. One half (50) of the respondents were to be middle-class.

Mothers with preschool-aged children in the home were preferred as subjects. Due to difficulties in locating disadvantaged mothers with very young children, the researchers interviewed mothers with children under 17 years of age if this child was living in the home.

The Disadvantaged Sample

Subjects were sought from the Junction City and Topeka areas of Kansas. There was not an attempt to locate families before the study began. Researchers drove to the low-income section of a town and "knocked on doors." Homes that were in very poor condition were selected over more well-kept homes.

The "door knocking" method was not very productive. Most of the disadvantaged families were not cooperative. Low-income Negro families were much more cooperative and friendly than were similar white families. Many people would not answer the door, and three out of five of those contacted would not fill out the form.

It was at this time in the research that a federal housing project became the center of attention. Topeka, Kansas, has two low-income federal housing projects. One of these projects housed 211 families with incomes under \$4,000. This project is called Pine Ridge Manor.

Pine Ridge Manor offered a unique opportunity for research. The housing

office was most cooperative. The families were low-income, and almost all of the families had younger children in the home. Forty forms, 80 percent of the low-income sample, came from this housing complex. The remaining forms were obtained from Junction City.

Method of Collecting the Disadvantaged Sample

In an attempt to reduce some of the difficulties in test administration with a low-income sample, the following alteration in techniques was employed with the culturally disadvantaged mothers. All questionnaires were administered individually and orally, with the interviewer holding one copy of the questionnaire and the respondent holding another, presumably reading it. The respondent was asked if she agreed mildly or strongly or disagreed mildly or strongly with each statement read. Every effort was made to sound completely neutral and to give no unusual emphasis to any word in the item. The replies were recorded by the interviewer on his own questionnaire. To reduce reluctance on the part of the mother to speak freely, the interviewee was reassured frequently that there were no right or wrong answers and that only her views were sought. She was given every indication her replies were completely acceptable.

It was found that the respondent frequently would agree vociferously with a statement and urge the interviewer to "put a double check" next to that reply. At other times the respondent seemed to have real difficulty in arriving at a decision as to how she felt. Often she would amplify her response, explaining why she answered as she did. In general, the mothers appeared to give thought to their replies and to enjoy the interest expressed by the interviewer in their

opinions. At Pine Ridge Manor, "word got around" that researchers were in the area. The questionnaire was quite a conversation piece and the mothers were most eager to cooperate.

Attempts were made to standardize and deal with the social situation at the time the instrument was administered. All questionnaires were given in the home of the lower-class mother. The interviewer took time to wait until children were fed, squabbles settled, diapers changed, and other interferences were concluded. If there was another adult present who seemed to be influencing the replies of the respondent, an excuse was found for ending the interview that day and returning another time.

The PARS took about 25 minutes to administer if interviewing conditions were ideal. Verbal competition with the television set and children often limited the number of interviews given in a day. Fatigue was definitely a problem with the interviewers.

No attempt was made to control the factor of race of the interviewee. All researchers were white middle-class graduate students; while the disadvantaged respondents were split between Negro and Caucasian. Although no reliable judgments can be made, there seemed to be an atmosphere of rapport during the testing situation which may have been helpful in encouraging the respondent to express her true views on child-rearing practices. Each researcher had a definite interest in learning more about disadvantaged families and this interest undoubtedly aided in establishing rapport with the subject. Not one family at Pine Ridge Manor turned away a researcher.

The Middle-Class Sample

Subjects were sought from the Manhattan, Kansas, area. Forty (80 percent) of the respondents were mothers of preschool children involved in nursery school education. These mothers were believed to hold traditional middle-class child-rearing attitudes.

The names and addresses of the parents of children in the nursery school operated by the Department of Family and Child Development at Kansas State University were obtained from the departmental office. Research forms and an explanatory letter were mailed to each mother of a nursery school child. Along with the PARS and the form letter was a stamped, self-addressed folder to encourage easy, expense-free return of the research. A return of 85 percent was achieved through this method.

Parents of children in a local church-controlled nursery school also were sent research forms and an explanatory letter asking for their help in the research. A faculty member in the Department of Family and Child Development supplied the names and addresses of these subjects. Each mother of a nursery school child in this nursery received PARS forms. A return of 67 percent was achieved in this sample.

Middle-class respondents read the instrument themselves and answered the items themselves. There were no research restrictions as to place of filling out the questionnaire or the time involved in doing so.

The remaining ten respondents were chosen from among friends of researchers involved in the project. Each respondent had a preschool child and each respondent was believed to hold traditional middle-class child-rearing

attitudes. It could be said that the middle-class respondents served as a control group in comparing and contrasting child-rearing attitudes.

The very fact that the middle-class sample valued learning experiences offered their children in a nursery school situation limits the variability of the sample. It was believed this sample would be homogeneous enough to offer opportunities for comparing and contrasting attitudes.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

This chapter reports the results of a factor analysis and an item analysis. The analysis of the biographical information sheet also is presented.

An item analysis of the PARS was computed to determine the percentage difference in responses between classes. The responses of the 50 lower-income mothers were computed as a separate sample from the 50 middle-class respondents. This division procedure allowed individual item comparisons between social classes. A factor analysis also was computed to resolve the many variables operating within the instrument into distinct patterns of occurrence.

Biographical Information on Subjects

The information sheet, which was coded to allow for computer analysis, may be observed as the last page of the PARS. (See Appendix B.) This section reports the analysis of this data.

The present ages of the respondents showed up as a relatively homogeneous group among subjects (see Table 5). Low-income mothers averaged 31.48 years of age while the middle-class mothers were slightly older at 34.42 years. The present ages of the respondents' husbands were a little closer. Low-income husbands were 35.67 years old and the middle-class

husbands were 34.38. In the middle-class sample, the husband and wife combinations were almost identical as to age, while the low-income husband was almost four years older than his wife. This difference can be accounted for in the wide range of ages in the low-income sample. There were five low-income husbands over 50 years of age and they ranged up to 69 years. There were no middle-class husbands 50 or older in the sample.

TABLE 5
PARENTS' AGE AT INTERVIEWING

Social Class	Mean	Range	S. D.
Low-income wife	31.48	17-46	8.39
Low-income husband	35.67	18-69	11.51
Middle-class wife	34.42	24-45	5.47
Middle-class husband	34.38	25-48	5.57

Another variable that provided additional information on the subjects was the age of the wife at marriage and the age of the husband at marriage. Table 6 presents a review of this information. The low-income mother was married almost two years earlier than the middle-class mother. Low-income ages at marriage ranged from 15 years to 30 years, with a mean of 19.73 years. The middle-class mothers' ages at marriage ranged from 17 to 29 years, with a mean of 21.50. One low-income mother of two children was never married; therefore, the data available is based on 49 subjects rather than 50.

Because some research interviewers were not specific in obtaining

divorced, one mother had never been married, and two mothers reported in other categories. Several of the twenty-six married low-income mothers had been married before, but it is not known exactly how many. It is felt that the mothers who reported in the other category were divorced and remarried. The information sheet did not include this category and it should have. In sharp contrast, all 50 of the middle-class respondents were married to their first husband at the time the information was collected.

TABLE 7

MARITAL STATUS OF SUBJECTS

Marital Status	Lower-Class		Middle-Class	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Married	26	52.00	50	100.00
Separated	5	10.00	0	.00
Divorced	16	32.00	0	.00
Widowed	0	.00	0	.00
Never married	1	2.00	0	.00
Other	2	4.00	0	.00
Total	50	100.00	50	100.00

An important determinant as to social class is the occupation of the family head. In the case of the low-income sample, at least 22 families did not have a father in the home; therefore, the occupational level of the family was determined by the mother. An occupational index was developed which consisted of eight categories coded from low (1) unemployed to high (8)

professional. An occupational summary is presented in Table 8. The coded level appears to be significant with the low-income family having a mean level of 2.63 and the middle-class family having a coded mean occupational level of 7.52 out of a maximum level of 8.

TABLE 8

OCCUPATIONAL LEVEL OF SUBJECTS

Occupational Level	Frequency	Frequency	Frequency	Frequency
	Low-income mother	Low-income husband	Middle-class mother	Middle-class husband
Unemployed	40*	3	28*	0
Unskilled labor	0	10	0	0
Service worker	6	15	0	0
Semi-skilled labor	3	21	0	1
Skilled labor	1	0	2	0
Clerical and sales	0	0	6	7
Managerial	0	0	3	6
Professional	0	0	11	36
Total	50	49	50	50

*Housewife included in this group

Most of the middle-class husbands were associated with Kansas State University and were rated as professionals on the occupational index. The large numbers of unemployed mothers were accounted for in the fact that housewives were included in this grouping. The reader will recall that 22 fatherless homes were included in the low-income sample and 40 mothers

biographical data, many low-income respondents reported the age at which they remarried after a divorce. The age at the first marriage was not always given by the low-income respondent. It is felt that if this first age would have been collected, the mean age of the low-income mother at marriage would have been lower. This same error in data collection is appropriate to the husbands' ages at marriage also. Many low-income husbands reported the age at which they married their present wife. The range of the ages at marriage for the low-income husbands was from 17 to 57 years. Two cases were reported which were above 50 years of age. This high range caused the mean age of the low-income husband to rise slightly. The mean age at marriage was 24.61 for the 49 low-income husbands, whereas the mean age for the middle-class husbands was 23.52.

TABLE 6

RESPONDENTS' AGES AT MARRIAGE

Social Class	Mean	Range	S. D.
Low-income wife	19.73	15-30	3.56
Low-income husband	24.61	17-57	8.09
Middle-class wife	21.50	17-29	3.06
Middle-class husband	23.52	18-33	3.32

One area of interest in this information is the high frequency of broken marriages in the low-income sample. Table 7 summarizes this information. Twenty-six respondents were married, five were separated, sixteen were

were unemployed. It is assumed that at least one half of these mothers were on welfare.

Low-income mothers had, on the average, one more child than the middle-class mothers. The range was also much greater for the disadvantaged sample which spanned from one child to twelve. The mean number of children was 3.90 for the low-income sample as compared with a mean of 2.80 children for the middle-class sample. The range was much more concise for this sample with one child to five. Table 9 presents this data along with ages for the youngest and the oldest child in the family.

TABLE 9

AGES AND NUMBER OF CHILDREN

Number of Children	Mean	Range	S. D.
Low-income mother	3.90	1-12	2.74
Middle-class mother	2.80	1-5	1.10
Age of Youngest Child*			
Low-income mother	4.24	1-17	3.91
Middle-class mother	3.08	1-11	2.30
Age of Oldest Child*			
Low-income mother	10.76	1-29	7.03
Middle-class mother	8.42	1-19	4.75

*Children younger than one were reported as one

Ages of children in the homes of the respondents were a concern in this study because it was planned to assess parental attitudes as they affected young children. Originally, it was planned to interview only mothers with

preschool children in the home, but because of difficulty in locating disadvantaged respondents, some deviations did occur. No respondent was interviewed, however, who did not have a child 17 or younger in the home. A review of Table 9 will clarify this data. The mean age for the youngest child in the home for low-income respondents was 4.24 years. The comparable mean age for the youngest child living in the middle-class home was 3.08 years. In contrast, the mean age of the oldest child living in the home of the disadvantaged respondent was 10.76, whereas the mean age for the oldest child in the middle-class category was 8.42. In this final biographical analysis it was found that the study researched mothers who had young children in the home. It is noted that children who were younger than one year were reported as one. Mean ages would have been lower if the monthly ages of children under one would have been used.

Education is indeed an important factor in the type of occupation a person acquires, and this education is directly related to the amount of income received from the occupation. Table 10 reports raw data as to number of years spent in school and Table 11 presents this same data in categorical or level form.

The mean number of years of education for the low-income mother is 10.88 or roughly that attained by a high school junior. The comparable mean for the middle-class mother revealed 14.96 years of education which is about that of a college junior. The low-income husband ranged in years of education from a third grade education to two years of college, with a mean of 10.48. The middle-class husband had a mean of 17.26 years of education which is

comparable to a college graduate degree. Once again it may be noted that most middle-class husbands were teachers or researchers at Kansas State University, and they were highly educated. The middle-class range in raw years of education was from tenth grade through a medical doctor degree.

TABLE 10

NUMBER OF YEARS OF EDUCATION

Social Class	Mean	Range	S. D.
Low-income mother	10.89	7-15	1.81
Low-income husband	10.49	3-14	2.24
Middle-class mother	14.96	12-19	2.17
Middle-class husband	17.26	10-19	2.35

The most important variable in determining social class categories is the family income level. A large difference is observable between income levels of the two samples used in this study. The disadvantaged sample had an income level of about \$3,500 a year before taxes, whereas the middle-class income level was about \$12,000 a year. Income levels found to be characteristic of the samples used for this study were felt to be characteristic of the population at large. Table 12 summarizes these findings. Eight low-income families reported annual incomes of less than \$2,000, while twenty-four middle-class families reported incomes of over \$14,000 a year.

TABLE 11

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF SUBJECTS

Educational level	Frequency			
	Low-income Mother	Low-income Husband	Middle-class Mother	Middle-class Husband
Grades 1-6	0	3	0	0
Grades 7-11	28	20	0	1
High school grad.	16	25	10	4
Post high school vocational training	5	0	0	0
1-3 years college	1	1	16	2
College graduate	0	0	14	9
M.A., M.S., M.S.W.	0	0	9	11
Ph.D, M.D., etc.	0	0	1	23
Total	50	49	50	50

TABLE 12

ANNUAL INCOME BEFORE TAXES

Family Income	Lower-class		Middle-class	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Less than \$2,000	8	16	0	0
\$2,000 - \$5,000	35	70	0	0
\$5,000 - \$8,000	7	14	5	10
\$8,000 - \$11,000	0	0	9	18
\$11,000 - \$14,000	0	0	12	24
\$14,000 or more	0	0	24	48
Total	50	100	50	100

Item Analysis

Individual items were selected for study rather than the entire five-item subscale. Radin and Glasser (1965) found that when individual items are analyzed sharp differences between social class exist which are not reflected in subscale scores. Discovering the items which differentiate between class was a major concern of this study. For this reason, it is felt that the item analysis procedure is the most important statistical summary reported in this thesis. Table 13 summarizes this analysis.

TABLE 13

CLASS SENSITIVE ITEMS

Item	Percentage of LC en- dorsing item	Percentage of MC en- dorsing item	Net Difference MC minus LC	Mean Resp. LC	Mean Resp. MC
123	22	88	66	1.84	3.26
117	24	88	64	1.84	3.24
122	30	92	62	1.90	3.24
53	22	80	58	1.74	3.06
22	30	88	58	1.98	3.56
15	10	60	50	1.42	2.70
47	44	96	52	2.28	3.40
79	34	86	52	2.14	3.40
80	38	90	52	2.10	3.60
115	24	76	52	2.00	2.82
116	42	94	52	2.24	3.30
83	16	64	48	1.66	2.76
11	8	52	44	1.46	2.52
42	32	76	44	2.02	3.16
66	40	84	44	2.10	3.22
99	14	58	44	1.58	2.88
111	36	80	44	2.10	3.06
110	22	64	42	1.74	2.54
54	38	78	40	2.26	3.18
93	32	72	40	2.00	2.88
20	16	56	40	1.76	2.60

To overcome the masking effect of subscale scores, an item analysis of the PARS replies was made. The percentage of mothers within each class answering the statements in the loaded item direction of 3 or 4 was calculated. These percentages were easily attained as cumulative coded percentages. The code simply reflected the item direction. The reader will recall that item direction refers to a scoring technique which establishes a predetermined "best" answer. It may be assumed that the middle-class mothers would have higher item loadings than the lower-class mothers because the item direction reflects traditional middle-class attitudes.

The item analysis revealed 21 items which differentiate between social classes a full 40 percentage points or more (see Table 13). Eleven of these items showed a full 50 percent difference. Three of the differentiating items revealed a full 62 percent difference or more. The range of class sensitive responses was from 40 percentage points to 66 percentage points. This series of findings was most encouraging because none of the studies reported in this thesis revealed as many class sensitive items as did the PARS. An example of an item is as follows: 88 percent of the middle-class mothers disagreed with item 123, "The main goal of a parent is to see that the kids stay out of trouble," but only 22 percent of the lower-class mothers disagreed with the item. The net difference was a full 66 percentage points.

There were also 15 items which did not differentiate between social class more than 4 percentage points (see Table 14). These items have been referred to as the non-class sensitive items. These 15 items along with the 21 class sensitive items and ten randomly selected items were pooled for a

factor analysis. This pooling of items represented at least one item from each subscale. These 46 items were factor analyzed and the results of this analysis will be the focus of the next section.

TABLE 14

NON-CLASS SENSITIVE ITEMS

Item	Percentage of LC en- dorsing item	Percentage of MC en- dorsing item	Net Difference MC minus LC	Mean Resp. LC	Mean Resp. MC
51	98	98	0	3.48	3.26
57	90	90	0	3.66	3.36
101	100	100	0	3.80	3.88
121	100	100	0	3.76	3.72
31	56	58	2	2.68	2.70
64	68	66	2	2.94	2.76
71	96	98	-2	3.58	3.70
109	72	74	2	3.24	2.84
1	96	100	4	3.66	3.80
14	64	68	4	2.76	2.66
21	98	94	-4	3.68	3.60
55	88	84	-4	3.48	3.26
62	70	74	4	3.12	3.02
102	100	96	-4	3.86	3.40
108	48	44	-4	2.40	2.36

Factor Analysis

It was felt that the factor analysis procedure would be a worthy supplement to the item analysis data. Factor analysis addresses itself to this question: "What are the patterns of relationship among these data?" (Rummel, 1967, p. 445). In other words, factor analysis is concerned with defining the patterns of common variation among a set of variables.

Unlike the item analysis procedure, this statistical analysis was computed

as a non-differentiating procedure. That is, the lower and the middle class responses were combined in analysis to allow for a more complete factor structure. The PARS is intended to serve a useful research purpose for both the lower and the middle classes. In this statistical analysis common variation was determined for the complete instrument as it is intended for use.

There was not a factor analysis program available for research use in the computing center at Kansas State University that could analyze the 125-item instrument. Several attempts were made with a program but because of expense it was not continued. At this stage in analysis it was decided to eliminate variables so a factor analysis program could work. The item analysis data were a great aid in determining what items would be included in the factor program. The 21 class-sensitive items, the 15 non-sensitive, and ten stratified random items were pooled to form a 46-item instrument. The stratified random sampling procedure was used in order to have at least one item represented from each of the 25 subscales.

Twelve independent factors were found to exist in the rotated factor matrix. According to Blalock (1960), the rotated factor matrix gives a set of factors which have the property that any given factor will be fairly highly correlated with some of the indices but uncorrelated with the rest. Each factor can then be identified with one of the clusters of indices, thereby reducing the effective number of variables to the number of factors used. By examining the nature of the items in each cluster it is possible to identify what they have in common. The factor loading, which is the correlation between an item and a given factor, is the most important single determinant of item

significance. Only items that loaded .49 or above are reported in the factor structure (see Table 15).

Fifteen of the 21 class-sensitive items were significant items in one of the factor structures. Thirty-seven different items loaded significantly on one of the factor structures. The 12 factor structures combined account for 68 percent of the total variance with the first factor accounting for 28 percent of the total. It is of interest to note that the final factor which accounts for less than two percent of the variance contains five items which have correlations of .6 or above.

Twelve items loaded on the first factor. Each of these items represented a different subscale. It is of interest to note that in each case where two or more items loaded in a factor structure there was not a duplication of subscales. That is, each item represented a different subscale within a factor. These findings are reported in Table 15. Table 16 lists the items within the factor structure.

TABLE 15

FACTOR STRUCTURE AND SIGNIFICANT LOADINGS

Item Subscale	Item	Factor Loading
<u>Factor I</u> (28 percent of the total variance)		
Suppression of sex	93	.78310
Irritability	109	.72925
Suppression of aggression	62	.71367
Alienation from authority figures	38	.70865
Excluding outside influences	110	.69481
Comradeship and sharing	21	.68900
Breaking the will	79	.66973
Intrinsic vs. extrinsic values	75	.66821
Marital conflict	57	.59092

TABLE 15 (continued)

Item Subscales	Item	Factor Loading
Fatalism	80	.53858
Seclusion of the mother	53	.53213
Family goals	48	.51440
<u>Factor II</u> (7 percent of the total variance)		
Authoritarianism	111	.68236
Fostering dependency	102	.66927
Fatalism	55	.59268
<u>Factor III</u> (5 percent of the total variance)		
Restriction of new experiences	106	.64740
Ascendance of the mother	69	.61187
Suppression of aggression	37	.55594
Strictness	83	.54942
<u>Factor IV</u> (5 percent of the total variance)		
Breaking the will	54	.72086
<u>Factor V</u> (4 percent of the total variance)		
Inconsiderateness of husband	117	-.76494
<u>Factor VI</u> (4 percent of the total variance)		
Equalitarianism	14	.71280
Acceleration of development	122	.66567
<u>Factor VII</u> (3 percent of the total variance)		
Fostering dependency	27	-.74396
<u>Factor VIII</u> (3 percent of the total variance)		
Avoidance of communication	66	-.76924
Concrete vs. abstract thinking	20	-.54142
<u>Factor IX</u> (3 percent of the total variance)		
Authoritarianism	11	.81609
Concrete vs. abstract thinking	45	.51584
Inconsiderateness of the husband	42	.49307

TABLE 15 (continued)

Item Subscale	Item	Factor Loading
<u>Factor X</u> (2 percent of the total variance)		
Comradeship and sharing	121	- .82379
<u>Factor XI</u> (2 percent of the total variance)		
Encouraging verbalization	51	.75356
<u>Factor XII</u> (2 percent of the total variance)		
Approval of activity	115	.77968
Encouraging verbalization	101	.62350
Family goals	48	.61002
Equalitarianism	64	.59936
Inconsiderateness of husband	42	.59084

TABLE 16

 FACTOR STRUCTURE AND CORRELATED ITEMS

FACTOR I

Item

- 93.* Boys and girls should not see each other undressed.
109. It's natural for a mother to blow her top when kids are selfish and demanding.
62. There is no good reason for a child to hit another child.
38. Almost all big shots are out to do you harm.
- 110.* There is nothing worse than letting a child hear criticisms of his mother.
21. Kids would be better if parents would show an interest in their affairs.
- 79.* Kids should be nicer to their mothers since their mothers suffer so much for them.
75. Work is really kind of fun and the money earned is not really as important as people let on.
57. No matter how much you are in love with your husband there are differences which lead to a fight.
- 80.* Most people don't realize how much our lives are controlled by secret plots and crooked deals.
- 53.* A woman has to decide between a well run home or lots of friends to visit with.
48. It doesn't do any good to plan ahead because you will just be disappointed.

TABLE 16 (continued)

FACTOR II

Item

- 111.* Nobody really ever learned anything important without suffering.
 102. A child should not be made to work if he doesn't want to.
 55. No weakness or problem can hold us back if we have enough will power.

FACTOR III

Item

106. Kids that go out and learn new things only come home and ask stupid questions.
 69. A mother has to do the planning because she is the one who knows what is going on in the home.
 37. A child should be taught to always come to his parents or teachers rather than fight when he is in trouble.
 83.* Most kids need more discipline and punishment.

FACTOR IV

Item

- 54.* Few mothers get any thanks for all they have done for their kids.

FACTOR V

Item

- 117.* Few husbands think that a mother needs some fun once in awhile.

FACTOR VI

Item

14. Parents should give in to the kids some rather than expecting the kids to always obey the parents.
 122.* A child should be taken away from the bottle or breast as soon as possible.

FACTOR VII

Item

27. A mother should do her best to avoid disappointments for her child.

FACTOR VIII

Item

- 66.* Kids pester you with little upsets all the time if you aren't careful from the first.

TABLE 16 (continued)

- 20.* New ideas are O.K. but parents should see things work before they get excited.

FACTOR IX

Item

- 11.* Behaving and respect for authority are the most important things lads should learn.
 45. Problems in the home either have yes or no answers to them.
 42.* Husbands could do their part around the house if they were not so selfish.

FACTOR X

Item

121. When the family does things together, kids feel close to you and can talk to you easier.

FACTOR XI

Item

51. A child has a right to his own ideas and should be encouraged to tell others about them.

FACTOR XII

Item

- 115.* The sooner a child learns that a wasted minute is lost forever the better off he will be.
 101. When a child is in trouble he should be able to talk about it with his folks.
 48. It doesn't do any good to plan ahead because you will just be disappointed.
 64. Children are too often made to agree with parents and this is not fair.
 42.* Husbands could do their part around the house if they were not so selfish.

*Refers to class sensitive items from item analysis. Fifteen out of twenty-one class-sensitive items also are factored items.

The pooling of items resulted in a 46-item factor program. The stratified random items were chosen to represent those scales that had not been represented before. Each subscale is represented by at least one item. The order of the items in the factor analysis program is as follows:

Class Sensitive 11, 15, 20, 22, 42, 47, 53, 54, 66, 79, 80, 93, 99,
110, 111, 115, 116, 117, 122, 123.

Non-class Sensitive 1, 14, 21, 31, 51, 55, 57, 62, 64, 71, 101, 102,
108, 109, 121.

Stratified Random 27, 106, 59, 37, 38, 69, 119, 45, 48, 75.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

This chapter will report basic contributions from personal communication with three researchers who have been involved with the PARI. Implications for further research with the PARS will also be discussed along with basic limitations of this study. Concluding this chapter will be a series of observations or value judgements which have been a direct result of this study.

Personal Communication

This study has been greatly enhanced through personal communication with three nationally known researchers. These researchers added general information to this study and served as an added motivational force for the research team. It was very important to be reminded of the fact that many researchers desired an instrument standardized for a lower-class population.

First, the research team wrote to the senior author of the PARI, Dr. Earl S. Schaefer.⁵ He returned a wealth of information on the PARI which would have been very difficult for the research team to obtain. Articles which he had published referring to the PARI and several unpublished manuscripts were

⁵Earl S. Schaefer, Ph.D. Senior Psychologist at the Center for Studies of Child and Family Mental Health. National Institute of Mental Health, Chevy Chase, Maryland.

included in the folder he sent. The most important single item sent to the research team was a complete list of the most recent studies which had utilized the PARI. Much information was attained on the reliability and validity of the original instrument.

As a direct result of the immediate response from Dr. Schaefer, the research team wrote to Norma Radin⁶ senior author of the much quoted article by Radin and Glasser (1965). Mrs. Radin responded very promptly. She has been using the PARI in an early education program for lower-class Negro families in Ypsilanti, Michigan.

Mrs. Radin reported in her return letter that the class-sensitive items on the PARI differentiate members of the lower-class from the middle-class and, further, make distinctions within the lower-class. The fact that the percentage agreeing with non-class-sensitive items is the same across all groups suggests more than response set is determining the replies to the PARI questions. Language of the PARI was reported to be a problem.

Radin has used the PARI in a number of interesting ways. The PARI has been used as a dependent variable in an experimental parent group which has been incorporated into the Early Education Project. It was found that eight PARI items showed significant differences in change scores between treatment and control groups.

The PARI, as an indicator of child-rearing techniques, has also been used

⁶Norma Radin, M. S. W. Lecturer and doctoral student at the University of Michigan School of Social Work, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

as an independent variable to predict cognitive growth of the child and has been found to be meaningful. Eight PARI items correlated significantly with initial Binet score, one at the .01 level (item 71 on the PARS). Radin also reports that the Equalitarian Factor which would closely resemble items 39, 71, 121, (see Appendix B) in the PARS is highly predictive of intellectual development.

Norma Radin also has used the PARI as a supplement to home observations of parent control mechanisms. The Authoritarian items correlated significantly at the .01 level with the observed mother behaviors. This is higher than any other instrument used. These same items were highly predictive of the child's interest in academic affairs as rated by the classroom teacher, and of Binet gain during the school year.

In general, Mrs. Radin wrote that she feels the PARI is sensitive to class differences and sheds light on the real explanatory variables behind the social class differences found in cognitive development. The PARI tends to be less useful as a measure of change because the replies tend to be extremely stable. This communication provided information for this study and presented several areas of interest for further research. If the PARI was able to detect social class differences in the structure of its language difficulties, it is felt that the PARS will be much more useful in this area.

A third researcher which influenced this study was Dr. David Weiskart.⁷

⁷David Weiskart, Ph.D. Director of the Perry School Project, Ypsilanti Public Schools, Ypsilanti, Michigan.

Dr. Weikart is currently the director of the experimental program in which Mrs. Radin works. He supplied extensive research reports on the PARI which included factor analysis data. Dr. Weikart is interested in a short form of the PARI which contains class-sensitive, non-sensitive, and random items. This short form could be compared to the 46-item pooling of the PARS. Two concerns Dr. Weikart expressed are the language of the PARI and ambiguous questions which have little relevance to the disadvantaged population. These concerns served as an added incentive to develop an instrument which controls language and focuses on knowledge of the disadvantaged parent. The PARS is the end result of these research concerns.

Implications for Research

As a direct result of Radin's use of the PARI in parent education groups, the research team investigated the possibilities of similar use of the PARS. Hereford (1963) has used attitude inventories as an index of change in parental attitudes through group discussion. In his work, he used some PARI items with reported success. The research team met with staff members of the North Central Kansas Guidance Center and explained the use of the PARS. At this time the Guidance Center is using the PARS in work with parent groups. Test-retest data will be available on approximately 150 parents by October, 1969. Through this study, attitude change will be measured as a direct result of group interaction. Additional studies in attitude change are planned with the PARS as the dependent variable.

The PARS certainly could be used, as the PARI has, as an index of change in parental attitudes through group discussion, prediction of cognitive growth, and as a supplement to home observations. The item analysis data of the PARS could greatly aid a practitioner or researcher interested in identifying women whose child-rearing orientation is more typically lower-class.

Limitations

A word of caution is needed regarding the limitations of this research. First, the sample was not randomly selected but rather represented a relative homogeneous population of either lower-class or middle-class mothers. Two separate and distinct groups of subjects existed which represented only 100 respondents. Second, many of the items are confusing. Third, items in most subscales are stated in a single direction. To adequately reduce acquiescence response set the items within a subscale should not all be stated in the same direction. Fourth, the empirical measures may lack precision. More detailed statistical analysis is needed on additional samples to completely determine acquiescent response set. Also, a complete factor analysis on the 125-item instrument should be computed. Fifth, the 125-item PARS, as it currently exists, is too long. Item numbers need to be reduced to limit the fatigue on the part of the respondent. Many items are assessing the same attitude. A subscale could be reduced to three items and the number of subscales should be reduced. It took from twenty to thirty minutes to complete the instrument.

Other Observations

In previous studies, middle-class instruments have been used to assess lower-class attitudes. This may be a typical procedure of middle-class researchers, but this seems to be a very weak technique. The PARS attempts to assess parental attitudes using questions which are relevant to both classes. Because most middle-class parents feel that their child-rearing methods and controls are the best, they immediately disregard the strengths of the poor. Most middle-class parents do not know or attempt to understand the behavior of the lower class. Behaviors which are foreign to us are considered to be wrong. Man tends to fear the unknown.

If change agents are to intervene in the vicious cycle of deprivation--school failure--school dropout--unemployment--financial dependency--cultural deprivation, it is most important that they gain a penetrating understanding of underlying attitudes of the lower-class population. It is also essential that these agents find instruments which will enable them to measure how effective their techniques have been. To assess parental attitudes on a wide scale, there appears to be no alternative to the use of some type of questionnaire. Attitude questionnaires must be developed which tap the feelings and beliefs of a lower-class population. The PARS is a beginning. More work needs to be done, but it is felt that this instrument development is a large step forward.

The item analysis reveals how large a gap there really is between socioeconomic class and child-rearing attitudes. Much can be gleaned from

looking at these differences in terms of the socialization impact they may have upon children. An understanding of parental attitudes, the child's environment, and socialization opportunities afforded the child may help in understanding the neglected one-fifth of America. Something needs to be done.

The PARS has been standardized on both a lower and a middle-class sample. To our knowledge, no other major parental attitude instrument has taken the lower-class into consideration in standardization. Language level has been controlled in the PARS, but more needs to be done. Research knowledge of the poor has been used in item construction and subscale development, but more "strengths" of the poor need to be utilized.

It is felt that social scientists must make available to the middle-class the beliefs and attitudes of the poor. The individuals involved with educating the youth of this country need to understand the lower-class family in order to teach the children from these families. These children have not had the same learning experiences as the middle-class children in the classroom.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY

This study was guided by the following propositions: (1) the family is the most important agent in the socialization process of the child; (2) parental attitudes toward child-rearing and family processes are an important influence on the socialization and personality development of the child; (3) maternal attitudes have the greatest effect upon the development of the child; (4) maternal attitudes vary with the socioeconomic class; (5) social class differences must be considered in instrument development. The basic assumption of this study was that maternal attitudes of the lower and the middle-class can be objectively measured in a single instrument.

To simplify the development of an instrument which would be applicable to both the lower-class and the middle-class, a standard instrument was chosen as a model. In the absence of a device which had been standardized on both populations, the decision was made to employ the best available instrument and make adaptations where necessary. The instrument chosen as the research model was the Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI). This instrument has been widely used as a research tool and has been found to be highly reliable.

The PARI is basically a middle-class instrument that assesses middle-class attitudes. Each of the 115 statements on the PARI uses a four-point

forced choice scale. The respondent is asked to agree strongly, agree mildly, disagree mildly, or disagree strongly; and the replies are scored 4, 3, 2, 1, respectively. All items within the 23 subscales are stated in a single direction.

The PARS, which is the end result of this study, used many of the techniques applied by Schaefer and Bell (1958) when they developed the PARI. The PARS used the four-point, forced-choice style of answering the items, and further developed the subscale concept which organizes homogeneous groups of items.

Language level was considered in writing items for the PARS, and research findings resulting from a review of literature were used in developing items which are relevant to the poor. Thirteen items used in the PARS were taken directly from the PARI. Another 60 items were taken from the PARI but they were revised and rewritten. Fifty-two new items were written which were conceptualized from the research findings resulting from the review of literature. An instrument was developed that contained 125 items arranged with five items in each of 25 subscales.

The basic assumptions used in developing the PARS were three in number. (1) More than one item should be written to assess a single child-rearing attitude. (2) Several predictors should be used to increase differentiation between groups. (3) Homogeneous groups of items are better predictors and differentiators than heterogeneous composite scores.

A scoring technique was developed which predetermined a "best" answer. This technique was referred to as item direction. Unlike the PARI in which all

items are stated in a single direction, the PARS contains items which are not consistent within subscales. Items were not stated in the same direction to eliminate response set. A subscale score was easily attained by simply adding items within the subscale and totaling this score. The item direction was based on traditional middle-class attitudes and values. This was done simply to have some type of scoring technique available for research comparisons.

This study was based on a population of 100 subjects. Fifty of the respondents were lower-class individuals and 50 respondents were middle-class. Income level was the basic consideration in determining the social class of the respondent. In an attempt to reduce some of the difficulties in test administration with the lower-class subjects, each questionnaire was administered individually and orally to the lower socioeconomic subjects. The middle-class subjects answered the questionnaire at their leisure and mailed the completed instrument to the research team.

An item analysis which compared responses between the two socioeconomic levels on all 125 items revealed 21 class-sensitive items. The criteria for determining a class-sensitive item were that there would be a full 40 percentage points difference between classes. The 21 class-sensitive items were pooled with the 15 items which did not differentiate more than four percentage points between classes and with ten stratified random items. This pooling of items represented each of the subscales with at least one item. The pooling of items served as a short version of the PARS which was used as a factor analysis structure. The factor analysis pooling was computed as a complete sample; that is, the responses were not divided into classes as previously in the item

analysis. The factor program computed 12 separate factors which represented 37 different items. Fifteen of the class-sensitive items were also significant factored items within one of the factor structures. The 12 factors represented 68 percent of the total variance with the first factor accounting for 28 percent of this total.

The biographical information available on the respondents revealed that this study did assess parents which represented two extremes of social class. Mothers with young children in the home were researched. Differences can be seen between social classes as to years of education, occupational level, number of children, marital status, and annual income.

Five limitations of this study were identified. These were: (1) the sample was not randomly selected but rather represented a relatively homogeneous population of either lower-class or middle-class subjects, (2) many of the PARS items were confusing, (3) the items in most subscales were stated in the same direction, (4) the empirical measures may not have been as adequate as necessary, and (5) the instrument as it exists is too long.

Most of these limitations can be reduced in future research work with the PARS. Few generalizations can be reported because this study was limited in scope to a standardization or pilot study. Although items were written to avoid confusion, more work needs to be done. Response set was considered but more precautions need to be taken. One of the purposes of the item analysis and factor analysis was to eliminate items which are non-differentiating and items which are repetitious. Future work with the PARS will eliminate these items.

This research indicated a need for instruments which have been standardized with a lower-class population. It is felt that the PARS can be a useful research tool applicable to both the lower and the middle-class. Future research uses may include the prediction of cognitive growth of children, an index of change in parental attitudes through group discussion, and as a supplement to home observations. The PARS can be a useful instrument in comparing and contrasting parental attitudes within social classes or between social classes. Further research is necessary to standardize the PARS with a random sample, but this pilot study will aid in eliminating items for use in future studies. At this point in time, it seems the social scientist has two basic choices. He may either employ less-than-perfect instruments or make no effort to collect objective data about the view of the disadvantaged family until better devices are created. In light of the urgency of the current situation, can social scientists afford to select the latter alternative?

REFERENCES

- Adams, H. E. and Kirby, A. C. Manifest anxiety, social desirability, or response set. Journal of Counseling Psychology. 27:140-146. 1963.
- Anderson, J. E. Parents attitudes on child behavior: A report of three studies. Child Development. 17:91-97. 1946.
- Bayley, N. and Schaefer, E. S. Relationships between socioeconomic variables and the behavior of mothers toward young children. The Journal of Genetic Psychology. 96:61-77. 1960.
- Becker, W. C., and Krug, R. S. The parent attitude research instrument--a research review. Child Development. 36:329-365. 1965.
- Bettelheim, B. Mental health and current mores. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry. 22:76-78. 1952.
- Blalock, H. M. Social Statistics. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc. 1960.
- Bossard, J. H. S. and Boll, E. S. The Sociology of Child Development. New York: Harper and Row. 1960.
- Brogden, H. E. Increased efficiency of selection resulting from replacement of a single predictor with several differential predictors. Educational Psychological Measurement. 11:173-195. 1951.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. Socialization and social class through time and space. In E. E. Maccoby, T. M. Newcomb, and E. L. Hartley, Eds., Readings in Social Psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston. 400-425. 1958.
- Child, I. L. Socialization. In G. Lindzey, Ed., Handbook of Social Psychology. Cambridge: Addison Wesley Publishing Co. 655-692. 1954.
- Chilman, C. S. Child-rearing and family life patterns of the very poor: implications for home economists. In Working with Low-Income Families. Washington, D. C.: American Home Economics Association. 47:56. 1965a.
- Chilman, C. S. Child-rearing and family relationship patterns of the very poor. Welfare in Review. 35:9-19. 1965b.
- Cronbach, L. J. Report on psychometric mission to clinitis. Psychometrika. 19:263-270. 1954.

- Crotty, C. J. Maternal attitudes and their relation to son's achievement motivation. Unpublished master's thesis. Catholic University. 1957.
- Davis, A. and Havinghurst, R. J. Social class and color differences in child rearing. American Sociological Review, 11:698-710. 1948.
- Freeman, H. E. and Schowel, M. The role of the family in the socialization process. Journal of Social Psychology, 37:97-101. 1953.
- Freeman, R. V. and Grayson, H. M. Maternal attitudes in schizophrenia. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 50:45-52. 1955.
- Goldstein, A. P. and Carr, A. C. The attitudes of mothers of male catatonic and paranoid schizophrenics toward child behavior. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 20:190. 1956.
- Guttman, L. Relation of scalogram analysis to other techniques. In S. A. Stouffer et. al., Eds., Measurement and Prediction. Princeton, New York: Princeton University Press. 172-212. 1950.
- Harris, E. K. The responsiveness of kindergarten children to the behavior of their fellows. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 11: no. 2. 1946.
- Havinghurst, R. J. and Davis, A. A comparison of the Chicago and Harvard studies of social class differences in child rearing. American Sociological Review, 20:438-442. 1955.
- Hereford, C. F. Changing Parental Attitudes Through Group Discussion. Austin: Hogg Foundation for Mental Health. 1963.
- Holzinger, K. J. Factoring test scores and implications for the method of averages. Psychometrika, 9:155-167. 1944.
- Hurlock, Elizabeth B. Child Development. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company. 1964.
- Maccoby, E. E. and Gibbs, P. K. Methods of child rearing in two social classes. In W. E. Martin and C. B. Standier, Eds., Readings in Child Development. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co. 1954.
- MacDonald, M., McGuire, C., and Havinghurst, R. J. Leisure activities and the socioeconomic status of children. American Journal of Sociology, 54:505-519. 1949.

- Mark, J. C. The attitudes of the mothers of male schizophrenics toward child behavior. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 48:185-189. 1953.
- Mead, G. H. Mind, Self, and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1934.
- Miller, S. M. and Riessman, F. The working class subculture: a new view. Social Problems, 9:86-97. 1961.
- Orlansky, H. Infant care and personality. Psychology Bulletin, 46:1-48. 1949.
- Radin, N. and Glasser, P. H. The use of parental attitude questionnaires with culturally disadvantaged families. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 27:373-382. 1965.
- Radke, M. J. Relation of parental authority to children's behavior and attitudes. University Minnesota Institute Child Welfare Monograph. No. 22. 1946.
- Read, K. H. Parents' expressed attitudes and children's behavior. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 9:95-100. 1945.
- Rummel, R. J. Understanding factor analysis. Journal of Conflict Resolution, 11:444-480. 1967.
- Schaefer, E. S. and Bell, R. Q. Development of a parental attitude research instrument. Child Development, 29:339-361. 1958.
- Schaefer, E. S. and Bell, R. Q. Development of a parental attitude research instrument. Human Development: Readings in Research, edited by Ira J. Gordon. Chicago: Scott, Foresman, and Company. 123-135. 1965.
- Sears, R. R., Maccoby, E. E., and Levin, H. Patterns of Child Rearing. New York: Harper and Row. 1957.
- Shapiro, M. B. Some correlates of opinions on the upbringing of children. British Journal of Psychology, 43:141-149. 1952.
- Shoben, E. J., Jr. The assessment of parental attitudes in relation to child adjustment. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 39:101-148. 1949.
- Stogdill, R. M. The measurement of attitudes toward parental control and the social adjustment of children. Journal of Applied Psychology, 20:359-367. 1936.

- Symonds, P. M. The Psychology of Parent-Child Relationships. New York: Appleton-Century. 1939.
- Watson, R. I. Psychology of the Child. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc. 1965.
- Zuckerman, M., Barrett, B. H., and Bragiel, R. M. The parental attitudes of parents of child guidance cases; comparisons with normals, investigations of socioeconomic and family constellation factors, and relations to parents' reactions to the clinics. Child Development. 31:401-417. 1960.
- Zuckerman, M., Ribback, B. B., Monashlan, I., and Norton, J. A. Normative data and factor analysis on the Parental Attitude Research Instrument. Journal of Counseling Psychology. 22:165-171. 1958.

APPENDIX A: PARS SUBSCALES AND ITEMS

PFRS SUBSCALES AND ITEMS

ENCOURAGING VERBALIZATION -- Item locations: 1, 26, 51, 76, 101.

- **1. Kids should be able to talk with parents if they think their own ideas are better.
- **26. When kids think family rules are wrong they should feel free to tell parents about it.
- **51. A child has a right to his own ideas and should be encouraged to tell others about them.
- **76. A child's ideas can be used when making family decisions.
- *101. When a child is in trouble he should be able to talk about it with his folks.

FOSTERING DEPENDENCY -- Item locations: 2, 27, 52, 77, 102.

- **2. A mother should protect her kids from life's problems.
- **27. A mother should do her best to avoid disappointments for her child.
- **52. A child should be protected from hard work.
- **77. Parents should not allow their kids to experience difficult situations.
- *102. A child should not be made to work if he doesn't want to.

EXCLUSION OF THE MOTHER -- Item locations 3, 28, 53, 78, 103.

- **3. A home is the most important thing to a good mother.
- *28. Women who want lots of things seldom make good mothers.
- **53. A woman has to decide between a well run home or lots of friends to visit with.
- **78. Too many women forget that a mother's place is in the home.
- **103. A good mother will have enough fun within the family.

*New items

**Revised and rewritten items

***Direct items from PARI

BREAKING THE WILL -- Item locations: 4, 29, 54, 79, 104.

- **4. Some kids are so bad that they must be taught to fear adults.
- *29. It is often necessary to beat the mischief out of a kid.
- **54. Few mothers get any thanks for all they have done for their kids.
- **79. Kids should be nicer to their mothers since their mothers suffer so much for them.
- *104. Parents that want their children to grow up and amount to something must keep after them.

FATALISM -- Item locations: 5, 30, 55, 80, 105.

- *5. No matter what we do, life seems to get the best of us, and we can't control that.
- *30. There is not much sense in working hard because we can't get ahead in life.
- *55. No weakness or problem can hold us back if we have enough will power.
- *80. Most people don't realize just how much our lives are controlled by secret plots and crooked deals.
- *105. More people get ahead because of fate or chance rather than by working hard.

RESTRICTION OF NEW EXPERIENCES -- Item locations: 6, 31, 56, 81, 106.

- *6. In raising children it's best to keep them close to home.
- *31. Kids can learn more from their mother than they can from other people.
- *56. What kids don't know sure won't hurt them.
- *81. Parents that like to have their kids learn new things are only asking for trouble.
- *106. Kids that go out and learn new things only come home and ask stupid questions.

MARITAL CONFLICT -- Item locations: 7, 32, 57, 82, 107.

- **7. People are wrong that think you can get along in marriage without fights.
- ***32. Sometimes it is necessary for a wife to tell off her husband in order to get her rights.
- **57. No matter how much you are in love with your husband, there are differences that lead to fights.
- **82. There are some things that can't be settled without a fight with your husband.
- *107. In many cases, divorce or separation is the answer to husband-wife problems.

STRICTNESS -- Item locations: 8, 33, 58, 83, 108.

- **8. A child will thank you later on for strict training.
- ***33. Strict discipline develops a fine strong character.
- **58. Kids that have firm rules to obey grow up to be the best adults.
- **83. Most kids need more discipline and punishment.
- **108. Kids are really happier under strict training.

IRRITABILITY -- Item locations. 9, 34, 59, 84, 109.

- **9. Kids will get on any woman's nerves if she is with them all day.
- **34. Mothers often feel that they can't stand their kids a moment longer.
- **59. It's hard to find a mother who can be nice to her children all day.
- **84. Raising children is a hard job.
- ***109. It's natural for a mother to "blow her top" when kids are selfish and demanding.

EXCLUDING OUTSIDE INFLUENCES -- Item locations: 10, 35, 60, 85, 110.

- **10. It's best if a child never starts wondering if his mother's views are right.
- **35. A parent should never be made to look wrong to a child.
- **60. Kids should not learn things outside the home that makes them question their parents ideas.
- ***85. The child should not question the thinking of his parents.
- ***110. There is nothing worse than letting a child hear criticisms of his mother.

AUTHORITARIANISM (Family life) -- Item locations: 11, 36, 61, 86, 111.

- *11. Behaving and respect for authority are the most important things kids should learn.
- *36. If kids would talk less and work more, the whole family would be better off.
- *61. There is nothing worse than a child that does not feel great love and respect for his parents.
- *86. The husband should be the leader and authority of the family.
- *111. Nobody really ever learned anything important without suffering.

SUPPRESSION OF AGGRESSION -- Item locations 12, 37, 62, 87, 112.

- ***12. A child should be taught to avoid fighting no matter what happens.
- ***37. A child should be taught to always come to his parents or teachers rather than fight when he is in trouble.
- **62. There is no good reason for a child to hit another child.
- *87. Children should not box or fight with each other because it makes them mean.
- **112. Most parents like a quiet child more than a child that is "screechy."

ALIENATION FROM AUTHORITY FIGURES -- Item locations: 13, 38, 63, 88, 113.

- *13. It is best to keep your kids away from policemen.
- *38. Almost all "big shots" are out to do you harm.
- *63. Children should not associate with leaders of the school or community.
- *88. Most of our problems could be solved if we could stay away from leaders and bosses.
- *113. Nowadays more and more leaders are sticking their nose into matters that aren't any of their business.

EQUALITARINISM (Child rearing) -- Item locations: 14, 39, 64, 89, 114.

- **14. Parents should give in to the kids some rather than expecting the kids to always obey the parents.
- *39. Parents must earn the respect of their kids by being fair with them at all times.
- **64. Children are too often made to agree with the parents, and this is not fair.
- **89. As often as is possible, the parent should treat the child as an equal.
- *114. Parents and children should give into each other as much as they can.

APPROVAL OF ACTIVITY -- Item locations 15, 40, 65, 90, 115.

- **15. There is no excuse for a child sitting around doing nothing because there are so many things he needs to learn about life.
- **40. Kids who don't try hard for success will feel they have missed out later in life.
- **65. Parents should teach their kids to get ahead in life and not to waste time.
- **90. A child who is busy all the time will most likely be happier than a child who sits around.
- ***115. The sooner a child learns that a wasted minute is lost forever the better off he will be.

AVOIDANCE OF COMMUNICATION -- Item locations: 16, 41, 66, 91, 116.

- **16. If you let kids talk about their troubles they end up complaining even more.
- ***41. Parents who start a child talking about his worries don't know that sometimes it's better to just leave well enough alone.
- **66. Kids pester you with little upsets all the time if you aren't careful from the first.
- **91. If a child seems upset it's best to leave him alone and not talk about it.
- **116. Kids usually try to keep you listening to their troubles by making up stories.

INCONSIDERATENESS OF THE HUSBAND -- Item locations 17, 42, 67, 92, 117.

- **17. Mothers could do a better job with the kids if father were kinder.
- **42. Husbands could do their part around the house if they were not so selfish.
- **67. When a mother does a poor job with the children it is usually because the father won't help out.
- **92. If mothers could get their wishes they would ask that their husbands be more understanding.
- **117. Few husbands think that a mother needs some fun once in awhile.

SUPPRESSION OF SEX -- Item locations: 18, 43, 68, 93, 118.

- *18. The husband uses sex to take advantage of the mother.
- **43. There is something wrong with a child that asks questions about sex.
- *68. Sex is really only enjoyable for the husband.
- **93. Boys and girls should not see each other undressed.
- ***118. A young child should be protected from hearing about sex.

PRESENCE OF THE MOTHER -- Item locations 19, 44, 69, 94, 119.

- **19. The mother should go ahead and make the rules for the home so the kids and husband can avoid unnecessary troubles.
- **44. Children and husbands do better when the mother is strong enough to settle most of the family problems.
- ***69. A mother has to do the planning because she is the one who knows what is going on in the home.
- **94. The whole family does fine when the mother runs things.
- **119. A married woman knows that she will have to take the lead in family matters.

CONCRETE VS. ABSTRACT THINKING -- Item locations 20, 45, 70, 95, 120.

- *20. New ideas are O.K., but parents should see things work before they get excited.
- *45. Problems in the home have either yes or no answers to them.
- *70. Parents can be divided into just two groups: the good, and the bad.
- *95. Reasons for kids behavior aren't very important to the good parent.
- *120. Everyone should have complete faith in some supernatural power whose decisions he obeys without question.

COMMUNSHIP AND SHARING -- Item locations 21, 46, 71, 96, 121.

- **21. Kids would be better if parents would show an interest in their affairs.
- **46. Laughing at children's jokes and reading them stories makes the family run smoothly.
- **71. Parents who are interested in hearing about their kids parties, friends, and fun help them grow up right.
- **96. When parents have fun with their kids, the kids are more likely to listen to them.
- **121. When the family does things together, kids feel close to you and can talk to you easier.

ACCELERATION OF DEVELOPMENT -- Item locations: 22, 47, 72, 97, 122.

- **22. Most kids should be toilet trained by 15 months of age.
- **47. The sooner a child learns to walk the better off he will be.
- **72. The sooner a child can break from parental control the better off he will be to handle his own problems.
- *97. A mother should make an effort to teach her child to take care of himself very early in his life.
- **122. A child should be taken away from the bottle or breast as soon as possible.

FAMILY GOALS -- Item locations: 23, 48, 73, 98, 123.

- *23. Every family should have goals in mind that they want to reach in 10 years.
- *48. It doesn't do any good to plan ahead because you will just be disappointed.
- *73. People that have big plans for the future are just fooling themselves.
- *98. It's best to think ahead only as far as tomorrow.
- *123. The main goal of a parent is to see that the kids stay out of trouble.

JUDGMENT OF OTHERS -- Item locations 24, 49, 74, 99, 124.

- *24. I like people for their special qualities rather than "who" they are in the community.
- *49. Parents must be careful not to trust most school teachers because they are too educated.
- *74. Being a "good" person and a friend on the job means more than "skill" in the job.
- *99. Good friends are few and far between.
- *124. People who don't succeed in life get just what they deserve.

INTRINSIC VS. EXTRINSIC VALUES -- Item locations: 25, 50, 75, 100, 125.

- *25. People usually do things that will help them get ahead rather than worry about others.
- *50. Parents should do things they want to do rather than what the community says they should.
- *75. Work is really kind of fun and the money earned is not really as important as people let on.
- *100. I do things because I want to not because someone tells me to.
- *125. Work is a way of life and it should have rewards other than money.

APPENDIX B: PARENTAL ATTITUDE RESEARCH SCALE

CONFIDENTIALPARENTAL-ATTITUDE RESEARCH SCALE
(PARS)

College of Home Economics
Department of Family and Child Development
Kansas State University
Spring 1969

R. Cromwell - S. Bollman

INSTRUCTIONS

The Department of Family and Child Development at Kansas State University needs your help. We want to find out more about children and their families. We would like to know what you as a mother really think. You can help us by sharing your ideas. Your participation is voluntary. It will take about 30 minutes to complete the form. Forget about what others may think, we want your ideas. We would also like for you to fill out the questions at the end of the form. The form is made up of ideas which other mothers have given us. You answer each question by circling one of the four letters by each statement. Circle the large "A" if you strongly agree, the small "a" if you mildly agree, the small "d" if you mildly disagree, the large "D" if you strongly disagree. Work as fast as you can. Circle your first reaction.

Thank you for your help.

Example:

Children should eat all the food on their plate.

Agree Disagree
A a d D

If you strongly agreed with this statement you would circle the large "A".

There are no right or wrong answers. Please answer all of the questions even if many of them seem to be alike.

- | | Agree | Disagree |
|--|-------|----------|
| 1. Kids should be able to talk with parents if they think their own ideas are better. | A a | d D |
| 2. A mother should protect her kids from life's problems. | A a | d D |
| 3. A home is the most important thing to a good mother. | A a | d D |
| 4. Some kids are so bad that they must be taught to fear adults. | A a | d D |
| 5. No matter what we do, life seems to get the best of us, and we can't control that. | A a | d D |
| 6. In raising children it's best to keep them close to home. | A a | d D |
| 7. People are wrong that think you can get along in marriage without fights. | A a | d D |
| 8. A child will thank you later on for strict training. | A a | d D |
| 9. Kids will get on any woman's nerves if she is with them all day. | A a | d D |
| 10. It's best if a child never starts wondering if his mother's views are right. | A a | d D |
| 11. Behaving and respect for authority are the most important things kids should learn. | A a | d D |
| 12. A child should be taught to avoid fighting no matter what happens. | A a | d D |
| 13. It is best to keep your kids away from policemen. | A a | d D |
| 14. Parents should give in to the kids some rather than expecting the kids to always obey the parents. | A a | d D |
| 15. There is no excuse for a child sitting around doing nothing because there are so many things he needs to learn about life. | A a | d D |
| 16. If you let kids talk about their troubles they end up complaining even more. | A a | d D |
| 17. Mothers could do a better job with the kids if father were kinder. | A a | d D |
| 18. The husband uses sex to take advantage of the mother. | A a | d D |
| 19. The mother should go ahead and make the rules for the home so the kids and husband can avoid unnecessary troubles. | A a | d D |
| 20. New ideas are O.K., but parents should see things work before they get excited. | A a | d D |
| 21. Kids would be better if parents would show an interest in their affairs. | A a | d D |
| 22. Most kids should be toilet trained by 15 months of age. | A a | d D |
| 23. Every family should have goals in mind that they want to reach in 10 years. | A a | d D |
| 24. I like people for their special qualities rather than "who" they are in the community. | A a | d D |
| 25. People usually do things that will help them get ahead rather than worry about others. | A a | d D |
| 26. When kids think family rules are wrong they should feel free to tell parents about it. | A a | d D |
| 27. A mother should do her best to avoid disappointments for her child. | A a | d D |
| 28. Women who want lots of things seldom make good mothers. | A a | d D |
| 29. It is often necessary to beat the mischief out of a kid. | A a | d D |
| 30. There is not much sense in working hard because we can't get ahead in life. | A a | d D |
| 31. Kids can learn more from their mother than they can from other people. | A a | d D |
| 32. Sometimes it is necessary for a wife to tell off her husband in order to get her rights. | A a | d D |

- | | | |
|--|-----|-----|
| 33. Strict discipline develops a fine strong character. | A a | d D |
| 34. Mothers often feel that they can't stand their kids a moment longer. | A a | d D |
| 35. A parent should never be made to look wrong to a child. | A a | d D |
| 36. If kids would talk less and work more, the whole family would be better off. | A a | d D |
| 37. A child should be taught to always come to his parents or teachers rather than fight when he is in trouble. | A a | d D |
| 38. Almost all "big shots" are out to do you harm. | A a | d D |
| 39. Parents must earn the respect of their kids by being fair with them at all times. | A a | d D |
| 40. Kids who don't try hard for success will feel they have missed out later in life. | A a | d D |
| 41. Parents who start a child talking about his worries don't know that sometimes it's better to just leave well enough alone. | A a | d D |
| 42. Husbands could do their part around the house if they were not so selfish. | A a | d D |
| 43. There is something wrong with a child that asks questions about sex. | A a | d D |
| 44. Children and husbands do better when the mother is strong enough to settle most of the family problems. | A a | d D |
| 45. Problems in the home have either yes or no answers to them. | A a | d D |
| 46. Laughing at children's jokes and reading them stories makes the family run smoothly. | A a | d D |
| 47. The sooner a child learns to walk the better off he will be. | A a | d D |
| 48. It doesn't do any good to plan ahead because you will just be disappointed. | A a | d D |
| 49. Parents must be careful not to trust most school teachers because they are too educated. | A a | d D |
| 50. Parents should do things they want to do rather than what the community says they should. | A a | d D |
| 51. A child has a right to his own ideas and should be encouraged to tell others about them. | A a | d D |
| 52. A child should be protected from hard work. | A a | d D |
| 53. A woman has to decide between a well run home or lots of friends to visit with. | A a | d D |
| 54. Few mothers get any thanks for all they have done for their kids. | A a | d D |
| 55. No weak boss or problem can hold us back if we have enough will power. | A a | d D |
| 56. What kids don't know sure won't hurt them. | A a | d D |
| 57. No matter how much you are in love with your husband, there are differences that lead to fights. | A a | d D |
| 58. Kids that have firm rules to obey grow up to be the best adults. | A a | d D |
| 59. It's hard to find a mother who can be nice to her children all day. | A a | d D |
| 60. Kids should not learn things outside the home that makes them question their parents ideas. | A a | d D |
| 61. There is nothing worse than a child that does not feel great love and respect for his parents. | A a | d D |
| 62. There is no good reason for a child to hit another child. | A a | d D |
| 63. Children should not associate with leaders of the school. | A a | d D |

- | | | | | | |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|
| 64. | Children are too often made to agree with the parents, and this is not fair. | A | a | d | D |
| 65. | Parents should teach their kids to get ahead in life and not to waste time. | A | a | d | D |
| 66. | Kids pester you with little upsets all the time if you aren't careful from the first. | A | a | d | D |
| 67. | When a mother does a poor job with the children it is usually because the father won't help out. | A | a | d | D |
| 68. | Sex is really only enjoyable for the husband. | A | a | d | D |
| 69. | A mother has to do the planning because she is the one who knows what is going on in the home. | A | a | d | D |
| 70. | Parents can be divided into just two groups: the good and the bad. | A | a | d | D |
| 71. | Parents who are interested in hearing about their kids parties, friends, and fun help them grow up right. | A | a | d | D |
| 72. | The sooner a child can break from parental control the better off he will be to handle his own problems. | A | a | d | D |
| 73. | People that have big plans for the future are just fooling themselves. | A | a | d | D |
| 74. | Being a "good" person and a friend on the job means more than "skill" in the job. | A | a | d | D |
| 75. | Work is really kind of fun and the money earned is not really as important as people let on. | A | a | d | D |
| 76. | A child's ideas can be used when making family decisions. | A | a | d | D |
| 77. | Parents should not allow their kids to experience difficult situations. | A | a | d | D |
| 78. | Too many women forget that a mother's place is in the home. | A | a | d | D |
| 79. | Kids should be nicer to their mothers since their mothers suffer so much for them. | A | a | d | D |
| 80. | Most people don't realize just how much our lives are controlled by secret plots and crooked deals. | A | a | d | D |
| 81. | Parents that like to have their kids learn new things are only asking for trouble. | A | a | d | D |
| 82. | There are some things that can't be settled without a fight with your husband. | A | a | d | D |
| 83. | Most kids need more discipline and punishment. | A | a | d | D |
| 84. | Raising children is a hard job. | A | a | d | D |
| 85. | The child should not question the thinking of his parents. | A | a | d | D |
| 86. | The husband should be the leader and the authority of the family. | A | a | d | D |
| 87. | Children should not box or fight with each other because it makes them mean. | A | a | d | D |
| 88. | Most of our problems could be solved if we could stay away from leaders and bosses. | A | a | d | D |
| 89. | As often as is possible, the parent should treat the child as an equal. | A | a | d | D |
| 90. | A child who is busy all the time will most likely be happier than a child who sits around. | A | a | d | D |
| 91. | If a child seems upset it's best to leave him alone and not talk about it. | A | a | d | D |
| 92. | If mothers could get their wishes they would ask that their husbands be more understanding. | A | a | d | D |

93. Boys and girls should not see each other undressed. A a d D
94. The whole family does fine when the mother runs things. A a d D
95. Reasons for kids behavior aren't very important to the good parent. A a d D
96. When parents have fun with their kids, the kids are more likely to listen to them. A a d D
97. A mother should make an effort to teach her child to take care of himself very early in his life. A a d D
98. It's best to think ahead only as far as tomorrow. A a d D
99. Good friends are few and far between. A a d D
100. I do things because I want to not because someone tells me to. A a d D
101. When a child is in trouble he should be able to talk about it with his folks. A a d D
102. A child should not be made to work if he doesn't want to. A a d D
103. A good mother will have enough fun within the family. A a d D
104. Parents that want their children to grow up and amount to something must keep after them. A a d D
105. More people get ahead because of fate or chance rather than by working hard. A a d D
106. Kids that go out and learn new things only come home and ask stupid questions. A a d D
107. In many cases, divorce or separation is the answer to husband-wife problems. A a d D
108. Kids are really happier under strict training. A a d D
109. It's natural for a mother to "blow her top" when kids are selfish and demanding. A a d D
110. There is nothing worse than letting a child hear criticisms of his mother. A a d D
111. Nobody really ever learned anything important without suffering. A a d D
112. Most parents like a quiet child more than a child that is "screechy." A a d D
113. Nowadays more and more leaders are sticking their nose into matters that aren't any of their business. A a d D
114. Parents and children should give into each other as much as they can. A a d D
115. The sooner a child learns that a wasted minute is lost forever the better off he will be. A a d D
116. Kids usually try to keep you listening to their troubles by making up stories. A a d D
117. Few husbands think that a mother needs some fun once in awhile. A a d D
118. A young child should be protected from hearing about sex. A a d D
119. A married woman knows that she will have to take the lead in family matters. A a d D
120. Everyone should have complete faith in some supernatural power whose decisions he obeys without question. A a d D
121. When the family does things together, kids feel close to you and can talk to you easier. A a d D
122. A child should be taken away from the bottle or breast as soon as possible. A a d D
123. The main goal of a parent is to see that the kids stay out of trouble. A a d D
124. People who don't succeed in life get just what they deserve. A a d D
125. Work is a way of life and it should have rewards other than money. A a d D

INFORMATION SHEET
(Confidential)

Directions: Please answer the questions by placing an "X" by the response that applies to you or by filling in the information requested.

Your present age _____ Husband's present age _____

Age at marriage: Wife _____ Husband _____

Check one: Married _____ Separated _____ Never married _____

Divorced _____ Widow _____ Other _____

Your occupation (specify) _____

Husband's occupation (specify) _____

Ages of all children-Boys _____

-Girls _____

Your education: Give highest level or grade completed _____

Husband's education: Give highest level or grade completed _____

Family income (before taxes):

Less than \$2,000 _____ \$2,000-5,000 _____ \$5,000-8,000 _____

\$8,000-11,000 _____ \$11,000-14,000 _____ \$14,000 or more _____

Adults living in your home other than you as parents. _____ Relationship _____ Age _____

none _____

APPENDIX C: SCORE SHEET

SCORE SHEET FOR SAMPLE
25 SCALE 5-ITEM QUESTIONNAIRE (PVRS)

Code No. _____

<u>Scale Title</u>						<u>Scale Score</u>
Encouraging Verbalization	1+	26+	51+	76+	101+	_____
Fostering Dependency	2-	27-	52-	77-	102-	_____
Seclusion of the Mother	3-	28-	53-	78-	103-	_____
Breaking the Will	4-	29-	54-	79-	104-	_____
Fatalism	5-	30-	55+	80-	105-	_____
Restriction of New Experiences	6-	31-	56-	81-	106-	_____
Marital Conflict	7+	32-	57+	82-	107-	_____
Strictness	8-	33-	58-	83-	108-	_____
Irritability	9-	34+	59-	84+	109+	_____
Excluding Outside Influences	10-	35-	60-	85-	110-	_____
Authoritarianism	11-	36-	61-	86+	111-	_____
Suppression of Aggression	12-	37-	62-	87-	112-	_____
Alienation from Authority Figures	13-	38-	63-	88-	113-	_____
Equalitarianism	14+	39+	64+	89+	114+	_____
Approval of Activity	15-	40-	65-	90-	115-	_____
Avoidance of Communication	16-	41-	66-	91-	116-	_____
Inconsiderateness of the Husband	17-	42-	67-	92-	117-	_____
Suppression of Sex	18-	43-	68-	93-	118-	_____
Ascendance of the Mother	19-	44-	69-	94-	119-	_____
Concrete vs. Abstract Thinking	20-	45-	70-	95-	120-	_____
Comradeship and Sharing	21+	46+	71+	96+	121+	_____
Acceleration of Development	22-	47-	72-	97-	122-	_____
Family Goals	23+	48-	73-	98-	123-	_____
Judgement of Others	24+	49-	74+	99-	124-	_____
Intrinsic vs. Extrinsic Values	25+	50+	75+	100+	125+	_____

Instructions: Enter the number 4, 3, 2, or 1 in each square according to the item direction. A plus (+) is shown in the box where Strongly Agree should receive a value of 4. A minus (-) is shown in the box where Strongly Disagree should receive a value of 1. Thus, if the subject responded with Mildly Disagree to item #51, a 2 would be entered in the third cell of the first row. Total score is the sum of entries across rows. Since items are arranged in rotating order by scales, all items in a given row belong to the same scale. Hence, summing across gives the score for that scale.

APPENDIX D: ITEM ANALYSIS DATA

ITEM ANALYSIS OF PARE ITEMS

Item	Percentage of lower-class endorsing item	Percentage of middle-class endorsing item	Net Difference	Mean response lower-class	Mean response middle-class
** 1	96	100	4	3.66	3.80
2	60	84	14	2.80	3.24
3	6	30	24	1.44	2.08
4	84	96	12	3.32	3.70
5	60	96	36	2.80	3.68
6	40	60	20	2.30	2.70
7	72	66	-6	3.08	2.92
8	12	18	6	1.44	1.98
9	18	38	20	1.58	2.16
10	66	92	26	2.82	3.42
*11	8	52	44	1.46	2.52
12	72	90	18	3.06	3.28
13	86	98	12	3.38	3.78
**14	64	68	4	2.76	2.66
*15	10	60	50	1.42	2.70
16	76	98	22	2.96	3.72
17	48	82	34	2.42	3.22
18	80	96	16	3.24	3.74
19	66	86	20	2.80	3.42
*20	16	56	40	1.76	2.60
**21	98	94	-4	3.68	3.60
*22	30	88	58	1.98	3.56
23	90	76	-14	3.32	3.06
24	94	100	6	3.68	3.78
25	68	62	-6	2.98	2.66

*Class sensitive

**Non-class sensitive

***Stratified random

Item	Percentage of lower-class endorsing item	Percentage of middle-class endorsing item	Net Difference	Mean response lower-class	Mean response middle-class
26	92	98	6	3.48	3.60
***27	30	62	32	2.12	2.72
28	58	80	22	2.56	2.96
29	80	90	10	3.24	3.56
30	88	100	12	3.42	3.92
**31	56	58	2	2.68	2.70
32	26	48	22	1.80	2.58
33	26	56	30	1.96	2.64
34	68	60	-8	3.08	2.78
35	46	68	22	2.34	2.86
36	48	80	32	2.40	3.10
***37	28	60	32	1.96	2.64
***38	76	96	20	3.06	3.50
39	90	96	6	3.44	3.66
40	12	38	26	1.48	2.20
41	48	70	22	2.32	3.00
*42	32	76	44	2.02	3.16
43	94	100	6	3.66	3.88
44	52	74	22	2.36	3.20
***45	60	96	36	2.66	3.64
46	82	90	18	3.20	3.24
*47	44	96	52	2.28	3.40
***48	64	100	36	2.86	3.76
49	92	100	8	3.64	3.92
50	66	44	-22	2.90	2.56
**51	98	98	0	3.62	3.78
52	90	96	6	3.66	3.56
*53	22	80	58	1.74	3.06
*54	38	78	40	2.26	3.18
**55	88	64	-4	3.48	3.26
56	64	88	24	2.80	3.30
**57	90	90	0	3.66	3.36

Item	Percentage of lower-class endorsing item	Percentage of middle-class endorsing item	Net Difference	Mean response lower-class	Mean response middle-class
58	32	22	-10	1.98	1.94
***59	30	58	28	1.98	2.68
60	72	94	22	2.98	3.52
61	18	46	28	1.80	2.40
**62	70	74	4	3.12	3.02
63	90	100	10	3.42	3.68
**64	68	66	2	2.94	2.76
65	14	44	30	1.64	2.36
*66	40	84	44	2.10	3.22
67	56	78	22	2.60	3.24
68	90	98	8	3.54	3.74
***69	42	62	20	2.28	2.74
70	70	96	26	3.00	3.72
**71	96	98	2	3.58	3.70
72	46	74	28	2.24	3.08
73	74	100	26	3.02	3.72
74	48	56	8	2.68	2.88
***75	46	64	18	2.28	2.86
76	88	100	12	3.30	3.62
77	82	96	14	3.30	3.42
78	26	48	22	1.66	2.60
*79	34	86	52	2.14	3.40
*80	38	90	52	2.10	3.60
81	84	100	16	3.34	3.84
82	56	80	24	2.54	3.22
*83	16	64	48	1.66	2.76
84	88	94	6	3.62	3.48
85	64	86	22	2.80	3.22
86	82	88	6	3.24	3.34
87	70	92	22	3.06	3.40
88	68	100	32	2.90	3.74
89	86	58	-26	3.22	2.78
90	8	28	20	1.30	1.88

Item	Percentage of lower-class endorsing item	Percentage of middle-class endorsing item	Net Difference	Mean response lower-class	Mean response middle-class
91	84	94	10	3.32	3.32
92	12	38	26	1.48	2.34
*93	32	72	40	2.00	2.88
94	74	84	10	2.96	3.32
95	90	98	8	3.42	3.78
96	90	96	6	3.62	3.56
97	2	20	18	1.08	1.82
98	66	96	30	2.92	3.68
*99	14	58	44	1.58	2.88
100	86	78	-8	3.46	3.12
**101	100	100	0	3.80	3.88
**102	100	96	-4	3.86	3.40
103	40	70	30	2.26	2.82
104	34	60	26	1.98	2.68
105	84	98	14	3.26	3.72
***106	76	100	24	3.06	3.86
107	34	68	34	2.20	2.96
**108	48	44	-4	2.40	2.36
**109	72	74	2	3.24	2.84
*110	22	64	42	1.74	2.54
*111	36	80	44	2.10	3.06
112	56	62	6	2.72	2.74
113	38	74	36	2.16	3.06
114	70	40	-30	2.94	2.42
*115	24	76	52	2.00	2.82
*116	42	94	52	2.24	3.30
*117	24	88	64	1.84	3.24
118	58	88	30	2.84	3.40
**119	46	84	38	2.44	3.04
120	50	66	16	2.56	2.72
**121	100	100	0	3.76	3.72
*122	30	92	62	1.90	3.24
*123	22	88	66	1.84	3.26

Item	Percentage of lower-class endorsing item	Percentage of middle-class endorsing item	Net Difference	Mean response lower-class	Mean response middle-class
124	82	94	12	3.36	3.38
125	86	94	8	3.44	3.60

APPENDIX E: PARI RESEARCH MODEL

PARENTAL ATTITUDE RESEARCH INSTRUMENT
(PARI)

Earl S. Schofer and Richard Q. Bell
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MENTAL HEALTH

1958

	Agree	Disagree
1. Children should be allowed to disagree with their parents if they feel their own ideas are better.	A a	d D
2. A good mother should shelter her child from life's little difficulties.	A a	d D
3. The home is the only thing that matters to a good mother.	A a	d D
4. Some children are just so bad they must be taught to fear adults for their own good.	A a	d D
5. Children should realize how much parents have to give up for them.	A a	d D
6. You must always keep tight hold of baby during his bath for in a careless moment he might slip.	A a	d D
7. People who think they can get along in marriage without arguments just don't know the facts.	A a	d D
8. A child will be grateful later on for strict training.	A a	d D
9. Children will get on any woman's nerves if she has to be with them all day.	A a	d D
10. It's best for the child if he never gets started wondering whether his mother's views are right.	A a	d D
11. More parents should teach their children to have unquestioning loyalty to them.	A a	d D
12. A child should be taught to avoid fighting no matter what happens.	A a	d D
13. One of the worst things about taking care of a home is a woman feels that she can't get out.	A a	d D
14. Parents should adjust to the children some rather than always expecting the children to adjust to the parents.	A a	d D
15. There are so many things a child has to learn in life there is no excuse for him sitting around with time on his hands.	A a	d D
16. If you let children talk about their troubles they end up complaining even more.	A a	d D
17. Mothers would do their job better with the children if fathers were more kind.	A a	d D

	Agree	Disagree
18. A young child should be protected from hearing about sex.	A a	d D
19. If a mother doesn't go ahead and make rules for the home the children and husband will get into troubles they don't need to.	A a	d D
20. A mother should make it her business to know everything her children are thinking.	A a	d D
21. Children would be happier and better behaved if parents would show an interest in their affairs.	A a	d D
22. Most children are toilet trained by 15 months of age.	A a	d D
23. There is nothing worse for a young mother than being alone while going through her first experience with a baby.	A a	d D
24. Children should be encouraged to tell their parents about it whenever they feel family rules are unreasonable.	A a	d D
25. A mother should do her best to avoid any disappointment for her child.	A a	d D
26. The women who want lots of parties seldom make good mothers.	A a	d D
27. It is frequently necessary to drive the mischief out of a child before he will behave.	A a	d D
28. A mother must expect to give up her own happiness for that of her child.	A a	d D
29. All young mothers are afraid of their awkwardness in handling and holding the baby.	A a	d D
30. Sometimes it's necessary for a wife to tell off her husband in order to get her rights.	A a	d D
31. Strict discipline develops a fine strong character.	A a	d D
32. Mothers very often feel that they can't stand their children a moment longer.	A a	d D
33. A parent should never be made to look wrong in a child's eyes.	A a	d D
34. The child should be taught to revere his parents above all other grown-ups.	A a	d D

	Agree	Disagree
35. A child should be taught to always come to his parents or teachers rather than fight when he is in trouble.	A a	d D
36. Having to be with the children all the time gives a woman the feeling her wings have been clipped.	A a	d D
37. Parents must earn the respect of their children by the way they act.	A a	d D
38. Children who don't try hard for success will feel they have missed out on things later on.	A a	d D
39. Parents who start a child talking about his worries don't realize that sometimes it's better to just leave well enough alone.	A a	d D
40. Husbands could do their part if they were less selfish.	A a	d D
41. It is very important that young boys and girls not be allowed to see each other completely undressed.	A a	d D
42. Children and husbands do better when the mother is strong enough to settle most of the problems.	A a	d D
43. A child should never keep a secret from his parents.	A a	d D
44. Laughing at children's jokes and telling children jokes makes things go more smoothly.	A a	d D
45. The sooner a child learns to walk the better he's trained.	A a	d D
46. It isn't fair that a woman has to bear just about all the burden of raising children by herself.	A a	d D
47. A child has a right to his own point of view and ought to be allowed to express it.	A a	d D
48. A child should be protected from jobs which might be too tiring or hard for him.	A a	d D
49. A woman has to choose between having a well run home and hobnobbing around with neighbors.	A a	d D
50. A wise parent will teach a child early just who is boss.	A a	d D
51. Few women get the gratitude they deserve for all they have done for their children.	A a	d D
52. Mothers never stop blaming themselves if their babies are injured in accidents.	A a	d D

	Agree	Disagree
53. No matter how well a married couple love one another, there are always differences which cause irritation and lead to arguments.	A a	d D
54. Children who are held to firm rules grow up to be the best adults.	A a	d D
55. It's a rare mother who can be sweet and even tempered with her children all day.	A a	d D
56. Children should never learn things outside the home which make them doubt their parents' ideas.	A a	d D
57. A child soon learns that there is no greater wisdom than that of his parents.	A a	d D
58. There is no good excuse for a child hitting another child.	A a	d D
59. Most young mothers are bothered more by the feeling of being shut up in the home than by anything else.	A a	d D
60. Children are too often asked to do all the compromising and adjustment and that is not fair.	A a	d D
61. Parents should teach their children that the way to get ahead is to keep busy and not waste time.	A a	d D
62. Children pester you with all their little upsets if you aren't careful from the first.	A a	d D
63. When a mother doesn't do a good job with children it's probably because the father doesn't do his part around the home.	A a	d D
64. Children who take part in sex play become sex criminals when they grow up.	A a	d D
65. A mother has to do the planning because she is the one who knows what's going on in the home.	A a	d D
66. An alert parent should try to learn all her child's thoughts.	A a	d D
67. Parents who are interested in hearing about their children's parties, dates, and fun help them grow up right.	A a	d D
68. The earlier a child is weaned from its emotional ties to its parents the better he'll handle its own problems.	A a	d D
69. A wise woman will do anything to avoid being by herself before and after a new baby.	A a	d D

	Force	Disagree
70. A child's ideas should be seriously considered in making family decisions.	F a	d D
71. Parents should know better than to allow their children to be exposed to difficult situations.	F a	d D
72. Too many women forget that a mother's place is in the home.	F a	d D
73. Children need some of the natural meanness taken out of them.	F a	d D
74. Children should be more considerate of their mothers since their mothers suffer so much for them.	F a	d D
75. Most mothers are fearful that they may hurt their babies in handling them.	F a	d D
76. There are some things which just can't be settled by a mild discussion.	F a	d D
77. Most children should have more discipline than they get.	F a	d D
78. Raising children is a nerve-wracking job.	F a	d D
79. The child should not question the thinking of his parents.	F a	d D
80. Parents deserve the highest esteem and regard of their children.	F a	d D
81. Children should not be encouraged to box or wrestle because it often leads to trouble or injury.	F a	d D
82. One of the bad things about raising children is that you aren't free enough of the time to do just as you like.	F a	d D
83. As much as is reasonable a parent should try to treat a child as an equal.	F a	d D
84. A child who is "on the go" all the time will most likely be happy.	F a	d D
85. If a child has upset feelings it is best to leave him alone and not make it look serious.	F a	d D
86. If mothers could get their wishes they would most often ask that their husband be more understanding.	F a	d D
87. Sex is one of the greatest problems to be contended with in children.	F a	d D

Agree Disagree

- | | Agree | Disagree |
|---|-------|----------|
| 88. The whole family does fine if the mother puts her shoulders to the wheel and takes charge of things. | A a | d D |
| 89. A mother has a right to know everything going on in her child's life because her child is part of her. | A a | d D |
| 90. If parents would have fun with their children, the children would be more apt to take their advice. | A a | d D |
| 91. A mother should make an effort to get her child toilet trained at the earliest possible time. | A a | d D |
| 92. Most women need more time than they are given to rest up in the home after going through childbirth. | A a | d D |
| 93. When a child is in trouble he ought to know he won't be punished for talking about it with his parents. | A a | d D |
| 94. Children should be kept away from all hard jobs which might be discouraging. | A a | d D |
| 95. A good mother will find enough social life within the family. | A a | d D |
| 96. It is sometimes necessary for the parents to break the child's will. | A a | d D |
| 97. Mothers sacrifice almost all their own fun for their children. | A a | d D |
| 98. A mother's greatest fear is that in a forgetful moment she might let something bad happen to the baby. | A a | d D |
| 99. It's natural to have quarrels when two people who both have minds of their own get married. | A a | d D |
| 100. Children are actually happier under strict training. | A a | d D |
| 101. It's natural for a mother to "blow her top" when children are selfish and demanding. | A a | d D |
| 102. There is nothing worse than letting a child hear criticisms of his mother. | A a | d D |
| 103. Loyalty to parents comes before anything else. | A a | d D |
| 104. Most parents prefer a quiet child to a "scrappy" one. | A a | d D |
| 105. A young mother feels "held down" because there are lots of things she wants to do while she is young. | A a | d D |

- | | Parce | Disagree |
|---|-------|----------|
| 106. There is no reason parents should have their own way all the time, any more than that children should have their own way all the time. | F a | d D |
| 107. The sooner a child learns that a wasted minute is lost forever the better off he will be. | A a | d D |
| 108. The trouble with giving attention to children's problems is they usually just make up a lot of stories to keep you interested. | A a | d D |
| 109. Few men realize that a mother needs some fun in life, too. | A a | d D |
| 110. There is usually something wrong with a child who asks a lot of questions about sex. | A a | d D |
| 111. A married woman knows that she will have to take the lead in family matters. | A a | d D |
| 112. It is a mother's duty to make sure she knows her child's innermost thoughts. | A a | d D |
| 113. When you do things together, children feel close to you and can talk easier. | A a | d D |
| 114. A child should be weaned away from the bottle or breast as soon as possible. | A a | d D |
| 115. Taking care of a small baby is something that no woman should be expected to do all by herself. | A a | d D |

SCORE SHEET FOR SAMPLE
25 SCALE 5-ITEM QUESTIONNAIRE (PIRS)

Code No. _____

Scale Title	Scale Score					
Encouraging Verbalization	1+	2+	51+	76+	101+	_____
Fostering Dependency	2-	27-	52-	77-	102-	_____
Seclusion of the Mother	3-	28-	53-	78-	103-	_____
Breaking the Will	4-	29-	54-	79-	104-	_____
Fetalism	5-	30-	55+	80-	105-	_____
Restriction of New Experiences	6-	31-	56-	81-	106-	_____
Marital Conflict	7+	32-	57+	82-	107-	_____
Strictness	8-	33-	58-	83-	108-	_____
Irritability	9-	34+	59-	84+	109+	_____
Excluding Outside Influences	10-	35-	60-	85-	110-	_____
Authoritarianism	11-	36-	61-	86+	111-	_____
Suppression of Aggression	12-	37-	62-	87-	112-	_____
Alienation from Authority Figures	13-	38-	63-	88-	113-	_____
Equalitarianism	14+	39+	64+	89+	114+	_____
Approval of Activity	15-	40-	65-	90-	115-	_____
Avoidance of Communication	16-	41-	66-	91-	116-	_____
Inconsiderateness of the Husband	17-	42-	67-	92-	117-	_____
Suppression of Sex	18-	43-	68-	93-	118-	_____
Ascendancy of the Mother	19-	44-	69-	94-	119-	_____
Concrete vs. Abstract Thinking	20-	45-	70-	95-	120-	_____
Comradeship and Sharing	21+	46+	71+	96+	121+	_____
Acceleration of Development	22-	47-	72-	97-	122-	_____
Family Goals	23+	48-	73-	98-	123-	_____
Judgment of Others	24+	49-	74+	99-	124-	_____
Intrinsic vs. Extrinsic Values	25+	50+	75+	100+	125+	_____

Instructions: Enter the number 4, 3, 2, or 1 in each square according to the item direction. A plus (+) is shown in the box where Strongly Agree should receive a value of 4. A minus (-) is shown in the box where Strongly Disagree should receive a value of 1. Thus, if the subject responded with Mildly Disagree to item #51, a 2 would be entered in the third cell of the first row. Total score is the sum of entries across rows. Since items are arranged in rotating order by scales, all items in a given row belong to the same scale. Hence, summing across gives the score for that scale.

DEVELOPMENT OF A PARENTAL ATTITUDE RESEARCH SCALE
FOR USE WITH THE LOWER AND MIDDLE CLASSES

by

RONALD E. CROMWELL

B. S., Kansas State University, 1968

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Family and Child Development

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1969

This study was guided by the following propositions: (1) the family is the most important agent in the socialization process of the child, (2) parental attitudes toward child-rearing and family processes are an important influence on the socialization and personality development of the child, (3) maternal attitudes have the greatest effect upon the development of the child, (4) maternal attitudes vary with the socioeconomic class, and (5) social class differences in child-rearing must be considered in instrument development.

The basic assumption of this study was that maternal attitudes of the lower-class and the middle-class can be objectively measured by the same instrument.

In the absence of a device which had been standardized on both the lower- and the middle-class populations, the decision was made to employ the best available instrument and make adaptations where necessary. The instrument chosen as the research model was the Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI). This instrument has been widely used as a research tool and has been found to be highly reliable. One limitation of this instrument is that it is a middle-class instrument that assesses middle-class attitudes.

The PARI served as a research model in the construction of the Parental Attitude Research Scale. Word reading level was controlled in the PARS so that a disadvantaged sample could understand the items. Research findings relevant to the lower-class were used in developing items which assess child-rearing attitudes of the lower-class. Thirteen items used in the PARS were taken directly from the PARI; another 60 items were taken from the PARI but they were revised and rewritten. Fifty-two new items were written which were

conceptualized from prior research findings.

The PARS was developed using the criteria that: (1) more than one item should be written to assess a single child-rearing attitude, (2) several predictors should be used to increase differentiation between groups, and (3) homogeneous groups of items are better predictors and differentiators than heterogeneous composite scores. A 125 item instrument was developed which contained 25 subscales with five items in each of the subscales.

One hundred subjects were tested with the PARS. Fifty of these subjects were lower-class and 50 were middle-class. Income level was the basic consideration in determining the socioeconomic level of the respondent. Data also were collected as to marital status, years of education, number of children, and occupation of each of the respondents. Mothers with young children living in the home were researched.

An item analysis of the responses between the two socioeconomic groups revealed 21 class-sensitive items. The criterion for determining a class-sensitive item was that there would be a full 40 percentage points difference between social class responses. Fifteen items in the PARS did not differentiate more than four percentage points. The 21 class-sensitive and the 15 non-sensitive were pooled with 10 stratified random items to allow for a factor analysis. This 46 item pool was factor analyzed. The factor program computed 12 separate factors which represented 37 different items. Fifteen of the class-sensitive items were also significant items within one of the factor structures. The 12 factors represented 68 percent of the total variance with the first factor accounting for 28 percent of the total.

Five limitations of this study were identified: (1) the sample was not randomly selected, (2) many of the PARS items are confusing, (3) the items in most subscales are stated in the same direction, (4) the empirical measures may not have been as adequate as necessary, and (5) the instrument as it exists is too long.

This study indicated that maternal attitudes of the lower-class and the middle-class are different. These attitudes can be measured objectively within the same instrument. Knowledge of the disadvantaged family and the attitudes that operate within that family are necessary to educate the agents that can initiate social change.