# MARITAL DISSATISFACTION AND SHIFTS IN CHILD REJECTION

Thesis for the Degree of M. A. MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY KENNETH H. ZIMMERMAN 1. •• · · · · ·



.

#### ABSTRACT

MARITAL DISSATISFACTION AND SHIFTS IN CHILD REJECTION

#### by

Kenneth H. Zimmerman

This study was suggested by two prior findings: (a) that marital satisfaction, measured by the Family Concept Inventory (FCI), was negatively related to child density (number of children divided by years married) among married housing residents at MSU (Hurley & Palonen, 1967); and (b) that parents of three or more children made greater increases than persons producing fewer children on the Manifest Rejection (MR) scale when readministered by mail six years after this scale had been initially taken as undergraduates in MSU Child Psychology classes (Hurley & Hohn, 1971). The present study was designed to ascertain if increases in child rejection are related to marital dissatisfaction.

This problem was approached through mailing the FCI and a supplementary questionnaire concerning demographic, sociological, and other variables considered relevant to changes in child-rearing attitudes to 93 former MSU students who had taken the MR scale both about six months previously (by mail) and also about 10-11 years earlier when they were MSU undergraduates. Twenty-one males and 42 females supplied usable returns. Their MR and FCI scores were closely comparable to those of similar samples. FCI scores correlated negatively ( $\underline{r} = -.28$ ,  $\underline{p} < .05$ ) with increments in MR, linking marital dissatisfaction with the increasing rejection of children. Written responses to the questionnaire item "Since undergraduate college days, how do you think you have changed, if at all, in your attitude toward the utility of strictness in disciplining children?", after being reliably classified into categories of increase, decrease, and no change by two independent judges, correlated significantly ( $\underline{r} = .40$ ,  $\underline{p} < .05$ ) with MR changes. This finding supported the validity of MR as a measure of change in disciplinary strictness.

Parents of three or more children showed an MR increase which contrasted with an overall MR decrease in the total sample. The Hurley and Hohn (1971) finding of a monotonic relationship between MR increases and number of children (0, 1, 2, and 3+) was also confirmed. However, the general MR increase found in that earlier study did not obtain in this one. Child density was unrelated to marital satisfaction for this sample, as Figley had found with a more broadly representative sample in a Pennsylvania university community. Apparently the high child density, low marital satisfaction linkage is a special characteristic of student families with children who live in relatively cramped low income housing, since Tucker (1972) recently replicated, in another sample of MSU married housing families, the earlier findings of Hurley and Palonen (1967). An elementary factor analysis of 28 variables derived from the supplementary questionnaire plus MR and FCI scores, yielded three major clusters focusing on MR, number of children, and age at marriage. These and three minor clusters seemed to identify a conservative versus contemporary orientation, the former facet being associated with greater religious attendance, earlier marriage, and larger families. Also, Catholics made greater MR decrements than Protestants, a difference associated with higher undergraduate MR scores among the Catholics.

Further research in this area might well attend to the conservative-contemporary orientation variable and attempt to ascertain if a causal relationship obtains between marital satisfaction and NR changes.

Approved ommittee

10/13/72 Date:

Thesis Committee:

John R. Hurley, Chairman Donald L. Grummon Mary Leichty MARITAL DISSATISFACTION AND

SHIFTS IN CHILD REJECTION

Ъу

Kenneth H. Zimmerman

A THESIS

Submitted to Michigan State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Psychology

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

1 19 1

I wish to express special thanks to Dr. John Hurley, my chairman, supervisor, and advisor, for his contributions to this thesis and to my graduate education.

I would like to thank Drs. Donald R. Grummon and Mary Leichty for serving on my committee.

I also wish to extend thanks to Grey Larison, a fellow graduate student who served as co-rater, and to my wife, Janet, whose typing skill has been so helpful.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
LIST OF FIGURES	v
INTRODUCTION	1
METHOD	3
RESULTS	5
Sample Attributes. MR Changes. Religion. Subjective Questionnaire. Elementary Factor Analysis. Content of Clusters. MR and FCI Means Compared with Other Samples.	5 9 12 14 17 19
DISCUSSION	20
The Meaning of MR Changes	20
Change and the FCI The Issue of Child Density Peripheral Findings Implications for Future Research	22 22 23 24
REFERENCES	27
APPENDICES	
A. Child Behavior Inventory	29
B. Research Feedback Material	34
C. Family Concept Inventory	37
D. General Information Form	38
E. Letter Accompanying Questionnaires	39
F. Return Postcard	40

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		Page
1.	Means and Standard Deviations	7
2.	Intercorrelations among Selected Variables for Men and Women Combined	8
3.	Mean Changes in MR Scores	10
4.	Selected Means by Religion	11

# LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE	Page
1. Relationships of Variables Found by Modified Elementary Factor Analysis	. 16

#### Introduction

This study was concerned with one aspect of the ways in which parents, marriage, and children influence each other, particularly in regard to the child-rearing attitudes of parents. As noted by Walters and Stinnett (1971), much has been written about the effects of parents and their marriages on the personalities of children, but little on the effects of children on their parents.

One aspect of the effects of children on parents that has been investigated is the effect of number of children and child density on marital satisfaction. Child density, defined by Hurley and Palonen (1967), is the number of children divided by the number of years married. Hurley and Palonen, using 40 couples in a Michigan State University (MSU) married housing unit, found that marital satisfaction had a significant negative correlation ( $\underline{r} = -.39$ ,  $\underline{p} < .05$ ) with child density. Marital satisfaction was measured with the combined T-scores of the Locke-Wallace scale and the Family Concept Inventory (FCI), a multiple-choice instrument described in the method section of this paper. Tinker (1972) observed a similar correlation ( $\underline{r} = -.35$ ,  $\underline{p} < .10$ ) several years later in another study of 24 couples from the MSU married housing unit. Neither Hurley and Palonen nor Tinker found a significant correlation between number of children

and marital satisfaction, suggesting that the impact of several small children at one time is much more important than the number of children alone. The negative findings of Figley (1971) in an attempted extention of the Hurley and Palonen (1967) study to a more heterogeneous population support this conclusion. For a sample of 92 university faculty and staff members and spouses married an average of 15.9 years, Figley found a correlation of .02 between child density and the Locke-Williamson Marital Adjustment Questionnaire.

Investigating the impact of children on child-rearing attitudes, Hurley and Hohn (1971) compared the child-rearing attitudes of 75 former university students with their attitudes as expressed six years earlier while enrolled in an MSU undergraduate psychology course. Unlike similar attitudinal variables of Overprotection and Achievement Pressure, which decreased over the interval, Manifest Rejection (MR) increased over this period, especially for those producing three or more children. With the exception of this study, the present search of the literature shows this to be an unexplored area of research. <u>A Decade Review of Family</u> <u>Research and Action</u> (Broderick, 1971), reviewing most of the research in the area of family behavior for the 1960's, contains no reference to the influence of children on parental child-rearing attitudes.

The studies cited show a negative relationship between child-rearing experience and both marital adjustment (Hurley and Palonen, 1967) and attitudes toward children (Hurley and

Hohn, (1971). This suggests that marital dissatisfaction and manifest rejection of children would tend to occur together. The present study was designed to test that hypothesis.

#### Method

With data gathered recently by Hurley, the Hurley and Hohn (1971) study was replicated with a sample of 93 former university students who had been tested with the Child Behavior Inventory while taking undergraduate courses in child psychology, communication skills, and physics. They were tested again by mail after a 10-11 year interval. Current addresses were obtained from the files of the university alumni office. These <u>Ss</u> were used for this study.

The Child Behavior Inventory, developed by Hurley from original items and items from instruments by Shoben (1949) and Mark (1953), consists of 149 items offered with "strongly agree, mildly disagree, neither agree nor disagree, mildly disagree, and strongly disagree" response alternatives designed to reflect parental attitudes on dimensions of MR, Overprotection, Achievement Pressure, and Overindulgence (see Appendix A, page 29). The MR scale, which was central to this study, consists of 30 items randomly placed within the Child Behavior Inventory. MR was defined by Hurley and Hohn as

... the general tendency to assume a negative and punitive stance toward children. It was represented by items endorsing behaviors which minimize

or restrict contact with children, inhibit the child's legitimate demands for attention and considerate care, or would impose harsh sanctions. (1971, p. 325)

Test-retest reliability of the short initial version of the Child Behavior Inventory used by Hurley and Laffey (1957) was .68 for a 20 item MR over a ten-week period. For Hurley and Hohn (1971), the test-retest correlation was .37 over a six-year interval for a 36 item MR scale. Using a revised, 30 item version of the MR scale balanced for agreement (15) and disagreement (15) statements, Hurley (1965) found that the MR scores of parents of 204 thirdgrade children were negatively correlated ( $\underline{r} = -.27$ ,  $\underline{p} < .001$ ) with the children's intelligence as measured by the California Test of Mental Maturity. In the same study MR was found positively correlated ( $\underline{r} = .46$ ) with the Punishment Index (Eron, Walder, Toigo, and Lefkowitz, 1963), a measure of direct parental acknowledgement of severity of punishment.

The present <u>Ss</u> received a mailing containing information on the results of the research in which they were participating (see Appendix B, page 34) together with a multiple-choice variation of the FCI (see Appendix C, page 37) developed by van der Veen, Huebner, Jorgens, and Neja (1964) and used in the Hurley and Palonen study (1967). This consisted of 48 items answered with five response options similar to those of the Child Behavior Inventory. Palonen (1966) found correlations between the FCI and the Locke-Wallace Scale of marital adjustment of .72 for men,

.69 for women. and .73 for men and women together. and a split-half reliability of .85 for the FCI. Ss were also asked to provide information regarding date of marriage. birthdates of children. their religious denomination. and the frequency of their religious attendance. On the same form (see Appendix D. page 38) they were asked to state how their attitudes might have changed since college days regarding disciplinary strictness, protective supervision. freedom. affection. and achievement pressure toward children. and were also asked to give reasons for such changes. Additionally they were asked at what age it was best for a person of their sex to marry, and how many children they would plan to have if newly married. These were intended as supplementary measures. on the assumption that they would reflect satisfaction or dissatisfaction with marriage and children. This material was accompanied by an explanatory letter (see Appendix E, page 39) and a return envelope. Several weeks after the original mailing. a postcard (see Appendix F, page 40) was mailed to verify their willingness or unwillingness to participate by checking an appropriate box and dropping it in the mail.

#### Results

#### Sample Attributes

Twenty-two males and 45 females responded, comprising 84%, 68%, and 72% of the male, female, and combined <u>Ss</u> respectively. Of these, two females and one male did not answer the FCI because they were unmarried, and another

female was removed from the sample because she had remarried quite recently, leaving a total of 63 <u>Ss</u>. Of those who did not respond, an incorrect address and persons indicating unmarried status on the return postcard account for three, and probably more of these were unknown to E.

The average respondent was 31.7 years old, had been married nine years, and had 2.23 children. These and related data means are presented in Table 1. Most were Protestant and fairly regular church-goers. Two of the women were divorced and remarried, and one of the men was separated. The <u>Ss</u> were in a broad variety of occupations, commensurate with their educational levels as former college students.

#### MR Changes

A product-moment correlation of -.28 (p < .05) between the FCI and MR change supports the hypothesis that increased rejection of children occurs together with marital dissatisfaction. Most of this correlation was related to new MR, which correlated -.23 with the FCI, while the college MR had a correlation of .12 with the FCI. For women, the new MR correlated more highly ( $\underline{r} = -.32$ ,  $\underline{p} < .05$ ) with the FCI than did MR change. These and other correlations are listed in Table 2. Two-tailed tests of significance were used exclusively in this study.

The overall shift in MR for the group was a drop of 2.63 points from the earlier mean of 50.76. Men shifted

# Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations

Variable			Means			std	. Dev.
	Both	N	Men	N	Women	N	Both
Total years married	8.95	63	9.38	21	8.90	42	2.93
Actual marriage age	22.78	63	23.24	21	22.40	42	2.25
Ideal marriage age	24.37	49	25.56	17	23.73	31	2.78
<b>A-I</b> marriage age	-1.55	49	-2.03	17	-1.37	31	3.06
Child density	.25	63	.23	21	.26	42	.12
Number of children	2.25	63	2.14	21	2.33	42	1.18
Ideal # of children	2.46	58	2.45	20	2.47	<b>3</b> 8	1.02
A-I children	22	58	45	20	08	38	.77
College MR	50.76	6 <b>3</b>	59.67	21	45.79	42	13.66
New MR	48.13	63	53.90	21	44.52	42	12.68
MR change	-2.63	63	-5.76	21	-1.26	42	16.13
FCI	149.60	63	147.10	21	151.00	42	1.76

Table 2

Intercorrelations among Selected Variables for Men and Women Combined

Var	<u>1able</u>	NI	n	41	'n	9	Ч	<b>60</b> 1	6	10	티	12	IJ	
<b>.</b>	Years married	-67#	-27	-19	01	61*	-02	61*	-06	-17	-14	63	8	
N.	Actual age married		26	*817	-01	-33*	<del>1</del> 0-	-30	08	25 <b>*</b>	54	-02	-10	
ë	Ideal marriage age			-72*	-14	-35*	おす	60	-38	16	-05	-18	-28	
<b>. 1</b>	A-I marriage age				8	60	33*	<del>-</del> 24	36*	-02	17	15	22	
\$	Child density					73*	t+2#	31+	26#	-08	-01	90	-06	
6.	No. of children						3**	63#	\$3*	-23	-02	18	5	
2.	Ideal No. of childre	u						-51*	*07-	-08	30*	31*	17	
ື້	A-I No. of children								ちー	-19	<b>-</b> 29 <b>*</b>	-07	-11	
•	Religious attendance	•								-18	01	16	-05	
10.	College MR										2 <i>5</i> #	-65#	12	
11.	New MR											52*	-23	
12.	MR change												-28	
13.	FCI													
Į	c.05, two-tailed test	Dec	imal p	oints om	1tted 1	from tak								1

 $\underline{\underline{N}} = \underline{63} \quad \underline{63} \quad \underline{6x} \quad \underline{64} \quad \underline{61} \quad \underline{81} \quad \underline{$ 

more (-5.76) than women (-1.26), but still remained substantially higher, with means of 53.90 for men and 44.52 for women. This general MR decrease is contrary to the general MR increment of 3.85 points found earlier by Hurley and Hohn (1971) after a six year hiatus.

The test-retest correlation for the MR scale was .25 (p < .05), somewhat less than Hurley and Hohn's finding of .37, but not surprising for a time-span nearly twice as long.

This sample did not confirm the findings of Hurley and Palonen (1967) and Tinker (1972) that child density is related to marital satisfaction. The correlation was .06 between child density and the FCI. However, the present data and the Hurley and Hohn (1971) finding show the same pattern of MR change differences among parents producing 0, 1, 2, or 3 or more children. MR change score means by number of children from Hurley and Hohn (1971) and the <u>Ss</u> who received the mailing for the present study are listed in Table 3.

#### Religion

Means across religion for MR change were -2.25 for Protestant, -12.28 for Catholic, and -5.50 for those indicating no religion. The difference between Protestant and non-Protestant yielded a <u>t</u> of 2.14, (p < .05). Means for college MR, new MR, MR change, FCI, and number of children by religion are listed in Table 4.

Tabl	8	3
------	---	---

Mean Ananges In Mr DCOIS	Mean	Changes	in MR	Scores
--------------------------	------	---------	-------	--------

Number	of Children	Hurley a	and Hohn	Present De	ata
		<u>N</u> <sup>#</sup> <u>MR</u>	Change	MR change	<u>N</u> *
	3+	11	11.2	<b>1.9</b>	25
	2	17	6.2	-3.2	<b>3</b> 6
	1	22	3.0	-4.8	16
	0	25	0.2	-5.2	14

 $\mathbf{\tilde{N}}^{\dagger}\mathbf{S}$  include males and females

Table 4
---------

Selected	Means	by	Rel	igion
----------	-------	----	-----	-------

	$\frac{\text{Protestant}}{(\underline{N} = 46)}$	$\frac{\text{Catholic}}{(\underline{N} = 8)}$	$(\frac{None}{N}=8)$
FCI	150.15	151.25	145.13
Number of children	2,22	2.50	2.25
College MR	48.76	6 <b>1.50</b>	56.26
New MR	47.48	49.25	50.76
MR change	-1.28	-12.25	-5.50

#### Subjective Questionnaire

Reading:

The responses to the questions on how <u>Ss</u> had changed in respect to attitudes regarding disciplinary strictness, protective supervision, freedom, affection, and achievement pressure toward children were rated by <u>E</u> as increased, unchanged, or decreased in importance, and the reasons given for change were sorted into categories derived from examination of the data as follows:

Other's children:mention of other children known to the respondent or seen by him.Society:general reference to the ills of the world and society, e.g. drugs, crimeSelf-change:reference to personal change or growth, more general than in specifi attitudes.Home-life:mention of parents' attitudes or behavior as important in own attitude change.Profession:mention of professional or work experience.Mate:mention of spouse as influence.	Cwn children:	mention of coping with or attitude change toward own children.
Society:general reference to the ills of the world and society, e.g. drugs, crimeSelf-change:reference to personal change or growth, more general than in specifi attitudes.Home-life:mention of parents' attitudes or behavior as important in own attitude change.Profession:mention of professional or work experience.Mate:mention of spouse as influence.	Other's children:	mention of other children known to the respondent or seen by him.
Self-change:reference to personal change or growth, more general than in specifi attitudes.Home-life:mention of parents' attitudes or behavior as important in own 	Society:	general reference to the ills of the world and society, e.g. drugs, crime.
Home-life:mention of parents' attitudes or behavior as important in own attitude change.Profession:mention of professional or work experience.Mate:mention of spouse as influence.	Self-change:	reference to personal change or growth, more general than in specific attitudes.
Profession:mention of professional or work experience.Mate:mention of spouse as influence.	Home-life:	mention of parents' attitudes or behavior as important in own attitude change.
Mate: mention of spouse as influence.	Profession:	mention of professional or work experience.
	Mate:	mention of spouse as influence.

mention of reading as influence.

These responses were independently rated again for direction of change and sorted into the above categories by an advanced graduate student in clinical psychology. Of 315 answers rated for direction of change, the independent rater and  $\underline{E}$  rated 290 the same for 92% agreement. Of the total of 1008 possible category assignments (2 raters x 8 categories x 63 <u>Ss</u>) for reason of change for both raters combined, 216 categories were selected, and of these, 179, or 83% were identical. Following this proceedure, the ratings and sortings of the independent rater were checked for apparent clerical errors, and he was asked to re-rate the items with apparent clerical errors without reference to his previous work. This proceedure resulted in 98% agreement on direction of change, the 2% disagreement being limited to whether a given response was ratable or not. Respondents tended to ignore the instructions on these questions, and 34% of the items were unratable for direction of change. Agreement on category sorting was increased to 96% by the re-rating proceedure.

Of the five attitudinal change questions, only the one concerning the change in importance of disciplinary strictness bore a relationship to the MR change scores. Of 16 <u>Ss</u> indicating an attitude of increased emphasis on disciplinary strictness, 12 had increased in MR, and of 16 indicating decreased emphasis on disciplinary strictness, 12 had lower MR scores. Mean MR change for those indicating an increased emphasis on disciplinary strictness was +8.6 with a mean of -8.4 for those indicating a decreased emphasis. The product-moment correlation between MR change and change in importance of disciplinary strictness was .40 (p < .01).

The correlation between the FCI and actual-minus-ideal (A-I) marriage age was substantial for men (.41) but non-significant, while the correlation was .02 for women.

The correlation of .06 between MR change and A-I number of children suggests that there is no relationship between these variables.

Reaction to own children was by far the most frequently (40 mentions) cited reason for attitude change, while the remainder ranged from six to 14 mentions, except for reading (two mentions).

#### Elementary Factor Analysis

Correlational matrices for men, women, and both were prepared for the following variables: sex; total years married; years of current marriage; age when married; ideal age for getting married; A-I age for marriage; child density; number of children; ideal number of children; A-I number of children; religious attendance on a fivepoint scale; increase or decrease in emphasis on disciplinary strictness, freedom, protective supervision, affection, and achievement pressure (all rated plus, zero, or minus); presence or absence of mentioning one's own children, others' children, society, self-change, homelife, profession, mate, or reading in explanation of attitude changes; college MR scores; new MR scores; MR change scores; FCI; and time in months to respond to the questionnaire.

An elementary factor analysis was performed as described by McQuitty (1961) except that significance levels were used rather than correlations, since the <u>N</u>'s for correlations varied widely due to missing data. This was

done as follows: A matrix of significant correlations was made, including those for men, women, and both, and the high correlations between obviously related variables were deleted. The remaining data were translated into reciprocals of the levels of significance and summed for men, women, and both at each point in the matrix. McQuitty's procedure was then applied to the matrix of the sums of the reciprocals of the levels of significance. Ties were solved by summing the three correlations at each point in the tie, and using the point with the highest sum. Using correlations for the procedure would have resulted in the same analysis providing the  $\underline{N}$ 's were equal, since the highest correlations would have the highest levels of significance. In the present case, however, a nonsignificant correlation might be larger than another which is significant due to a larger N. Using reciprocals of levels of significance allows one to avoid building clusters of variables on large but nonsignificant correlations. Combining all three matrices gives more weight to the more reliable effects. The clusters formed by this procedure were further related by finding the highest correlation linking each cluster with a variable in another cluster, and joining the clusters at these points as depicted in Figure 1. This procedure gives an overview of the strongest relationships among the variables.



Fig. 1. Relationships of variables found by modified elementary factor analysis. Clusters are encircled by dashes with dominant variables underlined.



· ·

#### Content of Clusters

In the following description of the relationships between the variables depicted in Figure 1., all correlations referred to were significant at the .05 level or higher.

Three major clusters of variables were observed. Central to these clusters were marriage ages, manifest rejection, and numbers of children. The first major group is formed around the correlation (-.72 for men and women together) between A-I marriage age and ideal marriage age, which indicates that although ideal marriage age correlated positively with actual marriage age, the tendency to prefer an older ideal marriage age than actual marriage age was greatest for those who married latest. Thus, those who waited longest to get married thought it would be better to wait even longer, since the mean ideal marriage age was 24.4, or 1.6 years more than actual marriage age. A general relationship was found between religious attendance. children, and ideal marriage age. Those more regularly attending church indicated a younger ideal age for marriage, although they had not married younger. The more regularly church-attending men indicated a larger ideal number of children, and a larger number than they presently had, even though their actual number of children was more than those of men less regularly attending. Men indicating a younger ideal marriage age also preferred a larger ideal number of children, regardless

of religious attendance. Apparently those who go to church more regularly are more likely to seek to conform to traditional concepts of marriage and family. Those with greater religious attendance also responded more quickly to the questionnaire and were less likely to mention self-change as a reason for changing attitudes in child-rearing. Self-changes were mentioned by those who would marry older, and by women who wanted more children and put relatively more value on protective supervision and achievement. Men who mentioned home-life as a reason for changed attitudes also preferred an older ideal marriage age.

In the group of variables build around numbers of children, the correlations between actual number of children, ideal number of children, and A-I number of children reflect the finding that the most popular (31 of 58) ideal number of children was two, whether the respondent had two, or more, or fewer than two. Having more children and thinking it better to have fewer correlates positively with mentioning one's own children as a reason for child-rearing attitude changes. For men, an indicated increase in the importance of affection correlates positively with mentioning their own children, but negatively with mentioning others' children as reasons for attitude changes. This suggests that those who have warmed up to their own children are more likely to relate their attitudes to them than to

others. Increased importance of protective supervision for men correlates positively with having more children, being married longer, and having scored lower on college MR.

Another major group is formed around MR. Those who mentioned professional experience as a source of change in child-rearing attitudes tended to have low MR scores. MR increments were associated with indicated increase in emphasis upon disciplinary strictness, while men with high college MR scores reported increased value on freedom for children. Influence of mate on child-rearing attitudes was mentioned by women who tended to have lower MR scores, and who had more than their ideal number of children. Men mentioned society as a reason for attitude change more often than women.

#### MR and FCI Means Compared with Other Samples

The present sample seems quite representative of samples with similar ages and educational backgrounds in terms of MR and FCI scores. For couples with a mean age of 29.6 years, averaging about three years of college, and living in an apartment complex near MSU, Updyke (1968) found mean FCI scores of 145.3 for men and 154.3 for women, compared to 147.1 and 151.0 respectively for this sample. Mean MR scores of Updyke's sample were 52.5 for men and 47.9 for women, similar to the means of 53.9 and 44.5 for men and women respectively in the present sample. Palonen (1966) found

```
FCI means of 148.4 for men and 154.7 for women among 40 couples living in an MSU married housing unit.
```

#### Discussion

#### The Meaning of MR Changes

An important question concerns the behavioral correlates of MR scores. The import of the present findings is clarified to the extent that information is available on the relationship between the MR scale and the global behavior of parents, as well as the impact of such behavior on children.

In the present data, the correlation (.40) between MR change and the ratings of subjective reports of change in emphasis on disciplinary strictness support the validity of the present MR changes. Other possible facets of rejection explored by the subjective questionnaire such as lack of affection, protective supervision, and achievement pressure were not significantly related to MR change.

To the extent that MR represents non-pathological strictness, the relationship between MR change scores and number of children found by Hurley and Hohn (1971), and supported by this data may reflect the need for more discipline in larger families, as well as a combination of the old-fashioned values favoring large families and strict discipline. Ernhart and Loevinger (1969) found a positive linkage between women's scores on Approval of Conventional Social Role and their number of offspring.

Evidence of an undesirable child-rearing outcome related to high parental MR scores was found by Hurley's (1965) study of parental MR and children's intelligence. The correlation (.46) between MR scores and the Punishment Index reported by Hurley (1965) indirectly suggests another possible negative outcome, inasmuch as parental scores on the Punishment Index were found by Eron, et al. (1963) to be positively related to peer ratings of children's aggression.

Melnick and Hurley (1969) unexpectedly found higher mean MR scores ( $\overline{X} = 66$ ) for controls than for child-abusing mothers ( $\overline{X} = 54$ ) although both groups of lower-class Negro women scored substantially higher than the present sample of middle-class white women ( $\overline{X} = 44.5$ ). Limited information about the parental behavior of the control <u>Ss</u>, a small combined <u>N</u> of 20, and the likelihood that the abusive mothers, who faced possible court action, intentionally biased their responses to some of the rather blatant MR items (A naughty child sometimes needs a good slap in the face, etc.) severely limit the implications of this study in regard to MR scores, although the vulnerability of MR scores to defensiveness seems clear.

The Central Finding: Linkage between MR Change and the FCI

Because of the well-known instability of change scores (Bereiter, 1963), it is not surprising that the correlation between the FCI and MR change was modest. It would be surprising if it were otherwise, due to the problems inherent in repeating a measure over a time span of more than a decade. Like many similar change measures, the MR change scores were highly correlated (-.65 and .57)with the first and second administrations of the MR scale, respectively. The time span of nearly a year between the administration of the MR scale and the FCI tended to further reduce their observed correlation. Therefore, the significant correlation between MR change and the FCI suggests that a relationship not only exists. but may well be stronger than our methods allow us to demonstrate. A base-free measure of change (Tucker. Damarin. and Messick. 1966) has been designed which may help alleviate measurement problems. It would be desirable to move toward such more sophisticated techniques in future research.

#### The Issue of Child Density

The lack of linkage between marital satisfaction and child density in this sample, and in Figley's (1971) data, in contrast to inverse correlations between these variables in the studies of Hurley and Palonen (1967) and Tinker (1972), suggests that length of marriage and other factors may importantly impinge upon child density.

Both the Hurley-Palonen and Tinker studies used university married housing tenants, who typically have been married about five years, have crowded living quarters, minimal privacy, poverty-level incomes, and academic pressure to deal with. Adding several young children could be expected to stress a marriage much more under such conditions than in an economically established family with normal living space and job pressures. Future research in this area should consider these factors. For longer-married persons, as in this study and Figley's (1971), the variable of child density is less discriminating, since those who started their families late and have several infants have the same child density as those who spaced out the same number of children. A corrected measure of child density which also considers the ages and spacing of children might be more discriminating.

### Peripheral Findings

Greater MR changes for Catholics and those not indicating a religion represent moves from more extreme earlier positions, particularly for Catholics, to more typical adult positions. This suggests that while at the stage of no longer being children and not yet being parents, the role of the child was seen with considerable dislike by these respondents, becoming more positive with age and child-rearing experience. The earlier tendency of the Catholic group to score very high on MR might be speculatively explained both as looking back at childhood as a somewhat repressed period, and looking forward to parenthood as a burdensome duty.

The most saliant generalization from the elementary factor analysis is the appearance of a conservative versus contemporary orientation encompassing greater religious attendance, younger ideal marriage age, more children, and greater ideal number of children, as well as other connected variables such as not mentioning self-change, shorter time of response to the questionnaire, and emphasis on achievement characterizing the conservative respondent. Future research on child-rearing attitudes might consider the effects of the conservative-contemporary orientation of their subjects.

#### Implications for Future Research

The need for more information on the validity of the MR scale suggests numerous research possibilities, such as comparing MR scores of controls with parents of juvenile delinquents and parents of children brought to mental health clinics, or correlating MR scores of parents with teacher ratings of students on various interpersonal dimensions. In any such research, the vulnerability of the MR scale to defensiveness would have to be taken into account.

The increase in MR earlier in marriage (Hurley and Hohn, 1971) followed by the decrease at nine years, as found in this study, may be related to the growth of mature parentchild relationships over time and increasing age of children, and perhaps a decreasing need for discipline. Here

again, perhaps a better index of child density, corrected for the age and spacing of children would correlate more closely with MR scores. Decreased MR may also be related to the increasing age of parents, with attendant maturity and personal security. Interpretation of the trend over years in MR as mentioned, overlooks the differences in the two versions of the MR scale used to measure this trend. However, it seems unlikely that the difference of six items alone could account for a difference in MR change score means of 6.48 (-2.63 versus 3.85) between this study and that of Hurley and Hohn (1971).

MR trends over years of marriage, and the correlation between MR and the FCI, may be related to the findings of Rollins and Feldman (1970) that satisfaction with marriage tends to decrease following the birth of the first child, hitting a low in about the middle of the child-rearing period, and then rising into the retirement stage. About half of this sample falls in Stage IV as defined by Rollins and Feldman, which is the point of lowest ebb of general marital satisfaction. Most of the remainder fall in Stage III.

A cross-sectional study of MR, marital satisfaction, and years married, taking into account parental age, and ages and number of children, could provide a measure of MR trends over the child-rearing period as they relate to marital satisfaction. It has already been suggested that such studies might profit by considering the conservative-

contemporary orientation of the <u>Ss</u>, economic and housing conditions, and a child density measure corrected for ages of children. The number of possible variables is limited only by the need to prevent the design from becoming unwieldy, and should be restricted to variables most likely to be of major importance. It would be simpler to plot MR and other child-rearing attitudes over time if <u>Ss</u> could be limited to those conforming to relatively typical economic and family patterns.

For the present it appears that having more children, being unsatisfied with marriage, and increasing child rejection as measured by the MR scale tend to occur together, at least in certain stages or circumstances of marriage. Why they occur together deserves further study. It seems likely that those factors of personality and interpersonal competence that contribute to better marriages could also be expected to affect the quality of parent-child relationships.

REFERENCES

#### References

- Bereiter, C. Some persisting dilemmas in the measurement of change. In C. W. Harris (Ed.), <u>Problems in</u> <u>measuring change</u>. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1963.
- Broderick, C. B. (Ed.) <u>A decade of family research and</u> <u>action</u>. National Council on Family Relations, 1971.
- Ernhart, C. B., and Loevinger, J. Authoritarian family ideology: A measure, its correlates, and its robustness. <u>Multivariate</u> <u>Behavioral</u> <u>Research</u> <u>Monographs</u>, 1969, No. 69-1.
- Eron, L. D., Walder, L. O., Toigo, R. & Lefkowitz, M. M. Social class, parental punishment for aggression, and child aggression. <u>Child Development</u>, 1963, <u>34</u>, 849-867.
- Figley, C. R. Child density and the marital relationship. Unpublished master's thesis, Pennsylvania State University, 1971.
- Hurley, J. R. Parental acceptance-rejection and children's intelligence. <u>Merrill-Palmer Quarterly</u>, 1965, <u>11</u>, 19-31.
- Hurley, J. R., & Hohn, R. L. Shifts in child-rearing attitudes linked with parenthood and occupation. <u>Developmental Psychology</u>, 1971, 4, 324-328.
- Hurley, J. R. & Laffey, J. J. Influence of a conventional child psychology course upon attitudes toward children. <u>Collected Papers of the Michigan Academy of Science</u>, <u>Arts, and Letters</u>, 1957, XLII, 299-306.
- Hurley, J. R., & Palonen, D. P. Marital satisfaction and child density among university student parents. <u>Journal of Marriage and the Family</u>, 1967, <u>29</u>(3), 483-484.
- Mark, J. C. The attitudes of mothers of male schizophrenics toward child behavior. <u>Journal of Abnormal and Social</u> <u>Psychology</u>, 1953, <u>48</u>, 185-190.
- McQuitty, L. I. Elementary Factor analysis. <u>Psychological</u> <u>Reports</u>, 1961, <u>9</u>, 71-78.
- Melnick, B., & Hurley, J. R. Distinctive personality attributes of child-abusing mothers. <u>Journal of</u> <u>Consulting and Clinical Psychology</u>, 1969, <u>6</u>, 746-749.

- Palonen, D. J. Interpersonal perceptions and marital adjustment. Unpublished master's thesis, Michigan State University, 1966.
- Rollins, B. C., & Feldman, H. Marital satisfaction over the family life cycle. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1970, 32, 20-27.
- Shoben, E. J., Jr. The assessment of parental attitudes in relation to child adjustment. <u>Genetic Psychology</u> <u>Monographs</u>, 1949, <u>39</u>, 101-148.
- Tinker, R. H. Dominance in marital interaction. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1972.
- Tucker, L. R., Damarin, F., & Messick, S. A base-free measure of change. <u>Psychometrika</u>, 1966, <u>31</u>, 457-473.
- Updyke, P. R. Family and role satisfaction among young married women. Unpublished master's thesis, Michigan State University, 1968.
- van der Veen, F., Huebner, B., Jorgens, B., & Neja, P. Relationships between the parents' concepts of the family and family adjustment. <u>American Journal of</u> <u>Orthopsychiatry</u>, 1964, <u>34</u>(2), 45-55.
- Walters, J., & Stinnett, N. Parent-child relationships: a decade review. In C. B. Broderick (Ed.) <u>A decade</u> of family research and action. National Council on Family Relations, 1971.

APPENDIX A CHILD BEHAVIOR INVENTORY

CHILD BEHAVIOR	INVENTORY
The statements about children expressed in the with by many people. In this same, there as read and then rate each of these statements 1. Strongly agree 2. Mildly agree 3. Uncer Remember, there are no "right" or "wrong" and pet heritate to express your remember or more	his booklet are both agreed and disagreed re no "right" or "wrong" answers. Please as follows: 5. Strongly disagree 4. Mildly disagree tain swers from our viewpoint. So please do by Tt will be expecially beloful to ye
if you will give an opinion for each one of that this will not always be a very adequate	these statements even though we realize expression of your views.
indicate your opinions on the accompanying a if you strongly agree with the statement of mildly agree; space 3 ==== if you neither agr	inswer form by checking space leves the same number; space 2 ==== 1f you wee nor disagree; etc.
1. It is better for children to play at home than to visit at the homes of others.	14. Children should usually be allowed to have their own way.
2. Children should be taught that parents "know best."	15. "Talking back" to parents is about the worst thing that a child can do.
A*3. It is hard to make some children really . "feel bad."	16. Children should not keep secrets from their parents.
4. Children should be neat and orderly at all times.	17. It is very important that young boys and girls not be allowed to see each other completely mude.
for it whether given special training or not.	18. Ordinarily arguments and fights breaking out among children are best handled by the children without adult
6. Women who like parties are often good mothers.	intervantion.
7. Parents should not take it upon them- selves to decide exactly how much a child	play in the living room.
is to eat. D	*20. Children do not "act lazy" without some important reason.
keep their clothes clean.	21. Much freedom tends to make children "wild."
9. If a father pumishes a child without good reason, the mother should stand up D- for the child's rights.	*22. Sneakiness in children is usually the result of faulty training methods used by their parents.
10. Parents should sacrifice everything for their children.	23. A good mother regularly shelters her children from life's little difficulties
11. Children should generally be encour- aged to choose their own playmates.	*24. If an infant dislikes a certain food, the parent should not insist that it be
12. The sooner children are toilet-trained, the better,	eston.

29

13. Parents should protect their children from exposure to extremely difficult tasks. 25. Shaming children in front of their friends is a good way to make them be-have.

	3	0 -2-
	26. Children should be taken to and from school by parents until about age 8 just to make certain that they avoid accidents.	44. host reports which parents hear from others about a child's misconduct are exaggerated.
	27. Boys should be allowed to play with $D$ dolls and carriages if they desire to.	*45. Very strict discipline can destroy what might have developed into a fine personality.
	28. Parents should not closely follow a policy of siding with their own child in its disputes with other children or adults.	46. Children should be allowed to nurse from the breast or bottle as long as they like.
	29. A mother should not shower her child $D^4$ with praise at all times.	47. Often it is a mistake to punish the child who has just done something very bad.
<b>A</b> *	30. Most children need some of the natu- ral meanness taken out of them.	48. Children should be permitted to keep secrets from their parents.
	1. Parents should close their eyes to the faults of their own children. De	+49. It is healthy for children to some- times express anger toward their parents.
	lowed to try out new things without parental supervision.	50. When parents are entertaining, chil- dren should be "seen but not heard."
	33. Children who are continuously "kept after" rarely amount to much as adults.	51. Even older children should sometimes be allowed to play with food during family meals.
	34. An older child who wets the bed should be shamed.	52. In raising children, one's feelings are generally a better guide than are a
	35. A child should not be protected from jobs which might be very tiring or tax-ing.	carefully thought-out set of rules. 53. If it is avoidable, a mother should
	36. Spanking very little children is about the only way that they can be taught not	never be separated from her child.
	to run into the street.	or mildly punish children who are misbe- having.
	37. Older children are more fun than babies.	55. Early weaning and toilet-training are important in preparing children for life.
	38. Children should be encouraged to think for themselves even though this may create more problems for their parents.	56. Parents should not require their chil- dren to undertake very difficult tasks.
	39. Physical punishment of children should be avoided.	57. It is the duty of parents to make certain that their children play only with the "right kind" of youngsters.
	40. Parents should make sure that their own children win at games.	58. Jealousy among brothers and sisters is a very common thing.
	41. Children will neglect their school- work if parents do not keep after them. De	*59. It is good for children to sometimes "talk back" to parents.
D	42. Children should not be punished for their exploratory sex play.	60. For their own sake children should be pressed by parents to excel in school.
	1.3 Children should not be allowed to	

.

A

e e general e service e se

**\* 6** 

• . • • • •

a Advision Constant de la Constant d Constant de la Constant

· · · · · · · · · · ·

. 

)\* 61. When children misbehave it is their parents who are really at fault.

62. Even the best parents sometimes feel very angry toward their children.

63. Children who do not keep up with their classmates usually need special tutoring more than anything else.

64. Children should be allowed to sometimes make a real mess of things just for the fun of it.

A # 65. A wise parent will teach the child early just who is boss.

66. Children are most lovable when they are small and helpless.

67. It is not of much importance that a child excel in club activities, such as the Girl or Boy Scouts.

68. The good parent never becomes angry with children.

69. Children should be given a chance to try out as many things as possible on their own.

A#70. Young children who simply refuse to obey should be whipped.

71. Children should be given much freedom.

72. The children of even a very watchful parent will have many accidents.

73. Children should not be expected to take very good care of their toys.

A# 74. Firm and strict discipline makes for a strong character in later life.

75. Some children have ways of making parents lose their temper.

D\*76. Most children enjoy helping their parents.

77. Children should have the right to play with whom-so-ever they please.

78. Children should be given the impression that their parents know "most everything.

79. It takes a lot of "reminding" to get children to do things right.

80. Almost any child who is not plain lasy can do well in schoolwork if they really try.

81. Parents should permit children to get as dirty as they wish once in a while.

82. One reason why it is sad to see children grow up is that they need you more when they are babies.

83. When children do not eat well it helps to tell them how nicely other children eat.

84. It is unwise for parents to admit their own mistakes to children.

85. Few parents worry about hurting their babies while handling them.

86. If children are quiet for very long, it is a good idea to check up on them.

87. A child should be encouraged to protest if it feels that it has been treated unfairly.

88. It is very important for parents to feel that their own children are welldressed and attractive.

89. Children should be trained early to keep their toys in order at all times.

90. Parents should watch their children closely at all times.

91. Only the foolish parent will attempt to make sure that they know their child's innermost thoughts.

92. A good parent intercedes immediately if other children start picking upon their child.

93. It is unreasonable to expect that a child will stick up for parents when the parents are in the wrong.

94. Even when children are very slow in getting dressed, parents should not do it for them.

95. Parents should not "give until it hurts" to their children.

A\* 96. A great deal of discipline is necessary for the proper training of children.

- and the second s

- nitus societarias de la constante massi de la presenta de la constante tista de la constante de la constante de la constante de la constante de la
- . 1997 State 1998 – State Sta 1997 – State Sta

  - n an an an Anna Anna an Anna an
  - n de dez en son de la Internet de la son de
  - A state of the second seco

  - $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}} = \{ 1, \dots, n \} := \{ 1, \dots, n \} : \{ 1, \dots, n \} \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}} : \{ 1, \dots, n \} \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}} : \{ 1, \dots, n \} \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}} : \{ 1, \dots, n \}$

  - n Braker (1997) Charles Charles (1997) Anno 1997 - Charles Charles (1997)

  - n an an tha An Sin an tha an tha

-4-97. The sooner children realize that they 116. Sometimes it is best to coax chilmust fight their own battles, the better. dren into doing things. 98. Most children can talk very little by 117. Children who always obey their parthe age of 12 months. ents do not grow up to become the more desirable kind of adults. 99, It would be better if school teachers were less strict. A\*118. Children should be spanked for temper tantrums. 100. The best children are those who show great affection for their parents. 119. Even the best parents make many mistakes in the handling of their chil-101. Two-year-olds are easier to manage dren. than are six-year-olds. D\*120. It is normal and healthy for chil-102. A child should be weaned away from dren to occasionally disobey their the breast or bottle as soon as possible. parents. 103. It is all right for a parent to A\*121. Most children get more kindness sleep with a child because this gives the and sympathy than is good for them. child a feeling of being loved and wanted. A\*122. A naughty child sometimes needs a 104. Four-year-olds are too young to be good slap in the face. expected to keep their toys in order. D\*123. Spanking children generally does 105. Children should be protected from more harm than good. learning about sex. 124. By the age of 7 most children are 106. It is foolish to push children to old enough to spend part of the summer stand upon their own feet in life at the away from home in a camp. earliest possible age. 125. Young people should choose employ-107. Even very good children will fight ment which they really like regardless with others upon occasion. of their parents' views. 108. Devoted parents may still have time A\*126. When parents speak, children should for an active social life. obey. \* 109. Slapping children immediately when 127. Parents should expect to give up they get into mischief is the best way to their own happiness for that of their end it quickly. children. 110. Children should believe whatever 129. Good parents never feel disgusted their parents tell them. toward their children. 111. After punishing a child, parents nat 7,#130. An intelligent child who does poorly urally want to make up for it by giving in school work should not be shamed. the child everything it wants. 131. Parents should not prevent children 112. Parents often worry that others may from playing in common games and sports play too roughly with their little ones. even though they think that the youngsters might get hurt. 113. It is foolish to expect three-yearolds to eat everything on their plates. 132. Children should not annoy parents with unimportant problems. 114. Children should never undertake something new without the consent of parents. 133. Children who are several years old should never be "babied." 115. Most good parents will occasionally strike a child for misbehavior.

1

and a second 

and a state of the second s Second second

in the second second

134. The sooner that children are weaned from emotional ties with their parents, the better they will handle their own problems.

135. Children must learn to do things without always waiting for their parents' approval.

A\* 136. Most children need more discipline than they get.

137. Good parents should do their best to guard their children against disappointments.

138. It is a mother's duty to know just about everything that her children are thinking about.

139. Young people should not marry without the approval of their parents.

140. No child is just naturally bad.

141. Most children should have music or other special lessons.

A\*142. Children are actually happier under strict training than they are under more lenient training. -5-

143. Special after-school activities are of greater character-building value to the child than is ordinary neighborhood play.

114. Children should seldom be expected to be neat and orderly.

145. Very few children complete bowel training by the age of 15 months.

- A\*146. Babies rarely cry just "to get attention."
- D\*147. Making a child feel wanted and loved is the surest way to obtain good behavior.

148. Shaming a child before friends is likely to cause more trouble than it does good.

A# 149. Children must be continuously "kept after" if they are to get somewhere in life later on.

150. Children should not be permitted to leave toys stream about the house.

A\* = Items of MR scale scored for agreement. D\* = Items of MR scale scored for disagreement.

33

Form 5A, September 1958.

j., \*

•

# APPENDIX B

# RESEARCH FEEDBACK MATERIAL

BRIEF SUMMARY OF CHANGES (1958-1969) ON CHILD-REARING ATTITUDE VARIABLES John R. Hurley, Dept. of Psychology, Michigan State University

This is a brief overview of how the respondents, as a group, generally shifted in their 1969 responses to the items of the child-rearing questionnairefrom the responses made by these same persons as MSU undergraduates in 1958-59. Many individuals shifted in directions opposite to these general trends, although this summary will deal only with these major trends.

Generally there was a clear shift toward lower scores on all four attitude dimensions. This trend was sharpest on variables I (Achievement Pressure) and II (Overprotection), as the typical respondent shifted toward lessened Achievement Pressure and lowered Overprotection by about 10 points. A less dramatic but similar change occurred on the shorter (23 items versus 30 items on all other attitude scales) scale IV (Overindulgence), where the typical respondent shifted downward by 3+ points. The changes on all three of these scales were statistically significant, or of such magnitude and consistency that they are unlikely to represent chance differences. No identifiable linkages between the number of children produced by the respondents over this 10-11 year interval and shifts on scales I, II, and IV occurred.

A less consistent and less reliable downward shift also occurred on variable III (Manifest Rejection). While the typical respondent shifted about 3 points downward on this measure, so many individuals shifted in the opposite direction that this overall downward trend was not statistically reliable. Another aspect of shifts on Manifest Rejection was that changes on this measure were linked to number of children produced over this 10-11 year interval. Thus, the 25 respondents producing 3 or more children showed an average increase of 1.9 points, while all other groups showed average <u>decreases</u>. Also the 36 producers of 2 children decreased an average of 3.2 points, the 16 parents of one child decreased an average of 4.8 points, and the 14 non-parents dropped an average of 5.2 points.

This atypical shift of Manifest Rejction confirmed a similar trend in preliminary studies (Hurley & Hohn, in press). With many individual exceptions, it appears that persons who produce larger numbers of children over this 10-11 year interval tend to swing toward more strict disciplinary policies than do those who have fewer children.

In summary, notable changes were observed on all four variables. Respondents generally shifted toward a more permissive and relaxed stance toward child-rearing -- at least according to these questionnaire measures -- since undergraduate days. Manifest Rejection scores constitute a major exception to this trend, as respondents who produced three or more children, especially mothers, shifted in the opposite direction of adopting a stricter disciplinary policy.

#### REFERENCES

- Hurley, J. R., & Hohn, R. L. Shifts in child-rearing attitudes linked with parenthood and occupation. <u>Developmental</u> <u>Psychology</u>, in press.
- Hurley, J. R., & Palonen, D. J. Marital satisfaction and child density among university student parents. <u>Journal of Marriage and the Family</u>,1967, 29, 483-484.

Hurley, J. R. Parental malovelence and children's intelligence. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1967, 31, 199-204.

- Hurley, J. R. Parental acceptance-rejection and children's intelligence, Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1965, 11, 19-31.
- Burley I. B. Achievement Pressure: an attitudinal correlate of college course

Measures of four specific facets of child-rearing attitudes were developed from the CHILD BEHAVIOR INVENTORY which you completed both as a student at MSU in 1958-59 and again in late 1969. Each item in this inventory was given with five alternative response choices: Strongly agree, Mildly agree, Uncertain, Mildly disagree, and Strongly disagree. The mix of items included in each of these four specific variables was such that respondents had to tend to agree with half of the items in each measure and to disagree with the remaining items in that measure to receive either unusually high or unusually low scores. These four variables were:

- I. A set of 30 items dealing with acquisition of a broad variety of social skill. Items representative of this series included: Early weaning and toilet training are important in preparing children for life; For his own sake a child should be pressed to excell in school; Parents should not take it upon themselves to decide exactly how much a child is to eat; and It would be better if school teachers were less strict. High scores on variable I tended to go with agreement with the first two of these sample items but with disagreement with the latter two items. The opposite pattern tended to hold for low scorers. The term used to characterize this series of 30 items was Achievement Pressure.
- II. Another set of 30 items dealt with how inclined the respondent was to view the environmental as threatening and dangerous to young children. Representative items from this series were: Parents should watch their children closely at all times; It is very important that young boys and girls not be allowed to see each other completely nude; Children should be permitted to keep secrets from their parents; and Children must learn to do things without always waiting for their parents' approval. Disagreement on these last two items, but agreement with the first two tended to go with high scores on this variable. Low scores tended to be linked with disagreement with the last two items, but agreement with the first two. The term Overprotection was used to characterize this measure.
- III. Thirty items also constituted this variable. This series of items were concerned with general strictness in disciplinary orientation toward children. Items representative of this series included: When parents speak, children should obey; Most children need more discipline than they get; Often it is a mistake to punish the child who has just done something very bad; and Spanking children generally does more harm than good. High scores on this measure tend to be associated with disagreement with these last two items and agreement with the first two items. Low scores follow the contrary pattern. The term employed to characterize this series of items was Manifest Rejection.
  - IV. Twenty-three items constituted this series. These items concerned how highly indulgent and affectionate the parent acted toward the child. Representative items were: Sometimes it is best to coax children into doing things; Parents should sacrifice everyting for their children; Four year-olds should know enough to keep their clothes clean; and A child should be protected from jobs which might be very tiring or taxing. As before, low scores tended to go with disagreement with the first two items, but agreement with the last two items. High scores tended to reflect agreement with the first two items but disagreement with the last two. The label attached to this set of items was Overindulgence.

36 MEAN<sup>+</sup> CHANGES IN CHILD-REARING ATTITUDE VARIABLES BY RESPONDENTS' SEX & NO. OF CHILDREN

CHILD-REARING ATTITUDE VARIABLES

	<u>N</u> "*	No. of Children	Ī	<u>11</u>	<u>111</u>	IV
	19	3 or more	-9.8	-9.3	3.7	-3.6
	18	2	-11.4	-10.2	-3.5	-2.8
WOMEN:	11	1	-13.6	-7.6	-5.2	0.4
	<u>10</u>	0	-9.0	-13.2	-4.7	-2.4
	58		-10.9	-9.9	-1.7	-2.4
	6	3 or more	-10.7	-9.0	-3.7	-3.3
	18	2	-9.4	-10.4	-3.1	-6.7
MEN:	5	1	-10.8	-15.6	-4.0	-7.4
	4	0	-9.0	-12.8	-11.0	-12.8
	33		-9.6	-10.9	-5.5	-5.0
	25	3 or more	-10.0	-9.2	1.9	-3.5
	36	2	-10.3	-10.0	-3.2	-4.9
WOMEN & M	en 16	1	-12.7	-10.2	-4.8	-2.1
	14	0	-9.0	-12.8	-5.2	-3.2
	91		-10.4*	-10.3*	-3.0	-3.3*

\*The probablility that this mean change is attributable to chance is less than 1 in 100.

+The mean is the toal sum divided by the number of persons. Thus, it represents the "general average."

It N symbolzes "Number" thus, 19 former students had produced 3 or more children, etc.

APPENDIX C

FAMILY CONCEPT INVENTORY

	37	<b>.</b>				
Ħ.	<b>I12</b> FAMILY CONCEPT INVENTORY	<u>SA</u>	<u>a</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>d</u>	$\frac{SD}{\omega}$
Tne	tructiones. Indicate the deeree of your concernet on the				ee	re
agr	eement with each of the following items as it applies to	ee	e	0	1gr	388
you	r immediate family (husband or wife and children) and	Ag I	STe	2 E E E E E	036	01.
enc	ircle the letter(s) representing the appropriate response.	4	A8	A(	۵Ă	~
Fir	st impressions are satisfactory, and most people are able	19	t t	19 18	t C	100
to	complete this inventory in ten minutes. It is quite impor-	uo	þ	4 C L	p	uo
tan	t that you give a response to each item, even though it	Str	ſen	Vel	lei	Str
may	sometimes be difficult to make a decision.		Ξ			
1.	We usually can depend on each other.	SA		N	đ	SD
2.	We nave a number of close friends. We feel secure when we are with each other.	5A SA	8. A	N N	d d	SD SD
4.	We do many things together.	SA	a	N	d	SD
5.	Each of us wants to tell the others what to do.	SA	a	N	d	SD
<b>6</b> .	There are serious differences in our standards and values.	SA	a	N	d a	SD
7. 8	Our home is the center of our activities	SA	a 9	N	a A	SD
9.	We are an affectionate family.	SA	8	N	d	SD
10.	It is not our fault that we are having difficulties.	SA	a	N	d	SD
11.	Little problems often become big ones for us.	SA	a	N	d	SD
12.	We do not understand each other.	SA	a	N	d	SD
13.	We get along very well in the community.	5A CA	a	N	D A	20
15	We do not talk about sex	SA	a	N	4	SD
16.	We get along much better with persons outside the family	011		••	~	00
	than with each other.	SA	a	N	d	SD
17.	We are proud of our family	SA	a	N	d	SD
18.	We do not like each other's friends.	SA	a	N	d	SD
19.	There are many conflicts in our family.	SA	a	N	d a	SD
20.	We are usually calm and relaxed when we are together.	5A CA	a. 	N N	D A	5D 6D
21.	Accomplishing what we want to do seems to be difficult for us.	SA	A	N	d	SD
23.	We tend to worry about many things.	SA	a	N	ď	SD
24.	We are continually getting to know each other better.	SA	a	N	d	SD
25.	We encourage each other to develop in his or her own					
	individual way.	SA	a	N	đ	SD
26.	We have warm, close relationships with each other.	SA	a	N	d	SD
27.	Together we can overcome almost any difficulty.	SA	a	N	d	SD
20. 20	We really do trust and confide in each other.	DA CA	8	M N	a A	50
30.	We get more than our share of illness.	SA	a	N	d	SD
31.	We are considerate of each other.	SA	a	N	d	SD
32.	We can stand up for our rights if necessary.	SA	a	N	d	SD
33.	We have very good times together.	SA	a	N	d	SD
34.	We live largely by other people's standards and values.	SA	a	N	d	SD
35.	Usually each of us goes his own separate way.	SA	a	N	d	SD
30.	We resent each other's outside activities.	SA	8	N	đ	SD
5/.	even when we differ strongly.	SA	а	N	d	SD
38.	We sometimes wish we could be an entirely different family.	SA	a	N	d	SD
39.	We are sociable and really enjoy being with people.	SA	a	N	d	SD
40.	We are a disorganized family.	SA	a	N	d	SD
41.	We are not really fond of one another.	SA	a	N	d	SD
42.	We are a strong, competent family.	SA	a	N	d	SD
43. 44	we just cannot tell each other our real reelings. Ne are not estisfied with southing short of perfection	5A C A	8	N N	a A	<b>3</b> 0 <b>C</b> D
45.	We forgive each other easily.	SA	a A	N	d	SD
46.	We usually reach decisions by discussion and compromise.	SA	a	N	d	SD
47.	We can adjust well to new situations.	SA	a	N	đ	SD
48.	Our decisions are not our own, but are forced on us by					
	circumstances.	SA	а	N	d	SD

# APPENDIX D

# GENERAL INFORMATION FORM

#### 38 GENERAL INFORMATION FORM

Your name:		Date(s) of mai	riage:
Birthdates of your children:	1. 4.	2.	3.

Your religious denomination:

Please characterize your church attendance by checking one of the following: Regular\_\_\_\_\_ Occasional\_\_\_\_\_ Seldom\_\_\_\_\_ Rare\_\_\_\_\_ Never\_\_\_\_\_

SINCE UNDERGRADUATE COLLEGE DAYS, HOW DO YOU THINK THAT YOU HAVE CHANGED, IF AT ALL, IN YOUR ATTITUDE TOWARD.....

1. The utility of strictness in disciplining children:

What do you think has led to these changes (if any)?

2. The amount of parental protection and supervision which children need?

What has led to your changes in this area?

3. The amount of freedom in such areas as verbal expression, choice of activities, and spending money that children can be allowed:

What has led to your changes in this area?

OVER, PLEASE

4. The amount of parental affection and time which should be given to children.

What has led to your changes in this area?

5. The importance of urging a child to excel in school and in physical and social development.

What has led to your changes in this area?

At what age do you think it is best for a person (of your sex) to marry?

If you were newly married and planning your family, how many children would you want to have?

If you desire more specific information about how your own scores changed over this 10 - 11 year interval on the Child Behavior Inventory scales, please check here:

APPENDIX E

.

LETTER ACCOMPANYING QUESTIONNAIRES

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY EAST LANSING . MICHIGAN 48823

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY · OLDS HALL

Dear

Your response to the 150-item Child Behavior Inventory was very much appreciated. Enclosed you will find a short summary of the principal findings.

Our findings appear to be the only firm information yet available concerning how young adults shift their attitudes toward children between college days and ensueing years. This line of research has proven exceptionally fruitful, and we now feel a need to better understand the clear and interesting changes observed.

Toward this goal, three additional information forms are enclosed with which we again seek your assistance. These include the Family Concept Inventory, the Attribute Preference Inventory, and the related General Information Form. The pre-addressed envelope may be used to return these. These instruments should require less time to complete, probably about 30 minutes, than the previous 150-item questionnaire.

I want to express my gratitude for your help. Without it, and especially without the candid expression of your views, research in this important but previously neglected sector of parent-child relations would be impossible for me.

Sincerely,

John R. Hurley Professor APPENDIX F RETURN POSTCARD

Dear M 6/ /70
Enclosed with the brief report of the findings of our research on how child-rearing attitudes have changed since college days was a copy of a new follow-up questionnaire. Because returns have been somewhat slow over the past month, this note is intended as a reminder.
The attached return postcard has also been phrased so that you might provide me with some "feedback" on that questionnaire. with minimal effort. The number on your return postcard makes it unnecessary for you to add your name.
Your generous assistance with the 10 year follow-up study of last summer was most helpful. I also appreciate whatever time and attention you can give to this more recent request.
Cordially,
John R. Hurley, Professor of Psychology, Michigan State U.

Message portion of double postcard

PLEASE CHECK ALL ITEMS RELEVANT TO THE RECENT QUESTIONNAIRE
I recently mailed it for return.
I intend to return it soon.
It may take more time, but I wil return it.
My copy was misplaced, but I would like a replacement.
I MAY NOT COMPLETE THE QUESTIONNAIRE BECAUSE:
I found the report of prior findings unsatisfactory
The following aspects of the questionnaire seemed objectional: Family Concept Inventory, General Information Form, Attribute Preference Inventory, Overall Package
Responding to it would be too time consuming
THANKS AGAIN FOR YOUR HELP

Return portion of double postcard

