University of Rhode Island

DigitalCommons@URI

1974

Perception of Father and Teacher by Pre-Adolescent Boys

Alfred J. Arsenault
University of Rhode Island

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

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 behins 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

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

The dynamics of parent-child interaction are gener-
ally 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 re-
view 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 per-
sonality development in children, there has been a rela-
tive 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 im-
portant 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 clesely 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 fig-
ures. Parent perception, then, will refer to the child's
experience or interpretation of parental behavior and at-
titudes.

The literature review which follows explores selec-
ted notions of fatherhood in American life. The research
on children's perceptions of their parents is then exam-
ined, leading to the formulation and testing of an hypo-
thesis for the present study.

II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

FATHERHOOD IN AMERICAN LIFE

For various historical and cultural reasons, father-
hood in American life is a unique phenomenon. The social
system has been less than adequate in providing opportuni-
ties 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 mod-
ern 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 con-
temporary American culture.

In his comprehensive review of fatherhood and person-
ality development, Biller (1971) employs several frame-
works 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 influ-
ence upon masculine sex-role development.

Studies have found marked differences in father con-
cept 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
pursuasion and reason than on threats of physical punish-
ment. Also, lower-class parents seem to give comparative-
ly 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 evi-
dence 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 interations 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 "fil-
tered" through his interpretation of his father's person-
ality and expectations.

In what amounts to a fourth framework, Biller inte-
grates the socioeconomic, cultural expectations, and con-
stitutional 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 successful-
ly. With father availability as the basic criterion for
masculine sex-role development, other factors, such as
consistent affection, sufficient praise, and reinforce-
ments toward social behaviors, are built. If a boy per-
ceives 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 orien-
tation, 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 factior 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 in-
hibition 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 au-
thority 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 speci-
fic 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 responsiblity 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 suf-
ficiently disruptive, they are more likely to use physi-
cal punishment than middle-class fathers. Neither group
resorts to physical punishment as a first course of ac-
tion. They set limits and then evaluate the situation in
terms of the particular context.

Kohn describes three aspects of authority in the fam-
ily. First, there is the relative role of the mother and
father in making family decisions. Then there is the rel-
ative 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 re-
sort to physical punishment to enforce obedience.

Dubin and Dubin (1965) suggest that the child's per-
ception 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 re-
bellious 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 be-
liefs than the social indoctrination given through the re-
gional 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 in-
stitutions 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 inconsis-
tencies 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. Re-
viewing 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 behaivor. 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 (Nich-
ols, 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 par-
ent-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 relation-
ship 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-percep-
tions of rejection and extrinsic evaluation would be re-
lated to: 1) an underdeveloped self-concept with notions
of "omnipotence;" 2) higher levels of ego aspiration and
goal frustration tolerance; 3) greater ideational indepen-
dence from parents; and 4) less advanced levels of gener-
al personality maturation. Their data for fourth, fifth,
and sixth graders gave support to the hypotheses for sub-
jects who perceived themselves as extrinsically valued by
parents. Perceptions of acceptance and intrinsic valua-
tion 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 psy-
chology 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, tend-
ed 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 ad 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 consise 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, dispite 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 invididual subject's relative score contributing to each factor extracted from the intercorrelations. It is developed from the factor matrix and is calculated by an appropiate 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 tenta-
tive. 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 par-
simony to the original series. Individual differences in
subjects, design error, or any number of reasons can in-
fluence 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 (Schae-
fer, 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 simi-
larity 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, perferably
pre-adolescent, is considered, the child is still large-
ly influenced by family socialization and his interac-
tion 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.

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 rela-
tively 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 educa-
tion. 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 with-
out siblings.

School officials indicated that all the subjects fell
within the agerage range of intelligence and academic per-
formance. 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 be-
havior. 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 stu-
dents at the University of Rhode Island. With the permis-
sion 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 timen time to circle the appropiate 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 appropiate 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 speci-
fic 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 inter-
correlated and the resulting matrix was factor analyzed
using the UCLA Biomedical Computer Program (BMDO8M) Fac-
tor Analysis Program. This program uses the principle
component solution which extracts the maximum amount of
varience from observed variables; and parsimony is ob-
tained 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 orthogonal-
ly by the varimax method. Factor scores were also ob-
tained using the BMDO8M 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.

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 or-
thogonally by the varimax method. Factor scores were ob-
tained.

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

Factor one for the teacher scales yielded high load-
ings on the following components: Hostile detachment .84,
Rejection .83, Hostile control .75, Withdrawal of rela-
tions .74, Control through guilt .73, Inconsistent disci-
pline .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 in-
volvement .87, Childcenteredness .78, Acceptance of in-
dividuation .76, and Lax discipline .58.

Kendall rank correlation coefficients (tau) were ob-
tained 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 (tau) 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 (tau) cor-
relation between the father and teacher loadings for the
first factor in the present study is .41.

Similar Kendall (tau) 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 (tau) BETWEEN CORRESPONDING FACTORS
IN THE PRESENT STUDY AND AN EARLIER STUDY (BURGER AND ARMENTROUT, 1971)

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

t test levels of significance

* < .02 > .01   ** < .01

34

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 (tau) 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 partnts' behavior are not sufficiently differentiated to support a more complex three-dimensional factor structure, which might be more appropiate 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, hugh 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 Ac-
cepting 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.

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 infance should be well perfected (Ginsburg and Opper, 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, expecially the same sex parent.

The way children experience the permance 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 rinforcement 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 person-
ality assessments of fathers and other adult.

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

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. Ban-
dura (Ed.), Psychological Modeling, New York: Aldine-
Atherton, 1971.

Bandura, A., and Walters, R.H. Social Learning and Per-
sonality 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 Inven-
tory Manuel. 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 Per-
sonality 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 Familian Antecedents of Responsi-
bility and Leadership in Adolescents. In L. Petrullo
and B.M. Bass (Eds.), Leadership and Interpersoanl Behav-
ior. 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. <u>Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology</u>, 1959, 58, 143-152.

Burger, G.K. and Armentrout, J.A. Comparative Study of Methods to Estimate Factor Scores for Reports of Parental Behaviors. <u>Proceedings, 79th Annual Convention, APA, 1971</u>, 149-150.

Burger, G.K., Armentrout, J.A., and Rapfogel, R.G. Estimating Factor Scores for Children's Reports of Parental Child-Rearing Behaviors. <u>Journal of Gentic Psychology</u>, 1973, 123, 107-113.

Cox, F.N. An Assessment of Children's Attitudes Toward Parent Figures. <u>Child Development</u>, 1962, 33, 821-830.

Cross, H.J. College Students' Memories of their Parents: A Factor Analysis of the CRPBI. <u>Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology</u>, 1969, 10, 275-278.

Despert, L., and Potter, H.W. Technical Approaches used in the Study and Treatment of Emotional Problems in Children. <u>Psychiatric Quarterly</u>, 1936, 10, 619-638.

Dubin, E.R., and Dubin, R. The Authority Inception Period in Socialization. <u>Child Development</u>, 1963, 35, 885-898.

Dubin, R., and Dubin, E.R. Children's Social Perceptions: A Review of Research. <u>Child Development</u>, 1965, 35, 809-838.

Du Valle, E.W. Child-Parent Social Distance. <u>Sociology Society Research</u>, 1937, 21, 458-463.

Erikson, E.H. <u>Childhood and Society</u>. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1963.

Fruchter, B., and Jennings, E. Factor Analysis. In H. Borko (Ed.), <u>Computer Applications in the Behavioral Sciences</u>. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1962, 238-265.

Fuchs, L.H. <u>Family Matters</u>. New York: <u>Random</u> House, 1972.

Ginsburg, H., and Opper, S. <u>Piaget's Theory of Intellectual Development: An Introduction</u>. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1969.

Goldin, P.C. A Review of Children's Reports of Parental Behaviors. <u>Psychological Bullitin</u>, 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 The-
    ory and Psychotherapy. In Learning Theory and Person-
    ality 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 Socializa-
    tion 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 Be-
    havior. 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 Ques-
    tionnaire. Child Development, 1963, 34, 355-369.

Romney, A.K. Variations in Household Structure as Deter-
    minants 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. Spring-
    field, 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 Develop-
    ment of Internal-External Control Orientation. Jour-
    nal 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 Quarterley, 1963, 9,
    57-72.

Zuckerman, M., Ribback, B.B., Monashkin, I., and Norton,
    J.A. Normative Data and Factor Analysis of the Par-
    ent Attitude Research Instrument. Journal of Con-
    sulting 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 exact-
ly 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.