1974

Perception of Father and Teacher by Pre-Adolescent Boys

Alfred J. Arsenault
University of Rhode Island

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/theses>

Recommended Citation

Arsenault, Alfred J., "Perception of Father and Teacher by Pre-Adolescent Boys" (1974). *Open Access Master's Theses*. Paper 1424.
<https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/theses/1424>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Open Access Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons-group@uri.edu.

MASTER OF SCIENCE THESIS
PERCEPTION OF FATHER AND TEACHER

BY PRE-ADOLESCENT BOYS

BY

ALFRED J. ARSENAULT

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF SCIENCE

IN

CHILD DEVELOPMENT AND
FAMILY RELATIONS

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND

1974

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND
1974

MASTER OF SCIENCE THESIS

OF

ALFRED J. ARSENAULT

Approved:

Thesis Committee:

Major Professor

R C Smart

Mollie S. Smart

Henry B. Biller

Nancy A. Potter

Dean of the Graduate School

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND

1974

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the relationship between father perception by pre-adolescent boys and their perception of another non-parental adult authority figure. Reflecting Piaget's theory that children apply perceived parental behavior patterns to other individuals (assimilation), it was hypothesized that boys' perceptions of their father would be similar to their perceptions of their teacher, a non-parental adult authority figure.

A review of the literature established the relevance of studying personality development through children's reports of perceptions. A review of these studies during the 1960's then led to the formal statement of the hypothesis.

The subjects were all the fifth- and sixth-grade boys in a suburban parochial school. A modified version of the Children's Reports of Parental Behavior Inventory was administered twice in a single session, one form for the father and one form for the teacher. A factor analysis of the boys' father and teacher perceptions was performed and compared to test the similarity in perceptions.

Within limits the perceptions were similar. Two factor dimensions were isolated and labeled Demanding and Accepting. They were extracted from intercorrelations

for both teacher and father forms of the inventory. Further statistical analyses using subjects' factor scores revealed certain real differences in boys' perceptions of the two adults. It is suggested that boys live in two distinct contexts as their social horizon begins to emerge. They react in similar but not identical ways to home and social situations. Research with more refined instruments may be necessary to account for these distinctions and how the child perceives them.

The relevance of the findings to three theoretical issues is discussed: Erikson's stage of Industry vs. Inferiority; Piaget's theory of Assimilation; and Kagan's theoretical description of the acquisition of identification.

Some limitations of the study are listed.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to the members of my Thesis Committee. Because of them this work has been a rewarding experience in learning and research.

The kind and patient direction of Dr. Russell C. Smart, my Major Professor, has been a constant source of inspiration. The enthusiastic encouragement and suggestions of Dr. Mollie S. Smart and Dr. Henry B. Biller, Committee Members, were especially helpful and greatly appreciated.

The administration and staff of St. Rose of Lima School, Warwick, Rhode Island deserve a special word of thanks for their wonderful cooperation in arranging the test setting for this research. Also most helpful in specific roles were Ron Ferri, William Maguire, and Joseph W. Sullivan.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	2
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	4
Fatherhood in American Life	4
Parental and Social Authority Patterns	9
Children's Parental Perceptions	12
Summary and Formulation of a Hypothesis	23
III. METHOD	25
Subjects	25
Instrument and Procedure	25
Analyses	28
IV. RESULTS	30
V. DISCUSSION	36
VI. CONCLUSIONS	41
BIBLIOGRAPHY	45
APPENDIX A Sample Item for each Scale Component of the Modified Version of the CRPBI (Father Form)	50
APPENDIX B Sample Item for each Scale Component of the Modified Version of the CRPBI (Teacher Form)	52

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	Rotated Factor Matrices for Reports of Father-Teacher Perceptions	32
II.	Kendall Rank Coefficients (tau) Between Corresponding Factors in the Present Study and an Earlier Study (Burger and Armentrout, 1971)	33
III.	Means and Correlations of Father Factor Scores for All Subjects and their Cor- responding Teacher Factor Score. Sub- jects Grouped by Thirds on Father Fac- tor Score	34
IV.	Comparison of Mean Father Factor Scores for Subjects with One Sibling and for Sub- jects with Five or More Siblings	39

INTRODUCTION

The dynamics of parent-child interaction are generally considered crucial in building sound developmental theory and practice. Contemporary research, according to Walters and Stinnett (1971), has shown the salience of parental influence to sex-role identification, academic improvement, and personality adjustment. In a decade review of the literature on parent-child relationships, they indicate that various studies have suggested the adoption by children of parental attitude and behavior patterns.

However, much of the early research failed to account for the possible effects of fathering in the child-rearing process. It is only since the 1950's that the literature has seriously begun to include more relevant evidence on father-child interaction (Becker, 1964). Compared with the effects of maternal child-rearing practices upon personality development in children, there has been a relative neglect of similar research in regard to fathers.

The ambiguity in the role of the male authority figure is what Fuchs (1972, p. 26) calls the most striking and important characteristic of the American family as a social institution. With the Second World War and the Korean Conflict, when the implications of prolonged father de-

privation became of interest in developmental studies, systematic research to investigate the effects of paternal practices in child rearing became more common (Biller, 1971, p. 2).

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

This thesis examines the relationship between pre-adolescent boys' perceptions of their father and their perceptions of another non-parental adult authority figure. There is evidence that perceptions children have of their parents' behaviors and attitudes relates closely to their socialization and personality development (Dubin and Dubin, 1965). Current research has given substantial support to Piaget's theory. He believes that children apply perceived parental behavior patterns to other individuals. In his words, ". . . the child will tend to assimilate all other individuals into his (parental) schemes" (Piaget, 1951, p. 262). From this theoretical perspective, Cox (1962) implies it is reasonable to expect a positive correlation between a child's perceptions of his parents and his perceptions of other individuals, for example, teachers. Some research has been done to study the effects of parent perception by children upon peer relations (Siegelman, 1966): but a hiatus in the research does seem to exist in regard to children's perceptions of parents and

the perception of other adults who are authority figures. Parent perception, then, will refer to the child's experience or interpretation of parental behavior and attitudes.

The literature review which follows explores selected notions of fatherhood in American life. The research on children's perceptions of their parents is then examined, leading to the formulation and testing of an hypothesis for the present study.

II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

FATHERHOOD IN AMERICAN LIFE

For various historical and cultural reasons, fatherhood in American life is a unique phenomenon. The social system has been less than adequate in providing opportunities for role gratification in father-child relationships, and, in some ways, even providing sufficient understanding of the importance of the father role in child rearing. Social and behavioral sciences have neglected to consider the impact of the father in the total scheme of personality development in children (Peterson et al., 1959; Walters and Stinnett, 1971). The occupational priorities of modern industrial society; the relatively exclusive maternal involvement in child rearing; and the general trends toward activities away from the family circle merely begin, we suggest, to describe the situation of the father in contemporary American culture.

In his comprehensive review of fatherhood and personality development, Biller (1971) employs several frameworks to study the effects of the father role as reported in the research literature. Four of Biller's frameworks will be considered in the present review: socioeconomic status, cultural expectations, constitutional factors, and

some multidimensional factors concerning paternal influence upon masculine sex-role development.

Studies have found marked differences in father concept and style among various social and economic levels. In general, lower-class fathers seem to want more overt dominance and authority in family matters than middle-class fathers. But, in fact, when father influence at the two levels is studied, fathers from the former social class were found to have less actual influence and effect upon family members than fathers of middle-class families (Blood and Wolfe, 1960). Perhaps the greater extent of father availability or a more adequate self-concept are partly responsible for the variability in father-child relationships between various socioeconomic levels. In terms of support and control, Walters and Stinnett (1971) report that decade trends show middle-class parents to be more supportive and controlling of their children than lower-class parents, with their discipline based more on persuasion and reason than on threats of physical punishment. Also, lower-class parents seem to give comparatively greater differential treatment of male and female children than do middle-class parents.

Biller suggests the influence of father occupation upon personality development. There is substantial evidence of a relationship (e.g., Roe, 1957; Hurley and Hohn,

1971; Rose and Felton, 1971), but he thinks that the over-all quality of the father-son relationship is far more important than specific occupational influence.

Cross-cultural research, according to Biller, shows that children tend to be better adjusted in societies where the father is actively involved in the child-rearing process. Romney (1965) found that cultures with low father availability require children to be more compliant than do cultures with high father availability. Children in those societies tend to be more assertive and to develop their individual potentialities more readily.

Constitutional factors are apt to be the most ambiguous element of father-son interactions to understand and the most difficult to control. Physical, emotional, and intellectual differences between parent and child often require a great deal of sensitivity and acceptance in order for relationships to be successful. It is here that the direction of influence in a parent-child interaction is often difficult to predict accurately. Kysar (1968) lends support to Biller's suggestion that both mother and father can be influenced by constitutionally predisposed differences in children. He reports some evidence that fathers are less tolerant than mothers of intellectually handicapped children. A father's values in regard to what is socially acceptable as masculine behavior has an in-

fluence on his son. If the social milieu values physical agility in males, it is likely for a father to expect the development of these abilities in a son, especially if the father sees such qualities in himself. Lynn (1961 and 1962) comments that the male sex role is largely learned from cultural expectations; but we suggest further that masculine roles are perceived by the boy as they are "filtered" through his interpretation of his father's personality and expectations.

In what amounts to a fourth framework, Biller integrates the socioeconomic, cultural expectations, and constitutional considerations into a multidimensional factor to account more specifically for sex-role development. In general, a nurturant father aids in the development of culturally determined masculine behavior most successfully. With father availability as the basic criterion for masculine sex-role development, other factors, such as consistent affection, sufficient praise, and reinforcements toward social behaviors, are built. If a boy perceives such attitudes and behaviors in his father, then he is more likely to develop what Biller describes as the general aspects of sex-role development: sex-role orientation, sex-role preference, and sex-role adoption. The first aspect refers to an individual's self-evaluation of sex-role in relation to observed significant adults; the

second refers to his observation of sex roles in a larger social context such as the community environment; and the third pertains to the boy's publicly observed behavior of an adopted sex role.

Biller concludes that an "integrated description" of paternal influences upon masculine sex-role development is feasible. His formulation of masculine development focuses upon the constitutional and sociocultural factors discussed above, as well as a partial reliance upon social learning theory.

As described by Bandura and Walters (1963), social learning theory incorporates most of the currently disputed theories of identification and perception into the modeling concept. Modeling, according to Bandura (1971), more precisely denotes the behavioral phenomena involved in imitation and identification. Referring to various authors (Mowrer, 1950; Parsons, 1955; Kohlberg, 1963), he sees a lack of distinction between these terms and an insufficient understanding of their cause-and-effect relationship in formulating behavior. Bandura regards the term imitation to imply too narrow a behavioral repertoire and the concept of identification is too diffuse to define in working terms. Instead, he proposes the modeling concept as a much broader explanation for "matching" types of behavior. First, there is an observational learning effect;

then, there is a mechanism to strengthen or weaken inhibition of previously learned responses; and finally, modeling acts as a cue in facilitating existing responses of the same general class.

Though only four of his multidimensional factors have been discussed, Biller emphasizes the importance of other determinants of masculine development, such as maternal influences and cognitive abilities. For the purpose of this review, however, factors more directly related to father perception by sons are sufficient.

PARENTAL AND SOCIAL AUTHORITY PATTERNS

Since this thesis is concerned with boys' perceptions of fathers and other adults who are authority figures, a discussion of the nature of children's conceptions of authority will be included in this review. Dubin and Dubin (1965) question whether or not adults really understand the nature of authority as perceived from a child's point of view. They argue that children are able to recognize patterns of authority held by adults and can evaluate specific non-parental authority roles according to specific situations. If the child perceives the adult world to be an authority-structured one, adults may cause the child to feel less secure by disguising or abandoning adequate authority patterns (Dubin and Dubin, 1963).

Baumrind (1966) describes how the expression of authority in child-rearing practices has varied from time to time, for example, from psychoanalytic methods of full gratification to methods of more firm control. She presents three prototypes of adult control models: permissive, authoritarian, and authoritative. The first is a nonpunitive, acceptant and affirmative response to the child's impulses, desires, and actions. An authoritarian adult shapes, controls, and evaluates the behavior and attitudes of the child in accordance with a set standard, theologically motivated, and formulated by a higher authority. And the third, an authoritative adult, attempts to direct the child's activities in a rational, issue-oriented manner. Baumrind believes that authoritative control helps promote behavior which most successfully facilitates the development of independent living.

As discussed in the preceding section, there are differences in child-rearing behaviors according to social class. Kohn (1959) studied social class and parental authority, and found some fundamental differences between working-class and middle-class parents. His data showed that working-class parents were more concerned with controlling observed public behavior and more likely to punish in terms of immediate consequences. Middle-class parents, however, base their punishment on their inter-

pretation of the behavioral intent. The former is more concerned with outward responsibility and the latter with the development of internalized standards of conduct. More specifically, working-class fathers respond in two ways: if the child's behavior does not compel specific attention, they are apt to ignore it, and, if it is sufficiently disruptive, they are more likely to use physical punishment than middle-class fathers. Neither group resorts to physical punishment as a first course of action. They set limits and then evaluate the situation in terms of the particular context.

Kohn describes three aspects of authority in the family. First, there is the relative role of the mother and father in making family decisions. Then there is the relative role of the mother and father in setting limits on children's freedom of movement or activity. And third, there is the frequency with which the mother or father resort to physical punishment to enforce obedience.

Dubin and Dubin (1965) suggest that the child's perception of significant others' view of himself effects his self-image, which then influences his social behavior. Lane (1959) found that American boys tended not to express rebellious feelings in political matters because this would damage their "buddy" relationship with their father. He thinks that this kind of "more of a brother than a father"

relationship is more significant in forming political beliefs than the social indoctrination given through the regional social environment. Apparently, American boys tend to feel some guilt if they sense that they might want to rebel. More recently, Block (1972) reported a distinction between college students who rebelled against social institutions and rejected their parents, and those who also rebelled against institutions but kept positive regard for their parents. The former display a mitigated sense of personal identity, greater reaction to parental inconsistencies in child rearing, and more intense feelings of alienation from both society and family. The exercise of authority and the child's perceptions of it at an early age does appear, then, to have consequences for later socialization.

CHILDREN'S PARENTAL PERCEPTIONS

Research trends on children's perceptions of parents have shown two basic areas of development. One is the type of methodology and the other is the identification of factors salient to parent perception by children. Reviewing the literature from these perspectives clearly connects, we suggest, the earlier and current literature.

Methodology

A traditional antagonism between objective data

and subjective experience has long existed in western thought. This dichotomous separation in the meaning of knowledge has, in some measure, even affected research trends in contemporary social and behavioral sciences. Note the distinctive approach between European subjectivity and American experimental psychology.

Dubin and Dubin (1965) and Goldin (1969) provide comprehensive reviews of the literature on children's perceptions of their parents. They believe that much of the early research extrapolated child behavior from assessments of parental behavior. For example, Schaefer and Bell (1958) developed an instrument which measured attitudes of parents toward child rearing to help predict their behavior with the child as well as the future personality adjustment in the child.

Such research is useful in the assessment of family role functions and self-perceptions by parents of their behavior. However, merely specifying objective behavior does not sufficiently consider the dynamics of parent-child perception as an interaction process. Separate items of information might be appraised, but specific identification of variables affecting the relationship as a dynamic process would be difficult. One study on the attitudes of fathers failed to demonstrate whether or not a father's expression of dominating and controlling

attitudes toward children was related to difficulties in father-child interaction or to marital conflict (Nichols, 1962). Yarrow and Campbell (1963) found that an adult and a child had quite different perceptions of the same stimuli.

A different approach gives systematic attention to the child's actual experience of parental behavior. This technique yields more precise data on the dynamics of parent-child relationships and provides more insight into the dynamics of personality development and the socialization process (Dubin and Dubin, 1965). These studies consider the child's interpretation of a behavior as the primary index of parental influence in parent-child interactions. Ausubel et al. (1954) describe a developmental relationship between the way a child experiences parental behavior and its effects upon ego development. An infant receives environmental support from parents, and really perceives them as subservient to his "omnipotent" will. By the age of two or three, physical growth and cognitive maturity have become established. Parents begin to make demands in regard to the socialization of the child's behaviors. Through the remaining years of childhood, the youngster internalizes perceived parental values, and acquires the social approval necessary for proper ego development. In their study based upon these theoretical considerations,

Ausubel and his associates hypothesized that self-perceptions of rejection and extrinsic evaluation would be related to: 1) an underdeveloped self-concept with notions of "omnipotence;" 2) higher levels of ego aspiration and goal frustration tolerance; 3) greater ideational independence from parents; and 4) less advanced levels of general personality maturation. Their data for fourth, fifth, and sixth graders gave support to the hypotheses for subjects who perceived themselves as extrinsically valued by parents. Perceptions of acceptance and intrinsic valuation were highly correlated.

Siegelman (1966) found that pre-adolescent boys and girls who perceived their parents as punishing tended to be rated more introverted by their peers; and children who were rated as more extroverted by their peers, tended to perceive their parents as more loving. In another study, the effect of parent perception appeared to relate to eventual occupational choice. Graduate students in psychology who saw the dominant parent as acceptant were found likely to select person-oriented work in the field. Students who saw their dominant parent as avoiding, tended to pick less person-centered types of work (Medvene, 1969). Levenson (1973) found that perceived feelings of parents as punishing or controlling is related to feelings of control from sources outside the person and development

continues. Research techniques using children's reports of their perceptions have a wide range of applications, especially in studies of parent-child relationships from the perspective of symbolic interaction theory (Hill and Hansen, 1960; Scheck et al. 1973).

Both methodologies are valuable in parent-child research. One approach provides information about actual behaviors and family roles; the other describes dynamics between children and parents. Goldin (1969) presents an integrated analysis of the two methodologies. He considers parent-child behavior and interaction as a double element reality. First, there is the actual objective behavior which serves as a stimulus for a resulting behavior. The second element in Goldin's model is the phenomenological experience of that objective stimulus as perceived by the child, in other words, the perception by the child of the parent's behavior.

He relates these two elements in terms of predicting the child's behavior. If the actual behavior of the parent and the child's experience of it are congruent, knowing one factor would make for perfect prediction of the other. The implications for child rearing are enormous, as it might be possible to examine types of child behaviors related to the differential perception of parental behaviors. But since individual differences result in

subject variability, the most feasible approach may be further research which yields high correlations among variables. Factors such as level of cognitive development and cognitive style force correlations, according to Goldin, to be less than perfect. Perhaps with the aid of instruments such as the Parent Attitude Research Instrument (Schaefer and Bell, 1958) in combination with measures of children's perceptions of parental attitudes, future research might learn more about parental intentions and children's perceptions of their behaviors.

Statistical Treatment

Progress in the field has advanced not only in terms of methodology, but also in the statistical analysis and identification of perceived parent-child interaction factors. A listing provided by Goldin (1969) shows that the frequency of studies on children's perceptions of their parents had doubled every decade between 1930 and 1960. The development of more concise factor determinants may account for the decrease in such research by about forty-five percent during the 1960's.

Goldin reports that many early studies dealt with parental dominance, affection, and punishment (Despert and Potter, 1936; Block, 1937; Du Valle, 1937). He believes that contemporary factor analytic research generally supports earlier findings.

Schaefer (1965a) notes the frequencies of studies according to scale types. There were two studies on children's adjustment scales; four studies on family relations scales; and fourteen studies on parent-perception scales. Other studies were done on parent-child relationships (Bronson et al., 1959), measures of child adjustment (Berdie and Leyton, 1967), observers' reports of child behavior (Bronfenbrenner, 1961), school achievement (Morrow and Wilson, 1961), and differential criteria separating normal children from psychiatric patients (Williams, 1958).

He thinks that many studies did not measure direct components of perceived parental behavior. Specific concepts describing the parent-child relationship were not precisely identified and tested. Also, early studies did not sufficiently distinguish paternal and maternal behavior. Finally, he cites the lack of differentiation between parental adjustment and marital adjustment from other parent-child interactions.

The development of high speed computers had made possible the use of a more refined statistical technique. Factor analysis is a method of economy for determining the number and nature of underlying variables, or factors, from a larger number of correlations (Kerlinger, 1964, pp. 650-652). Factors clarify the fundamental nature

of variables and the relationship between them (Fruchter and Jennings, 1962).

Zuckerman et al. (1958) and Schaefer (1961) used factor analysis to study parental attitudes in child rearing. Milton (1968) used the technique to study actual child-rearing behavior. Siegelman (1965 and 1966) and Schaefer (1965b) have used factor analysis to study children's perceptions of their parents.

Most literature reviews consider the work of Schaefer and Siegelman concurrently. Though Goldin notes severe methodological limitations in their studies, Schaefer (1965b) in terms of social class and Siegelman (1965) in terms of intelligence, and both having too much heterogeneity in age and sex of their subjects, they specifically redirect research attention to the child's experience of parental behavior.

The two authors use similar methods and report similar dimensions in the extraction and isolation of factors. Concepts from clinical and research sources were chosen and developed into items for use in a research instrument. The Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire (Roe and Siegelman, 1963) and the Children's Reports of Parental Behavior Inventory (Schaefer, 1965a) were developed by Siegelman and Schaefer, respectively. Factor loadings were calculated from the matrix of intercorrelations of the items.

Each has extracted three factors from their respective scales and only on one dimension is there any substantial lack of similarity.

Siegelman (1965) named his factor dimensions loving, demanding, and punishment. The first two are almost identical to Schaefer's dimensions of acceptance vs. rejection and psychological autonomy vs. psychological control. There is a discrepancy between Siegelman's demanding and Schaefer's third dimension, firm control vs. lax control. However, despite the minor differences in emphasis, Goldin (1969) concludes that both investigators tend to account for the same reported parental behaviors.

Some recent research has attempted to extend factor analytic methods in this area. Burger and Armentrout (1971) and Burger et al. (1973) report methods for estimating factor scores for reports of perceived parental behavior. Factor score refers to an individual subject's relative score contributing to each factor extracted from the intercorrelations. It is developed from the factor matrix and is calculated by an appropriate weighing of an individual's score on the original variables (Fruchter and Jennings, 1962). Assuming the stability of factor dimensions such as those isolated by the Children's Reports of Parental Behavior Inventory (Schaefer, 1965a), Burger et al. (1973) suggest the use of factors themselves as

variables in future research. They argue that factor scores would permit group comparisons and options to use only those factor dimensions of the inventory which are of interest in a particular research problem. In the case of the CRPBI, three comparisons would have to be made in the intercorrelations instead of eighteen.

Factor analysis yields dimensions which are tentative. Neither the number nor the names of factors are really finally answered in one study (Kerlinger, 1964, p. 652). Factor analysis begins with a series of concepts and ends with another set of concepts which provide parsimony to the original series. Individual differences in subjects, design error, or any number of reasons can influence the way in which factors are isolated or labeled. The purpose and judgment of the research are the final criteria for the accuracy in a factor analysis.

The instrument used in this thesis is based on the Children's Reports of Parental Behavior Inventory (Schaefer, 1965a). The development of the CRPBI and its role among other instruments used in factor analytic studies of children's perceptions during the last decade provides a more immediate perspective for the current state of the research.

The CRPBI provides objective measures of parental perceptions by children. The original inventory consisted

of items which measured 26 components of parental behavior and attitudes of parents as perceived by children. There were 10 items for each component or scale. A later revision of the inventory measured 18 scales using 192 items, and yielded similar factor dimensions as Schaefer's original inventory. Since the CRPBI could be easily adapted to measure both children's perceptions of a parent and a non-parental adult authority figure, the revised form was chosen for the present study.

Following the suggestion of Becker (1964) most studies have yielded three-dimension factor structures. Siegelman (1965) and Schaefer (1965b) both isolated three factors. Studies using the revised form of the CRPBI with different types of populations also found factors similar to Schaefer. Rensen et al. (1968) in a cross-cultural study, Cross (1960) with college students, and Burger and Armentrout (1971) with fifth- and sixth-grade subjects all found the same factors as Schaefer. Armentrout (1970), however, questions the relevance of the three factor dimensions for children below the seventh grade. He thinks their perceptions may not be sufficiently differentiated to distinguish parental behaviors in order to provide a three-dimension factor structure. He suggests a two-dimension factor structure might be more relevant for children this age.

social institutions such as schools. Also, the similarity in perception may be enhanced when the sex of the child, the parent, and the adult authority figure are the same; and when a younger sample, preferably pre-adolescent, is considered, the child is still largely influenced by family socialization and his interaction with the larger society is still somewhat limited.

These considerations from empirical findings and consequent assumptions suggest the following hypothesis to be tested in the present study: Pre-adolescent boys' perceptions of a male adult authority figure will be similar to their perceptions of their father.

EXPERIMENT AND PRESENTATION

The revised form of the Children's Report of Perception

III

METHOD

SUBJECTS

The subjects were all the fifth- and sixth-grade boys in a suburban parochial school. There were 27 in the fifth grade and 24 in the sixth. The mean age of the subjects was 10 years 8 months, ranging from 10 years 1 month to 12 years 11 months.

All the subjects were white and the sample was relatively homogeneous in socio-economic status. Most of the fathers worked in skilled labor occupations; and only five were in occupations which require a college level education. One subject was fatherless, but it was decided to include him, since he had been so for less than two years.

Including the subject, the mean number of children in each family was 3.9. None of the subjects was without siblings.

School officials indicated that all the subjects fell within the average range of intelligence and academic performance. Only one boy was thought by the officials to be a possible behavior problem, but he appeared to cooperate during the testing period.

INSTRUMENT AND PROCEDURE

The revised form of the Children's Reports of Parental

Behavior Inventory was modified for the present study. Criteria were established for items to be included in the present form of the inventory. Items had to be applicable to both a teacher and father. It was decided to delete eight items which could not be applied to both situations; rewrite some items to make them relevant to a school situation; and to keep other items in the same form for both teacher and father. The result was a father-form and a teacher-form of the inventory each consisting of 184 items measuring the 18 scale components of perceived behavior. The items refer to concrete situations and the subjects have trichotomous response alternatives: "Like my Father/Teacher; Somewhat Like my Father/Teacher; Not Like my Father/Teacher."

All fifty-one subjects were tested at the same time. Part One (Father Form) of the inventory was distributed by the writer and two male assistants, one a graduate student and the other an undergraduate. An initial introduction indicated to the subjects that they were being asked to help in a special project being conducted by graduate students at the University of Rhode Island. With the permission of the school officials, they were being asked to tell some real facts about their lives both at home and at school.

It was emphasized that the exercise was not a test in

the usual sense. There were no "right" or "wrong" answers. No one would see their answers except those working on the project and the electronic computers that would help to figure out the results. Individual answer sheets were identified only by numbers.

A personal data sheet was completed giving such information as age, grade, number of siblings, and father's occupation. Then specific directions for Part One were given along with three practice items.

Each item was read aloud by either the writer or one of the assistants alternating every third page. The subjects were given time to circle the appropriate response alternative for each item.

After Part One of the inventory was completed the subjects were given a twenty minute rest period. Then Part Two (Teacher Form) was distributed and appropriate directions given. It was explained that this form was similar to the first one, but that the items referred to their feelings about school, and specifically teachers. While doing each item, they were asked to think of their Gym teacher. Items were written with reference to him rather than the father as in Part One.

It is the situation of the male gym teacher which made this sample population an ideal one for the present study. The subjects have contact with him at least one

period a week; and, since he also teaches science to higher grades, there is some interaction with him at other times during the school week. He is the only male teacher in the school and, except for occasional visits by the parish priests, the subjects do not have regular contact with other male authority figures. The writer has observed the interaction between the teacher and the subjects on several occasions both during gym period and other school situations.

Upon completion of Part Two, the inventory was collected and the subjects returned to their classrooms. Total time for the entire testing procedure was approximately two and one-half hours.

ANALYSES

A scoring procedure similar to earlier studies using the CRPBI was used. Nominal values of three, two, and one were assigned to responses of "Like, Somewhat Like, and Not Like my Father/Teacher," respectively.

For each subject there was a father and teacher score sheet matching the two forms of the inventory. Since items in both forms referred to the same components of perceived behavior, the score sheets for both forms were identical. While designing the instrument and scoring techniques, the number of specific items in both forms

referring to each component of behavior was determined. In this way scale totals of items applying to a specific component of behavior could be ascertained on the father/teacher scoring sheets. Thus scale totals for the 18 components of behavior were obtained for each of the 51 subjects.

The 18 scales from the father inventory were intercorrelated and the resulting matrix was factor analyzed using the UCLA Biomedical Computer Program (BMD08M) Factor Analysis Program. This program uses the principle component solution which extracts the maximum amount of variance from observed variables; and parsimony is obtained if a ". . . small number of linear combinations of the original variables can be found which account for most of the variance" (Harman, 1960, p. 132). Factor matrices were obtained and these were rotated orthogonally by the varimax method. Factor scores were also obtained using the BMD08M Factor Analysis Program.

The same analyses were performed on the 18 scales from the teacher inventory. The results of the factor analyses were then compared to test the hypothesis.

IV

RESULTS

The separate intercorrelations of the 18 scales for the father and teacher inventories yielded two similar and corresponding factor matrices which were then rotated orthogonally by the varimax method. Factor scores were obtained.

For the father scales, factor one loaded heavily on the following components: Hostile control .91, Enforcement .85, Instilling persistent anxiety .76, Control .74, Control through guilt .68, Intrusiveness .67, Withdrawal of relations .65, Possessiveness .64, and Rejection .62.

Factor one for the teacher scales yielded high loadings on the following components: Hostile detachment .84, Rejection .83, Hostile control .75, Withdrawal of relations .74, Control through guilt .73, Inconsistent discipline .69, Instilling persistent anxiety .65, Enforcement .64, and Control through guilt .49.

Factor two for the father scales had heavy loadings on the components of: Acceptance .88, Positive Involvement .81, Childcenteredness .71, Acceptance of individuation .67, and Rejection -.67.

For the teacher scales, factor two loaded heavily on

the following components: Acceptance .89, Positive involvement .87, Childcenteredness .78, Acceptance of individuation .76, and Lax discipline .58.

Kendall rank correlation coefficients (τ) were obtained between corresponding matrices for the first and second father-teacher factors, respectively. Similar correlations were calculated between these results and the findings of an earlier study (Burger and Armentrout, 1971). The previous study had extracted a third factor, but only the first two were used for comparison with the two factors isolated in the present study. (Table II).

The (τ) correlations between the previous study and the present loadings for the first factor show negative correlations in respect to both the teacher scale and the father scale, $-.86$ and $-.44$, respectively. The (τ) correlation between the father and teacher loadings for the first factor in the present study is $.41$.

Similar Kendall (τ) correlations showed positive correlations, $.81$ and $.72$, between the earlier study and the present loadings for the second factor, both for the father and teacher scales. The second factor also showed a positive correlation of $.83$ between the father and the teacher loadings.

Factor scores for each subject were obtained for both factors extracted from the teacher and father scales. For

TABLE I

ROTATED FACTOR MATRICES FOR REPORTS OF FATHER-TEACHER PERCEPTIONS
(Demical points omitted)

		Father Factors			Teacher Factors		
		I	II	h^2	I	II	h^2
1.	Acceptance	-02	88	78	00	89	79
2.	Childcenteredness	25	71	57	-09	78	61
3.	Possessiveness	64	35	54	45	40	36
4.	Rejection	62	-67	84	83	-17	72
5.	Control	74	17	59	58	27	42
6.	Enforcement	85	-17	76	64	-16	44
7.	Positive Involvement	28	81	74	01	87	76
8.	Intrusiveness	67	07	45	49	33	36
9.	Control through guilt	68	02	47	73	28	61
10.	Hostile Control	91	-06	84	75	24	63
11.	Inconsistent Discipline	36	-39	28	69	-00	48
12.	Nonenforcement	-01	-29	08	45	15	23
13.	Acceptance of Individuation	-29	69	56	00	76	84
14.	Lax Discipline	-46	14	23	29	58	42
15.	Instilling Persistent Anxiety	76	-15	61	65	14	45
16.	Hostile Detachment	38	-75	71	84	-25	77
17.	Withdrawal of Relations	56	-35	43	74	16	57
18.	Extreme Autonomy	-32	05	10	25	23	12

TABLE II

KENDALL RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS (τ) BETWEEN CORRESPONDING FACTORS
IN THE PRESENT STUDY AND AN EARLIER STUDY (BURGER AND ARMENTROUT, 1971)

Factor One	(τ)
Burger and Armentrout and Arsenault (Father)	-.86
Burger and Armentrout and Arsenault (Teacher)	-.44
Arsenault (Father) and Arsenault (Teacher)	.41
Factor Two	
Burger and Armentrout and Arsenault (Father)	.81
Burger and Armentrout and Arsenault (Teacher)	.72
Arsenault (Father) and Arsenault (Teacher)	.83

TABLE III

MEANS AND CORRELATIONS OF FATHER FACTOR SCORES FOR ALL SUBJECTS
AND THEIR CORRESPONDING TEACHER FACTOR SCORE. SUBJECTS GROUPED
BY THIRDS ON FATHER FACTOR SCORE.

	Factor One		Factor Two	
	Father	Teacher	Father	Teacher
Total Group	M 0.0000 t 0.483 r .51	M -0.0675	M -0.0001 t 0.0001 r .24	M 0.0001
Ranks 1 - 17	M 1.682 t 2.262* (tau) -.25	M 0.5381	M 0.9925 t 2.982* (tau) -.28	M 0.2470
Ranks 18 - 34	M -0.1075 t 0.456 (tau) -.24	M -0.0014	M 0.1373 t 0.305 (tau) -.25	M 0.0532
Ranks 35 - 51	M -1.0606 t 1.526 (tau) .15	M -0.3981	M -1.1300 t 3.996 (tau) .28**	M -0.3000

t test levels of significance

* $\angle$.02 $\angle$.01

** $\angle$.01

each father factor, the subjects were rank ordered by factor scores and divided into three equal groups of 17 subjects each. Kendall rank order correlations were calculated between these groups and three groups of each subject's corresponding teacher factor score. The (τ) correlations ranged from .28 to -.28 over the six comparisons. For the total group of 51 subjects Pearson product-moment correlations of the factor scores were .51 and .24 for factors one and two, respectively.

DISCUSSION

The dimensions isolated in this factor analysis are similar to those extracted in previous studies. Schaefer (1959) reported two bi-polar factor dimensions of maternal reports which he labeled Love vs. Hostility and Autonomy vs. Control. With the initial version of the CRPBI, he extracted three bi-polar factor dimensions: Acceptance vs. Rejection; Psychological Autonomy vs. Psychological Control, and Firm Control vs. Lax Control (1965b). Since then, studies using a revised version of the CRPBI have yielded the same general factor dimensions.

As previously discussed, Armentrout (1970) questions the advisability of using the three dimension factor structure with subjects below the seventh grade. His findings with boys and girls from a middle-class suburban community tend to show that the extent of perceived parental control was associated with both the degree of perceived parental rejection and perceived firmness of parental discipline. He suggests that young children's views of their parents' behavior are not sufficiently differentiated to support a more complex three-dimensional factor structure, which might be more appropriate for the perceptions of older children and adults.

The findings of the present study give support to this suggestion. The subjects did not make a clear distinction between the parental techniques represented by Schaefer's second and third factor dimensions. Psychological Autonomy vs. Psychological Control describes ". . . covert, psychological methods of controlling the child's activities and behaviors that would not permit the child to develop as an individual apart from the parent." Firm Control vs. Lax Control refers to ". . . the degree to which the parent makes rules and regulations, sets limits to the child's activities, and enforces rules and limits," (Schaefer, 1965b).

Apparently elements from the second and third factors of previous studies were coupled into the first factor of the present study. The perceptions are stronger and more unpleasant than the "psychological" character of a similar factor in other studies. The label for this factor will have to reflect the subjects' inability to perceive distinctions between overt limit setting behaviors and more subtle covert behaviors.

The first factor is called Demanding. Roe and Siegelman (1963) describe demanding parents, and we suggest other authority figures too, as requiring high standards in activities, imposing strict regulations, demanding unquestioning obedience, high punitiveness, limiting friend-

ships, and making little effort to discover a child's feelings about things.

The second factor loads heavily on more nurturant and positive perceptions. It is very similar to the first factor generally found in studies using the CRPBI. This factor is called Accepting.

Despite the perceived father-teacher similarity in the factors, a close examination of the factor loadings suggests some subtle differences. Neither factor in the teacher matrices have heavy loadings with negative sign values. The uni-polar nature of these loadings is evident when compared with the negative loadings in the two father matrices. In terms of perceiving a full range of behaviors on a positive-to-negative continuum, the teacher is seen with a sense of attenuation by the subjects as compared to their perceptions of the father. The teacher is not seen as accepting or demanding as strongly. The perceptions of the teacher appear more functionally oriented, while the perceptions of the father are more expressive in nature.

This attenuation in the perception of the teacher may reflect the greater emotional intensity of a child's one-to-one relationship with the parent. At home the child is one of a few at most, if there are siblings. At school he is one of many and the teacher-child interactions may be "diluted" in intensity.

The data in Table IV shows the effect of "diluted" perceptions by the subjects within the family. Boys with the greater number of siblings saw their father more strongly on the Demanding or functional factor, as a teacher might be seen in school. In comparison, boys with only one sibling perceived their father as more Accepting or expressive, denoting a more one-to-one kind of relationship. These findings suggest that not only personality and behavior of the parent is salient to parental perception by children, but also the number of siblings with which the parent must interact in the family.

TABLE IV

COMPARISON OF MEAN FATHER FACTOR SCORES FOR SUBJECTS WITH ONE SIBLING AND FOR SUBJECTS WITH FIVE OR MORE SIBLINGS

	Factor One		Factor Two	
Number of Siblings	1 Sib	5+ Sibs	1 Sib	5+ Sibs
Mean Factor Score	-0.2993	0.1970	0.4679	-0.7850
	t 3.237*		t 9.508**	

t test levels of significance

* .02 .01

** .001

Dubin and Dubin (1963) infer that a child does adjust to different situations where an authority figure is involved. The low product-moment correlations between the rank order factor score groups indicate certain real distinctions in children's perceptions. At least with the present instrument, it is not possible to predict perceptions between teacher and father. Further research with a more refined instrument may account for these variables.

From (1963, pp. 235-241) describes the school age child as beginning to be a "worker," as he realizes that if he is to survive he must be able to exert his progress outside the family. He learns to gain recognition by his abilities and industry in producing things. A tendency for ambivalence toward home life may begin at this time. The child knows he is accepted at home but resents parental control of his energies. It is this aspect of his relationship with his parents which, in his determination, dominates. Sexual latency is a time of "mischievous" experimentation meaning the child is handling the identity problem to be encountered during adolescence. The child must learn to balance a need for acceptance at home with the demands of living in a larger society.

This sense of tension between the home and the larger

VI

CONCLUSIONS

The findings of this study are relevant to some important theoretical issues in child development. A child's perceptions of his parents are salient to personality development at every age. But the pre-adolescent years may be more crucial than is commonly thought because this period is a transitional one from early childhood to adolescence.

Erikson (1963, pp. 258-261) describes the school age child as beginning to be a "worker;" as he realizes that if he is to survive he must be able to exist and progress outside the family. He learns to win recognition by his ambition and industry in producing things. A tendency for ambivalence toward home life may begin at this time. The child knows he is accepted at home but resents parental control of his energies. It is this aspect of his relationship with his parents which, in his estimation, dominates. Sexual latency is a time of "mischievous" achievement preparing the child to handle the identity problems to be encountered during adolescence. The child must learn to balance a need for acceptance at home with the demands of living in a larger society.

This sense of tension between the home and the emerg-

ing social horizon is suggested by the factor score data. Boys live in two distinct contexts and they react in similar but not completely identical ways to both situations.

By late pre-adolescence the child should have established mental structures which are sufficiently stable for dealing with the environment. The practice of "assimilation" begun during infancy should be well perfected (Ginsburg and Oppenheimer, 1963. p. 18). The way a child sees a parent should be relatively stable, in order that this "primary" relationship might serve as a model for persons beyond the family. Confidence in dealing with people in various settings is enhanced when the child experiences nurturant perceptions of his parents, especially the same sex parent.

The way children experience the permanence of material objects, as described by Piaget, may be similar to the way they adjust to various persons and social settings. There is a constant ordering of what is less familiar in new social settings, such as school and club activities, into more familiar structures of family life. As adolescence itself approaches, the task of constantly adjusting to new experiences becomes a crucial growth requirement. The period of "Formal Operations" increases reality testing and reactions to different social situations become more flexible. It is reasonable to suspect the perceptions of

parents would become less crucial as social experience increases and the personality becomes more solidified.

It is suggested that the findings might be relevant to the acquisition and maintenance of identification as described by Kagan (1958). Note the prevalence of parent perception type notions. The first criterion is that the child perceive a model as possessing desired goal states. Secondly, the child need believe that if he is similar to the model, then he does in fact possess the model's skills or goal states. Next, there is the reinforcement factor from other people, especially significant others, as well as the child's own feelings of success. Finally, after experiencing some of the affective aspects of the desired goal states of the model, the child comes to expect the same responses from the social environment as the model has received.

This study has shown that children's perceptions of their parents are salient to personality development and social adjustment. Within limits, children will perceive another adult authority figure as they perceive a parent. This study concerned pre-adolescent boys and their perceptions of their father and a male adult authority figure.

Though the hypothesis was supported, the findings may be considered tentative. The research was limited by number of subjects, sex of subjects and adults, and socio-

economic status of the families. Variables accounting for differences in subjects' perceptions of the fathers and teacher were not identified. It is suggested that a more refined instrument might be combined with personality assessments of fathers and other adult.

Results may also be considered as tentative due to the possibility of subject fatigue over the testing period, length of the instrument, and failure to counter-balance the administration of the Father-Teacher forms of the inventory.

- Miller, J. L. Effects of Authoritative Parental Control on Child Behavior. *Child Development*, 1960, 31, 490-497.
- Miller, J. L. Consequences of Different Modes of Parental Discipline. In M. L. Hoffman and L. W. Hoffman (eds.), *Studies of Child Development Research*, Vol. 10. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1961, 100-110.
- Bordin, E. F., and Lorton, F. L. *Marriage Counseling: A Case Manual*. New York: Psychological Corporation, 1957.
- Miller, J. L. Father, Child, and Sex Role. *Developmental Psychology*, 1971.
- Miller, J. L. Generational Continuity and Discontinuity in the Transmission of Social Behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1970, 39, 311-325.
- Miller, J. L. Conflict of Adolescents with their Mother. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1970, 31, 100-105.
- Miller, J. L., and Wolfe, E. M. *Marriage and Divorce: The Experience of Married Living*. New York: Free Press, 1960.
- Stemmer, G. J. Some Variables Associated with Response to Wife and Leadership in the Home. In L. L. Stokols and E. M. Wolfe (eds.), *Psychological and Sociological Research*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961, 217-231.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Armentrout, J.A. Relationships Among Preadolescents' Reports of their Parents' Child-Rearing Behaviors. Psychological Reports, 1970, 27, 695-700.
- Ausubel, D.P., Balthazar, E.E., Rosenthal, I., Blackman, L.S., Schpoont, S.H., and Welkowitz, J. Perceived Parent Attitudes as Determinants of Children's Ego Structure. Child Development, 1954, 25, 173-183.
- Bandura, A. Analysis of Modeling Process. In A. Bandura (Ed.), Psychological Modeling, New York: Aldine-Atherton, 1971.
- Bandura, A., and Walters, R.H. Social Learning and Personality Development. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1963.
- Baumrind, A. Effects of Authoritative Parental Control on Child Behavior. Child Development, 1966, 37, 887-907.
- Becker, W.C. Consequences of Different Kinds of Parental Discipline. In M.L. Hoffman and L.W. Hoffman (Eds.), Review of Child Development Research: Vol. I. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964, 169-208.
- Berdie, K.F., and Layton, W.L. Minnesota Counseling Inventory Manual. New York: Psychological Corporation, 1957.
- Biller, H.B. Father, Child, and Sex Role. Lexington: Heath Lexington Books, 1971.
- Block, J.H. Generational Continuity and Discontinuity in the Understanding of Social Rejection. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1972, 22, 333-345.
- Block, V.L. Conflict of Adolescents with their Mother. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1973, 32, 193-206.
- Blood, R.O., and Wolfe, D.M. Husbands and Wives: The Dynamics of Married Living. New York: Free Press, 1960.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. Some Familial Antecedents of Responsibility and Leadership in Adolescents. In L. Petrullo and B.M. Bass (Eds.), Leadership and Interpersonal Behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961, 239-271.

- Bronson, W.C., Katleen, E.S., and Livson, N. Patterns of Authority and Affection in Two Generations. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1959, 58, 143-152.
- Burger, G.K. and Armentrout, J.A. Comparative Study of Methods to Estimate Factor Scores for Reports of Parental Behaviors. Proceedings, 79th Annual Convention, APA, 1971, 149-150.
- Burger, G.K., Armentrout, J.A., and Rapfogel, R.G. Estimating Factor Scores for Children's Reports of Parental Child-Rearing Behaviors. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1973, 123, 107-113.
- Cox, F.N. An Assessment of Children's Attitudes Toward Parent Figures. Child Development, 1962, 33, 821-830.
- Cross, H.J. College Students' Memories of their Parents: A Factor Analysis of the CRPBI. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1969, 10, 275-278.
- Despert, L., and Potter, H.W. Technical Approaches used in the Study and Treatment of Emotional Problems in Children. Psychiatric Quarterly, 1936, 10, 619-638.
- Dubin, E.R., and Dubin, R. The Authority Inception Period in Socialization. Child Development, 1963, 35, 885-898.
- Dubin, R., and Dubin, E.R. Children's Social Perceptions: A Review of Research. Child Development, 1965, 35, 809-838.
- Du Valle, E.W. Child-Parent Social Distance. Sociology Society Research, 1937, 21, 458-463.
- Erikson, E.H. Childhood and Society. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1963.
- Fruchter, B., and Jennings, E. Factor Analysis. In H. Borko (Ed.), Computer Applications in the Behavioral Sciences. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1962, 238-265.
- Fuchs, L.H. Family Matters. New York: Random House, 1972.
- Ginsburg, H., and Oppen, S. Piaget's Theory of Intellectual Development: An Introduction. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1969.
- Goldin, P.C. A Review of Children's Reports of Parental Behaviors. Psychological Bullitin, 1969, 1, 222-236.

- Harman, H. Modern Factor Analysis. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.
- Hill, R., and Hansen, D. The Identification of Conceptual Frameworks Utilized in Family Studies. In M. Sussman (Ed.), Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1968, 485-498.
- Hurley, J.R. and Hohn, R.L. Shifts in Child-Rearing Attitudes Linked with Parenthood and Occupation. Developmental Psychology, 1971, 4, 324-328.
- Kagan, J. The Concept of Identification. Psychological Review, 1958, 65, 296-305.
- Kerlinger, F.N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.
- Kohlberg, L. Moral Development and Identification. In H.W. Stevenson (Ed.), Child Psychology: The Sixty-Second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Part I. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, 1963, 227-332.
- Kohn, M.L. Social Class and the Exercise of Parental Authority. American Sociological Review, 1959, 24, 352-366.
- Kysar, J.E. Reactions of Professionals to Disturbed Children. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1968, 19, 562-570.
- Lane, R.E. Fathers and Sons: Foundations of Political Belief. American Sociological Review, 1959, 24, 502-511.
- Levenson, H. Perceived Parental Antecedents of Internal, Powerful Others, and Chance Locus of Control Orientations. Developmental Psychology, 1973, 9, 268-274.
- Lynn, D.B. Sex Differences in Identification Development. Sociometry, 1961, 24, 372-383.
- Lynn, D.B. Sex Role and Parental Identification. Child Development, 1962, 33, 555-564.
- Medvene, A.M. Occupational Choice of Graduate Students in Psychology as a Function of Early Parent-Child Interactions. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1969, 16, 385-389.

- Milton, G.A. A Factor Analytic Study of Child Rearing Behaviors. Child Development, 1958, 29, 381-392.
- Morrow, W.R., and Wilson, R.C. Family Relations of Bright High-Achieving and Under-Achieving High School Boys. Child Development, 1961, 32, 501-510.
- Mowrer, O.H. Identification: A Link Between Learning Theory and Psychotherapy. In Learning Theory and Personality Development. New York: Ronald, 1950, 573-615.
- Nichols, R.C. A Factor Analysis of Parental Attitudes of Fathers. Child Development, 1962, 33, 791-802.
- Parsons, F. Family Structure and the Socialization of the Child. In T. Parsons and R.F. Bales, Family Socialization and Interaction Process. Glencoe, Ill., Free Press, 1955.
- Peterson, D.R., Becker, W.C., Hellmer, L.A., Shoemaker, D.J., and Quay, H.C. Parental Attitudes and Child Adjustment. Child Development, 1959, 30, 119-130.
- Piaget, J. Play, Dreams, and Imitation in Childhood. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1951.
- Rensen, G.J., Schaefer, E.S., and Levy, B.I. Cross-National Validity of a Spherical Conceptual Model for Parent Behavior. Child Development, 1968, 39, 1229-1235.
- Roe, A. Early Determinants of Vocational Choice. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1957, 4, 212-217.
- Roe, A., and Siegelman, M. A Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire. Child Development, 1963, 34, 355-369.
- Romney, A.K. Variations in Household Structure as Determinants of Sex-Typed Behavior. In F. Beach (ed.), Sex and Behavior. New York: Wiley, 1965, 208-220.
- Rose, H., and Felton, C.F. Sex and Occupational Choice. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1971, 18, 456-235.
- Schaefer, E.S. A Circumplex Model for Maternal Behavior. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 59, 226-235.
- Schaefer, E.S. Converging Conceptual Models for Maternal Behavior and for Child Behavior. In J.C. Glidwell (Ed.), Parental Attitudes and Child Behavior. Springfield, Ill.: Thomas, 1961, 124-146.

Schaefer, E.S. Children's Reports of Parental Behavior: An Inventory. Child Development, 1965, 36, 413-434. (a)

Schaefer, E.S. A Configurational Analysis of Children's Reports of Parent Behavior. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1965, 29, 552-557. (b)

Schaefer, E.S., and Bell, R.Q. Development of a Parental Attitude Research Instrument. Child Development, 1958, 29, 339-361.

Scheck, D.C., Emerick, R., and El-Assal, M.M. Adolescents' Perceptions of Parent-Child Relations and the Development of Internal-External Control Orientation. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1973, 35, 643-654.

Siegelman, M. Evaluation of Bronfenbrenner's Questionnaire for Children Concerning Parental Behavior. Child Development, 1965, 36, 164-174.

Siegelman, M. Loving and Punishing Parental Behavior and Introversion Tendencies in Sons. Child Development, 1966, 37, 985-992.

Walters, J., and Stinnett, N. Parent-Child Relationships: A Decade Review of Research. In C.B. Broderick (Ed.), A Decade of Family Research and Action 1960-1969. Minneapolis: National Council on Family Relations, 1971, 99-140.

Yarrow, M.R. and Campbell, J.D. Person Perception in Children. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1963, 9, 57-72.

Zuckerman, M., Ribback, B.B., Monashkin, I., and Norton, J.A. Normative Data and Factor Analysis of the Parent Attitude Research Instrument. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1958, 22, 165-171.

APPENDIX A

SAMPLE ITEM FOR EACH SCALE COMPONENT OF THE MODIFIED VERSION OF THE CRPBI (FATHER FORM)

Acceptance	He makes me feel better after talking over my troubles with him.
Childcenteredness	He likes to talk to me and be with me much of the time.
Possessiveness	He doesn't let me go places because something might happen to me.
Rejection	He isn't very patient with me.
Control	He sees to it that I know exactly what I may or may not do.
Enforcement	He is very strict with me.
Positive Involvement	He says I'm very good natured.
Intrusiveness	He wants to know exactly where I am and what I'm doing.
Control through Guilt	He feels hurt when I don't follow advice.
Hostile Control	He is always telling me how I should behave.
Inconsistent Discipline	He soon forgets a rule he has made.
Nonenforcement	He usually doesn't find out about my misbehavior.
Acceptance of Individuation	He doesn't mind if I kid him about things.

Lax Discipline He is easy with me.

Instilling Persistent Anxiety .. He worries about how I will turn out, because he takes everything bad I do seriously.

Hostile Detachment He doesn't talk with me very much.

Withdrawal of Relations He will not talk with me when I displease him.

Extreme Autonomy He allows me to go out as often as I please.

APPENDIX B

SAMPLE ITEM FOR EACH SCALE COMPONENT OF THE MODIFIED VERSION OF THE CRPBI (TEACHER FORM)

Acceptance	He makes me feel better when he helps me with a problem.
Childcenteredness	He likes to talk to me and be with me whenever he can.
Possessiveness	He doesn't let me do certain things in gym because something might happen to me.
Rejection	He isn't very patient with me.
Control	He sees to it that I know exactly what I may or may not do.
Enforcement	He is very strict with me.
Positive Involvement	He says I'm very good natured.
Intrusiveness	He wants to know exactly where I am and what I'm doing when I leave the gym area.
Control through guilt	He feels hurt when I don't follow advice.
Hostile Control	He is always telling me how I should behave.
Inconsistent Discipline	He soon forgets a rule he has made.
Nonenforcement	He usually doesn't find out about my misbehavior in class.

- Acceptance of Individuation He doesn't mind if I
kid him about things.
- Lax Discipline He is easy with me.
- Instilling Persistent Anxiety He seems concerned
about how I will turn
out, because he takes
it very seriously when
I misbehave.
- Hostile Detachment He seems to ignore me
during class activi-
ties and around the
school.
- Withdrawal of Relations He will not talk to me
when I misbehave or do
something wrong.
- Extreme Autonomy He lets me choose what
position I want to play
in games.