

CHILD ATTRIBUTES PREFERRED BY COLLEGE STUDENTS

Thesis for the Degree of M. A. MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY CHRISTIE C, RANDOLPH 1967 THESIS

۱

CHILD ATTRIBUTES PREFERRED BY COLLEGE STUDENTS

CHRISTIE C. RANDOLPH

Abstract of MA Thesis Completed Fall Term, 1967

Extending preliminary work by Hurley, this study explored college students' perceptions of what constitute the desirable behavioral attributes of 8-year-old children. The identity of desirable or preferred behaviors of children remains largely unexplored because most prior research focused upon undesired behaviors. The primary objectives of this study were: (a) to obtain a substantial sample of behavioral attributes "freely nominated" as desirable; (b) to assess linkages between such attributes and later forced-rankings of the 10 most frequently nominated attribute classifications; (a) to identify relationships between Hurley's earlier attribute list and the new set of attributes; (d) to identify relationships between attribute preferences and the Manifest Rejection (MR) scale, an independent index of parental punitiveness; and (e) to confirm a relationship between a complex derivative from Hurley's attributes, called the Child Image ("good slave minus strong personality") index and MR scores. The Child Image (CI) scores for females were expected to be more in the direction of the "good slave" (GS) than those for males, and CI scores for girls were expected to be more in the direction of the GS than those for boys.

In Phase I, 64 males and 189 females in an undergraduate child psychology course at Michigan State University were asked: (a) to nominate four or more behavioral attributes which "you

feel are desirable" in 8-vear-olds, and then to rank these nominations from 1 to 4; (b) to rank-order from 1 to 10 Hurley's attributes, both for an 8-year-old boy (BOY) and an 8-vear-old girl (GIRL); and (c) to complete a child-rearing attitude questionnaire, which included the MR scale. A new list of 10 attributes was next constructed from the most frequently cited "free nomination" behaviors. In Phase II, ten weeks later, 27 males and 61 females who had completed tasks b and c rank-ordered both the new attribute list and the older Hurley list, both separately for BOY and GIRL.

Supporting the validity of these forced-rankings, students who had nominated behaviors subsumed under new list attributes "curious," "able to make friends, "fun-loving and carefree," "imaginative and creative," "considerate and cooperative," and "neat and clean" ranked these attributes more highly on the new list than did students not nominating such behaviors. The major trend was for both sexes to prefer any specific attribute to the same degree for both BOY and GIRL. The exceptions to this trend were: (a) both sexes ranked "neat and clean," "good student," and "respectful toward adults" as more important for GIRL than BOY but "good in games and sports," "curious," and "assertive and selfreliant" as more important for BOY than GIRL; and (b) females ranked "fun-loving and carefree," "considerate and cooperative," and "good, dependable worker" as more important for GIRL than for BOY.

The BOY attribute rankings showed more cross-sex agreement

than did GIRL rankings. Males tended to assign GS attributes to GIRL while females preferred a blend of GS and "strong personality" (SP) qualities, with greater emphasis upon the latter. These conflicting GIRL attribute preferences imply diffuse expectations, which may pose important identity problems for girls. Both sexes agreed that interpersonal skill attributes, such as "interacts well with others" and "able to make friends" are highly desirable qualities in 8-year-olds.

The independent MR scale correlated positively with males rankings of "respectful toward adults" but inversely with their rankings of "openly expresses feelings" and "fun-loving and carefree". Among females, "obediant to parents" correlated positively, while "curious" and "openly expresses feelings" correlated negatively, with MR. As anticipated, CI scores correlated negatively with MR for both sexes. The CI scores for GIRL as compared with those for BOY were in the predicted direction and statistically significant.

John Hurley

Thesis Committee, John Hurley (Chairman), Charles Hanlev, and James Uleman

Accepted: December 19, 1967

CHILD ATTRIBUTES PREFERRED BY COLLEGE STUDENTS

By Christie C. Randolph

A THESIS

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

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Psychology

1967

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank Dr. John Hurley, chairman of my committee, for his help in planning the study and preparing this manuscript and especially for his continued support over the last two and one half years; Dr. Charles Hanley for his invaluable statistical advice; and Dr. James Uleman, for his helpful suggestions, particularly with respect to category reliability. I wish to express my thanks to Elizabeth Force for rating the free responses and for the many times she proof-read my manuscript.

Table of Contents

	Page
Acknowledgements	ii
List of Tables	iv
List of Appendices	v
Introduction	1
Subjects	8 8 10
Results	14
Preferences for Behavioral Attributes	14 18 19
CI Scores	25
Attributes	27
Discussion	32
Preferences for Behavioral Attributes	32 35
Index	36 37 38
References	40
Footnotes	41
Appendices	42

and the second -----1 0 5 1 F 6 5 ----• • • • • • • • · · · · -----

.

.

List of Tables

Table		Page
l.	Percentage of Students Assigning a Specific Rank to Freely Nominated Attributes Incorporated in List II	15
2.	Difference Between Mean Ranks of List II Attributes Assigned by Students Nominating These Attributes and Students Not Nominating These Attributes	16
3.	Mean Ranks Assigned by Males and Females to Behavioral Attributes in Lists I and II	17
4.	Correlations Between GS Attributes, SP Attributes, New Attributes, CI Scores and MR	20
5.	Mean Differences Between Ranks Assigned to Behavioral Attributes for BOY and GIRL by Males and Females	23
6.	Correlations Between Ranks Assigned to Behavioral Attributes for BOY and the Same Behavioral Attributes for GIRL	24
7.	GS and SP Attributes Having the Highest Significant Correlation with Each CI Score ••••••••••	26
8.	Significant Correlations Between New Attributes in List II and Each CI Score	28
9.	Significant Correlations Between List II Attributes and List I GS and SP Attributes	29

.

e

List of Appendices

Appendix		Page
Α.	Child Relations Inventory	42
B.	Response Set	44
C.	List of Behavioral Attributes	45
D.	Correlation Matrix of CI Scores, MR Scores, and Rankings of Attributs	46
E.	New Attributes in List II Which Meet the Require ments for Membership in One of Two Opposing Groups	÷ − 53

Introduction

This study explored the kinds of behavioral attributes that adults find desirable or prefer in children. A review of the literature on children, parents, parent-child relations, and attitudes published in the last forty years or so and summarized in <u>Psychological</u> <u>Abstracts</u> revealed that this is an area that is virtually unexplored.

Previous investigations of child behavior seem to have focused on misbehavior and to have been solely concerned with the undesirability of certain behaviors in children. For example, Stogdill (1933) asked parents, students, and mental hygienists to rate 70 items of child behavior on an attitude scale from 1 to 10 in terms of their degree of seriousness or undesirability. The scale included items such as, "disobedience," "disrespect," "rudeness," and "careless of appearance." MacClenathan (1933) had teachers and parents list misbehaviors or unusual behaviors and then condensed this list of behavior traits. Her list was composed of traits like, "cheating," "lying," "lack of cooperation," and "lack of respect for authority." Teachers were asked to mark the relative frequency of occurance of the traits on the list in each of their pupils and to what degree that child's social adjustment was seriously affected.

To the investigator's knowledge, only one study in the literature reviewedasks the question, "What types of behavior are desirable in children?" Medinnus (1961) constructed a sort of characteristics of 5-year-olds and asked parents of children this age to sort the items in terms of the "ideal 5-year-old." The items in the pool were taken from books, literature, and rating scales. Medinnus stated that a

- 1 -

multitude of sources were consulted in order to get complete coverage of the traits which pertinently and significantly describe the 5-yearold. The items retained from the pool were those which were mentioned most frequently and those thought by clinicians to be most predictive of later adjustment. Of the items retained, 42 formed a plus pool and 42 a minus pool. "Is interested in learning new things; asks many questions" and "has a lot of energy and pep; doesn't get tired guickly" are typical of the items in the plus pool, while "lacks drive, no spark" and "cries easily" are typical of the items in the minus pool. Seventysix parents, 19 sets of parents of boys and 19 sets of parents of girls, were required to sort the two pools of items with the ideal 5-year-old in mind. The items in the plus pool were sorted into seven piles of six items each on a continuum from "most important for the ideal 5-year-old to possess" to "least important for the ideal 5-year-old to possess". The procedure for the minus pool was identical, except that the continuum ranged from "least bad for the ideal 5-year-old to possess" to "worst for the ideal 5-year-old to possess." Medinnus reported that the mean of the reliability coefficients for the ideal sort was .51 for the plus pool and .53 for the minus pool.

Medinnus was chiefly interested in interparent agreement and intraparent agreement (the ideal sort was compared with a real sort for the parent's own child) and the items differentiating parents on the real and ideal sorts. Although he obtained information on the rank order and mean placement of items in the ideal sort, he did not make this information available in his article.

A few years ago, Hurley became interested in what kinds of behavioral attributes adults prefer in children.¹ As a result of his

interest, he listed 10 behavioral attributes that came readily to mind and had the students in his child psychology class rank order them in terms of their desirability in 8-year-old children. Empirical data and thoughtful consideration suggested that three of the attributes were congruent with the characteristics of a "good slave" (GS), a person who unquestioningly follows the patterns of behavior established by others for him and submits to authority. In addition, three of the attributes were in agreement with the characteristics of the "strong personality" (SP), a person who can function independently of others, make his own decisions, and assert himself. Hurley noted that each person who rank ordered the list of 10 behavioral attributes could be given a composite score by summing the ranks assigned to the GS attributes and subtracting the summed ranks assigned to the SP attributes. The composite score presumably reflects the kind of behavior in a child that the ranker prefers. A high score indicates a preference for the SP, and a low score indicates a preference for the GS. Hurley found that the students' composite scores had a correlation coefficient of -.45 (N=253) with their scores on the Manifest-Rejection (MR) index, a measure of how rejecting parents are, which he and other investigators had constructed (see Footnote 1).

The MR index was designed to assess parental attitudes toward child-rearing practices. It is composed of a series of items concerning the general inclination of parents to endorse either a supportive, accepting, and non-coercive approach to child-rearing practices or a punitive, intimidating, and fear-inducing disciplinary policy toward children. Representative of the kinds of items in the index are: "It is good for children to sometimes 'talk-back' to their parents," and "When parents speak, children should obey." Presumably, this instrument will also reflect the attitudes of the childless toward child-rearing practices.

<u>S</u>s agree or disagree with each item on a weighted 5-point scale. The scale score for each <u>S</u> is the sum of the item weights. High MR scores tend to reflect overly punitive and rejecting attitudes toward children. Low MR scores are assumed to reflect a tendency to avoid coercive, punitive, and rejecting behaviors in parent-child interactions.

The MR index has been found to relate to a measure of one's tendency to punish children called the Punishment (PUN) index (Hurley, 1965). The PUN index consists of 24 items categorized under physical punishment, love-withdrawal, restraint, isolation, shame, threat, and corrective reasoning. Only parents' direct acknowledgements that they might employ the described punishment with their own child were scored positively. The correlation coefficient between MR and PUN was .46 (N=194) (Hurley, 1965, p. 25). The MR index has also been found to be associated with children's intelligence. The correlation coefficient between parents' MR scores and children's IQ (measured by the California Test of Mental Maturity) was -.27 (<u>N</u>=204) (Hurley, 1965, Thus, the MR index is related to parents' behavior, that is, p. 24). the kind of punishment they say they would employ with their children, and to children's behavior, namely, their performance on a test of intelligence.

Hurley's work was the starting point for the present study, which explored the kind of behavior preferred by college students in 8-yearold children. Aside from contributing knowledge in this area, this investigation was justified in view of the relationship between preferences for behavioral attributes and parental behavior, and the probable influence of parental preferences for behavioral attributes on the development of behavioral attributes in children.

The study's objectives were: (a)to a obtain substantial sample of behavioral attributes thought by college students to be desirable in 8-year-old children; (b) to assess linkages between such attributes and later forced-rankings of the 10 most frequently nominated attribute classifications; (c) to ascertain relative preferences for Hurley's attributes and the new set of attributes based on the students' nominations; (d) to identify relationships between Hurley's earlier attribute list and the new set of attributes; (e) to identify relationships between attribute preferences and the MR index; and (f) to confirm the relationship established between the kind of behavior preferred in children (as measured by the composite scores) and the MR index.

In order to achieve objects c and e, the investigator administered the MR index and repeated the procedure used by Hurley to determine the kind of behavior preferred in children. Thus, composite scores were derived from the ranks <u>Ss</u>¹ assigned to the 10 behavioral attributes when asked to rank order them in terms of their desirability in 8-year-old children. College students were selected as <u>Ss</u> in order to facilitate comparison with Hurley's data. In addition, they were readily accessible to the investigator.

To achieve objectives a and c, the students were asked to nominate behavioral attributes that "they feel are desirable" in 8-year-old children and later to rank order in terms of desirability a list of attributes based on their own suggestions. The reason for asking the students to nominate attributes was the investigator's belief that the students own suggestions would be more representative of their broader preferences than the relative preferences they express for attributes given by the investigator. By the same reasoning, the students' rankings of the attributes in a list of attributes based on their own nominations should be more representative of their preferences than the ranks they assign to attributes in a list given by the researcher. The investigator also felt that the students would have fewer objections and give more thought to ranking a limited number of attributes if they were first given the opportunity to freely express their own attribute preferences. Therefore, the students were requested to give their nominations before they were asked to rank order the 10 behavioral attributes.

Students were asked to rank rather than rate the list of attributes based on their own suggestions because raters hesitate to make extreme judoments and thus tend to disolace rated items in the direction of the mean of the total group (Guilford, 1954, p. 278). Ten was set as the limit for the number of attributes to be ranked because the investigator felt that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to make meaningful discriminations among a larger number of attributes.

Scores on the MR index were correlated with the ranks assigned to behavioral attributes nominated by the students to demonstrate a relationship between the students' preferences for these attributes and their behavior. The MR index was selected because Hurley had found that it was related to one's reported intention to punish children and to one's preferences for behavioral attributes in children.

~

Few hypotheses were formulated in advance since this study was exploratory. Separate data were collected on the preferences of males and females for attributes in boys and girls because the investigator anticipated obtaining differences in the composite scores and the preferences for individual attributes, which could be attributed to the sex of the ranker and differences which could be attributed to the sex of the child being ranked. Despite Medinnus! (1961) failure to find consistent differences between fathers and mothers in their perception of their children regardless of the sex of the child, this investigator felt that women place less emphasis on the gualities of the SP in children than men do. Thus, composite scores for females were expected to be more in the direction of the GS than those for males. Composite scores for girls were expected to be more in the direction of the GS than those for boys since the investigator felt that our culture stresses the development of GS attributes in girls.

- 7 -

Method

Sub jects

<u>S</u>s were 64 males and 189 females in an undergraduate child psychology course at Michigan State University in the fall of 1965. Among the 253 <u>S</u>s, there were approximately 98 juniors, 70 seniors, 67 sophomores, 13 freshman, 1 undergraduate enrolled in special programs, and 1 graduate student.

Measures

Child Relations Inventory. The Child Relations Inventory (CRI) was administered in its entirety; but only the items in the MR index were scored. This inventory consists of three parts: items 1-30 represent the MR index; items 31-40 and 51-55 represent the Achievement Pressure Scale, and items 41-50 represent the Overprotection Scale (see Appendix A).

<u>Child Image Index</u>. The composite score, which is derived from the rankings of the 10 behavioral attributes originally formulated by Hurley, will be referred to as the Child Image (CI) index. Eight out of 10 of these behavioral attributes were reworded so that they might be applied to 8-year-olds and 16-year-olds alike. Hurley's list of 10 behavioral attributes and the revised list are as follows:

Hurley's List

reliable and conscientious worker expresses feeling directly energetic and vigorous outstanding in scholastic work

0

respectful toward adults independent and self-assertive extremely intelligent skillful in games and sports obedient to parents unusually competent verbally

<u>List I</u>

good, dependable worker (WORKER)
openly expresses feelings (FEELINGS)
alert and active (ALERT)
good student (STUDENT)
respectful toward adults (RESPECT)
assertive and self-reliant (ASSERT)
very intelligent (BRIGHT)
good in games and sports (SPORTS)
obedient to parents (OBEDIENT)

expresses thoughts clearly (THOUGHTS)

The word in parenthesis following each attribute is intended to be an abbreviation and should not be confused with the attribute it represent These abbreviations will be used from this point on. WORKER, RESPECT, and OBEDIENT are the three attributes which are characteristic of the GS, while FEELINGS, ALERT and ASSERT are the three attributes which are characteristic of the SP. Possible scores on the CI index range from plus 21 to minus 21. High positive scores indicate a preference for the SP, and high negative scores indicate a preference for the GS.

Procedure

Students were asked to nominate behavioral attributes desirable in 8-year-olds, to rank order the revised list of behavioral attributes, and to complete the CRI. Only those students who completed both the rankings of the behavioral attributes and the CRI were used as <u>S</u>s.

It was thought desirable to invoke an appropriate response set for nominations regarding behavioral attributes viewed as very important in an 8-year-old child. The description of 8-year-olds designed for this purpose is in Appendix B. After children of this age were briefly described to them and they had a few moments to review their own knowledge of these children, the students were asked to write down on 5" x 8" cards their name, age, and sex and the behavioral attributes that they would view as important in an 8-yearold child of the same sex. Several examples of behavioral attributes of all kinds (from telling the truth to being sassy) were given in order to clarify what was wanted from them. The students were asked to give four or more attributes and then to rank from 1 to 4 those attributes they regarded as most essential.

Next the <u>S</u>s were asked to rank order from highest to lowest the list of 10 behavioral attributes in terms of their desirability in (a) an 8-year-old boy (BOY), (b) an 8-year-old girl (GIRL), (c) a 16 year-old boy, and (d) a 16 year-old girl (see Appendix C). The order of the first two tasks prevented the students' nominations from being biased by the investigator's list of attributes. Finally, they were instructed to complete the CRI, using the middle category sparingly.

_ 10

It was necessary to examine the students' suggested behavioral attributes in order to arrive at a new and more representative list of categories. Each of the attributes nominated was assigned to a category on the basis of the investigator's estimation of its suitability. For example, "plays by the rules" was assigned to the category "honest." The categories themselves were determined on the basis of the actual content of the suggestions. In instances of apparent misunderstanding of instructions, the student's nominations were disgarded. When two or more nominations by one individual seemed to mean the same thing, they were counted as one.

To gain some information on the reliability of the 18 most frequently used categories, 50 cards bearing the <u>Ss'</u> nominations were chosen at random and each behavioral attribute was placed in one of 19 categories, devised by the investigator, by a new rater. The nineteenth category was reserved for all the attributes which did not fall into any of the preceding 18. Then the category judgments of the two raters were compared. The percentage of agreement, defined as the ratio of twice the number of times both raters assigned the attributes to the same category to the number of times the category was used by the first rater plus the number of times the category was used by the second rater, was 90% or higher in 12 of the 19 categories. No percentage agreement could be computed for category 18 because this category was used once by the first rater and not at all by the second rater. A complete analysis of these agreement percentages is as follows:

1.	Honest	100%

Curious 97

2.

З.	Interacts well with groups	85%
4.	Makes/has friends	91
5.	Respectful toward adults	100
6.	Independent	89
7.	Fun-loving	95
8.	Imaginative and creative	100
9.	Considerate	80
10.	Responsible	100
11.	Neat	100
12.	Cooperative	86
13.	Generous	100
14.	Active	100
15.	Good attitude toward school	100
16.	Athletic	91
17.	Obedient	88
19.	Other	84

A new set of behavioral attributes (list II) was derived from the 12 categories most frequently used by the students. Categories 1 and 10 and also 9 and 12 were combined so that the resulting list could be as inclusive as possible. The combinations of categories involved attributes that were closely allied such as, considerate and cooperative. List II is reproduced below.

> responsible and trustworthy (HONEST) curious interacts well with others (INTERACT) able to make friends (FRIENDS)

> > - -

respectful toward adults (RESPECT) assertive and self-reliant (ASSERT) fun-loving and carefree (CAREFREE) imaginative and creative (CREATIVE) considerate and cooperative (CONSIDER) neat and clean (NEAT)

The word in parenthesis following the attribute is intended to be an abbreviation and should not be confused with the attribute it stands for. Note that the attribute "curious" has no abbreviation. In the future, the word curious will be capitalized when it refers to the attribute "curious". These abbreviations will be used from this point on.

At the end of fall term, list II was introduced to the students as well as list I. The ranking instructing were the same, but they were asked to rank order each set only in terms of their desirability in BOY and GIRL. List I was ranked for 8-year-olds only, because the investigator had decided that comparisons between preferences for behavioral attributes in 8-year-olds and 16 year-olds were beyond the scope of this study. List II was ranked for 8-years-olds only, because the suggestions were made for children of this age. Approximately, 36 juniors, 27 seniors, 21 sophomores, 3 freshmen, and 1 undergraduate in special programs or a total of 27 men and 61 women who had completed both the CRI and the rankings of the behavioral attributes completed this new task.

. .

Results

Preferences for Behavioral Attributes

Ranks assigned to freely nominated attributes. To assess the relative importance of the attributes most freequently nominated by the students as desirable for 8-year-old children, the percentage of male and female students assigning a specific rank (1, 2, 3, or 4) to a nominated attribute incorporated in list II was computed. These percentages are given in Table 1.

Ranks assigned to list II attributes by students freely nominating these attributes and students not freely nominating these attributes. One would expect that students who had nominated attributes which were also incorporated in list II would rank these attributes as more important (lower mean rank) on list II than students who had not nominated them. The difference between the mean rank assigned to each attribute in list II for BOY and GIRL by students who had nominated this attribute or a similar one and the mean rank assigned by students who had not nominated this attribute or a similar one was tested for significance using a ttest for the difference between two means. Of these 20 differences, 9 were significant, 7 at the .05 level, one-tailed, and 2 at the .01 level, one-tailed. Nine of the remaining differences were in the expected direction but not significant, and 2 were not in the expected direction but not significant. These results are reported in Table 2.

Ranks assigned to behavioral attributes in lists I and II. The mean ranks assigned by male and female students to the behavioral attributes in both lists for BOY and GIRL can be found in Table 3.

Table l

Percentage of Students Assigning a Specific Rank to Freely Nominated Attributes Incorporated in List II

Attributes		Percentage f	or Each R	lank	<u>N</u>
	1	2	3	4	
FRIENDS	43	15	19	23	26
INTERACT	37	25	20	18	14
ASSERT	31	26	22	22	16
CAREFREE	28	28	28	20	16
HONEST	24	30	26	20	31
CURIOUS	23	39	15	23	18
RESPECT	22	30	24	24	17
CONSIDER	18	32	31	19	14
CREATIVE	18	32	31	19	12
NEAT	7	18	32	43	7

Note.--Percentages have been rounded off to the nearest whole number.

Differences Between Mean Ranks of List II Attributes Assigned by Students Nominating These Attributes and

Students Not Nominating These Attributes

tributes	Mean	List II BOY RE	anks	Mear	List II GIRL	Ranks	ZI	
	Nominators]	Non-Nominators	Mean Diff.	Nominators	Non-Nominators	Mean Diff.	NominatorsNc	n-Nominato
ONEST	5.16	5.37	•21	5.38	5.41	•03	31	54
JRIOUS	3 . 39	4 • 94	1 . 55*	4.72	6°03	1 . 37*	18	67
UTERACT	2.86	3.45	•59	2.86	3 . 32	•46	14	71
XIENDS	4. 85	4 . 58	-. 21	4. 23	4 °69	4 3*	26	59
ISPECT	5°23	6.50	-97	5.76	6.18	。42	17	68
SERT	5,19	5 • 55	•36	6.06	6.91	•85	16	69
AREFREE	4. 38	6.45	2.07**	4.69	7.10	2.41**	16	69
REATIVE	2.75	4.73	1 . 98*	3.17	4.60	1•43*	12	73
ONS IDER	4 • 86	6.20	1 . 34*	4.21	5.21	1.00	14	11
ЗАТ	7.14	8,79	1 •65*	7.29	7.26	- 03	7	78

* p > 05 (one-tailed)

****** p > 01 (one-tailed)

Table 2

Table 3

Mean Ranks Assigned by Males and Females to Behavioral

Attributes in Lists I and II

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~							
·····							
Attribute	Males BOY	<u>N</u> =27 Attribute G	IRL	Attribute	Females BOY	N=61 Attribut	e GIRL
		Li	st I				
ALERT	•96	ALERT	1.37	ALERT	1.16	ALERT	1.30
ASSERT	3.59	STUDENT	3.70	ASSERT	3.49	FEELINGS	3.39
FEELINGS	4.11	RESPECT	4.07	FEELINGS	3.56	WORKER	3.91
THOUGHTS	4.33	THOUGHTS	4.11	THOUGHTS	4.33	RESPECT	4.21
SPORTS	4.44	OBEDIENT	4.19	OBEDIENT	4.59	THOUGHTS	4.21
OBEDIENT	4.78	FEELINGS	4.30	WORKER	4.62	ASSERT	4.44
RESPECT	5.40	ASSERT	4.52	RESPECT	4.98	OBEDIENT	4.48
WORKER	5.44	WORKER	5.52	SPORTS	5.57	STUDENT	5.00
STUDENT	5.62	BRIGHT	5.67	STUDENT	5.75	BRIGHT	6.61
BRIGHT	6.30	SPORTS	7.56	BRIGHT	6.98	SPORTS	7.49
List II							
INTERACT	2.37	INTERACT	2.19	INTERACT	2.31	INTERACT	2.21
FRIENDS	3.59	FRIENDS	3.48	CREATIVE	3.21	CREATIVE	3.11
HONEST	3.70	CONSIDER	3.56	CURIOUS	3.44	FRIENDS	3.52
CURIOUS	3.89	HONEST	3.85	FRIENDS	3.57	CONSIDER	4.25
CREATIVE	4.07	CREATIVE	4.19	ASSERT	4.31	HONEST	4.59
CONSIDER	4.41	RESPECT	5.11	HONEST	4.54	CURIOUS	4.69
ASSERT	4.96	NEAT	5.11	CAREFREE	5.00	RESPECT	5.00
CAREFREE	5.15	CURIOUS	5.41	CONSIDER	5.10	ASSERT	5.46
RESPECT	5.56	CAREFREE	5.74	RESPECT	5.49	CAREFREE	5.74
NEAT	7.30	ASSERT	6.37	NEAT	8.00	NEAT	6.43

The attributes which were most preferred are those which have the lowest mean ranks.

The Relationship Between Attribute Preferences and MR

The use of a ranking system in which "1" indicates "most desirable" and "10" indicates "least desirable" makes the correlations between ranked attributes and such other variables as MR and CI difficult to interpret. Ordinarily, a positive correlation implies that high scores on one variable are empirically linked with high scores on the other variable: also that low scores on both variables tend to go together. However, with the present ranking system, a positive correlation between an attribute's rank and another variable means that a strong preference for the attribute is associated with a low score on the other item. Consequently, negative correlations show that a strong preference for the attribute is associated with a high score on the other variable. To facilitate the interpretation of correlations, the signs of correlations between ranked attributes and other variables have been changed (except in the Appendices) to permit the conventional interpretation of positive and negative cor-It was unnecessary, of course, to change the signs of relations. empirical correlations among the ranked attributes.

Inspection of the product-moment correlations between attribute preferences and MR scores shows which of the attribute preferences are most strongly associated with MR.

Among the GS attributes from list I, for male students, RESPECT had the highest significant positive product-moment correlation with MR; whereas, for female students, OBEDIENT had the highest significant positive correlation with MR. FEELINGS was the SP attribute which had the highest significant negative correlation with MR for both male and female students. No list II attribute had a significant positive correlation with MR for male students or female students considered separately. The list II attributes which had significant negative correlations with MR were CAREFREE for males only and CURIOUS (ranked for GIRL) for females only.

For males and females, the CI index that correlated most highly with MR was the one obtained for BOY on the second administration of list I. The correlation coefficient was -.70 (N=27) for the male and -.34 (N=61) for the female students. Thus, a high CI for BOY, which indicates a preference for the SP, was strongly associated with a low MR score which indicates a lack of parental rejection. The CI scores for BOY and GIRL remained relatively stable from the first administration of List I to the second. The male students' CI scores for BOY correlated .88 (N=27) and their CI scores for GIRL correlated .63 (N=27). The female students' CI scores for BOY and GIRL correlated .58 (N=61) and .68 (N=61) respectively. The greatest flux seemed to be in ranking children of the opposit sex.

Table 4 contains correlation coefficients between the students' MR scores and the ranks they assigned to the GS attributes, the SP attributes, the new attributes, and the four CI scores. A correlation matrix of CI scores, rankings of behavioral attributes from both lists, and MR can be found in Appendix D. Sex Differences

Preferences for individual attributes. To determine whether or not the sex of the ranker effected attribute preferences, the

Table 4

Correlations Between GS Attributes, SP Attributes, New

Attributes, CI scores and MR

		،		<u>ﻧﯩﺪﻩﺭﻩﻳﻮﺭﻩﻩﻩ «ﻣﻪﻛﺎ¹ار، چىرىمەنى»، 1000 مىر 2000 مىر 2000 مىر يەرەپ مە</u> رەپ
CI Scores	Males Stude	nts (N=27)	Female S	tudents (N=61)
Attributes	BOY	GIRL	BOY	GIRL
		List I		
CI ^a	-63**	-57**	-32*	-27*
cıp	-70**	-62**	-34**	-31*
G S				
WORKER RESPECT OBEDIENT	30 43* 36	28 57** 23	-05 26* 39**	-05 32* 33**
SP	·			
FEELINGS ALERT ASSERT	-68* * 22 -34	-61** 02 -37	-42** -01 -13	-33** -08 -03
	List II	(New Attrib	utes)	
HONEST	11	28	-03	-11
CURIOUS	-25	-26	-24	_ 39 **
INTERACT	-09	-09	06	-01
FRIENDS	-07	-18	04	00
CAREFREE	-43**	-39*	09	-03
CREATIVE	-21	-07	-19	-14
CONSIDER	10	21	10	17
NEAT	36	19	-00	24

^a First administration of list I.

^b Second administration of list I.

* p>.05 (two-tailed)

** p >_ 01 (two-tailed)

difference between the mean rank assigned by the males and the mean rank assigned by the females to each attribute for BOY and for GIRL was computed. (The mean rankassigned by females was subtracted from the mean rank assigned by males). Then the greatest difference was tested for significance using a t test for the difference between two means with the null hypothesis being that the difference is zero. The next largest differences were progressively tested for significance until the null hypothesis could no longer be rejected. The size of the variance for the two means was taken into account as well as the difference between the two means in deciding whether or not to test a given difference. Of the 40 differences, three proved to be significant. Two significant differences are expected to occur by chance in 40 tests of significance using the .05 level. The differences between the mean ranks given by male and female students to WORKER, STUDENT, and NEAT for GIRL were 1.60 (p > 01), -1.30 (p > 05), and 1.31 (p>.05). The <u>N</u> for males is 27 and the <u>N</u> for females is 61. The female students regarded being a WORKER as more important for GIRL than the males ranked it for GIRL. However, the males perceived that being a STUDENT and being NEAT are more important for GIRL than the female did.

The mean difference between ranks assigned to attributes for BOY and GIRL by male students and by female students was computed and tested for significance in order to determine if the sex of the child effected attribute preferences. (The rank assigned to GIRL was substracted from the rank assigned to BOY.) A \underline{t} test for matched pairs was substituted for the standard \underline{t} because the same

 \sim

<u>S</u> ranked the attributes for BOY and GIRL. For male students, 6 of the 20 differences were found to be significant. In 20 tests of significance using the .05 level, one significant difference is expected to occur by chance. The males ranked NEAT, STUDENT, and RESPECT as more important for GIRL and SPORTS, CURIOUS and ASSERT (in list II) as more important for BOY. For female students, 10 of the 20 differences were significant. The females ranked SPORTS, ASSERT (in both lists), and CURIOUS as more important for BOY and NEAT, STUDENT, RESPECT, CAREFREE, CONSIDER, and WORKER as more important for GIRL. These results are given in Table 5.

The product-moment correlations between the ranks assigned by males and females to behavioral attributes for BOY and the same attributes for GIRL in both lists can be found in Table 6. These correlations indicate the strength of the relationship between the rank assigned to an attribute for BOY and the rank assigned to the same attribute for GIRL. These correlations were all significant at the .01 level and beyond, except those for STUDENT and SPORTS as ranked by male students. The differences between these correlations for males and females were tested for significance in the manner described by Walker and Lev (1953, pp. 255-256). None of these differences were significant at the .05 level (two-tailed).

<u>CI scores</u>. Differences between the male and female students¹ CI scores for BOY and the differences between their CI scores for GIRL were computed and tested for significance in the manner pre-

Table 5

Mean Difference Between Ranks Assigned to Behavioral Attributes

for BOY and GIRL by Males and by Females

Attributes

	Males (N=24)	Females (N=61)
	List I	
WOPKER	0	•64 **
FEELINGS	13	.16
ALERT	.21	13
STUDENT	1.71**	•75**
RESPECT	•92 **	•77**
ASSERT	- .75	- •95**
BRIGHT	•42	•31
SPORTS	-2.42**	-1.92**
OBEDIENT	•04	•11
THOUGHTS	.25	.11
	List II	
HONEST	- •17	- •05
CURIOUS	-J.,17**	-1.20**
INTERACT	•13	•10
FRIENDS	•25	02
RESPECT	13	•43
ASSERT	1.33*	-1.15**
CAREFREE	21	74**
CREATIVE	 33	. 15
CONSIDER	. 88	•85 **
NEAT	1.75**	1.51**

** p > .01 (two-tailed)

Ta	b	1	е	6
----	---	---	---	---

Correlations Between Ranks Assigned to Behavioral Attributes

Attributes	sMales (N=27)	Females (N=61)
	List I	
WORKER	•76	•77
FEELINGS	•76	.83
ALERT	.72	•44
STUDENT	•38	•72
RESPECT	•72	•72
ASSERT	. 66	. 63
BRIGHT	•81	•74
SPORTS	•09	•63
OBEDIENT	•73	.89
THOUGHTS	.85	.85
	List II	
HONEST	•77	.81
CURIOUS	•72	•63
INTERACT	•92	. 78
FRIENDS	. 60	. 69
RESPECT	•76	•77
ASSERT	. 64	•63
CAREFREE	. 61	•77
CREATIVE	•53	.61
CONSIDER	. 68	• 48
NEAT	<u>•</u> 59	.53

for BOY and the Same Behavioral Attributes for GIRL

Note.--For males a correlation of .49 or above is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed). A correlation of .33 or above is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed) for females. viously described. None were significant, but all of the differences were in the predicted direction. Thus, differences in males and females CI scores can not be attributed to the sex of the ranker. The mean difference (2.08) between male students' CI scores for BOY and GIRL and the mean difference (2.82) between female students' CI scores for BOY and GIRL were tested for significance. (CI scores for GIRL were subtracted from CI scores for BOY.) Both these mean differences were significant at the .01 level and in the expected direction. Thus, differences in BOY and GIRL CI Scores can be attributed to the sex of the child being ranked.

Relationship Between Attribute Preferences and CI Scores

The magnitude of the correlations between the attributes and the CI scores indicate the strength of the relationship between them.

<u>GS and SP attributes</u>. RESPECT was the GS attribute which related most powerfully to the CI index, in terms of correlating with CI at the highest levels of statistical significance and more frequently than the other GS attributes over the series of eight individual CI indices (excluding the cross-sex correlations like RESPECT as ranked for GIRL with a CI score for BOY). This means that the location of the rank which a student assigns to RESPECT is the best predictor of his CI scores. The SP attribute which related most powerfully to the male students' CI scores for BOY was ASSERT, and for GIRL it was FEELINGS. The SP attribute which related most powerfully to the female students' CI scores for BOY and GIRL was FEELINGS. Of the SP attributes, ASSERT is the best predictor of a male students' CI scores for BOY, and FEELINGS is the best predictor of a male student's CI scores for GIRL. The remaining relationships for female students may be interpreted in a similar way. See Table 7 for a

Table 7

GS and SP Attributes Having the Highest Significant

·					
At	tributes	В	OY	GIF	۲. ۲
		CJ l ^a	CI 2 ^b	CI 1	CI 2
	1		Males (Ŋ=27)	
GS	RESPECT	- •65	73		78
	WORKER			42	
SP	ASSERT	•55	•54		
	FEELINGS			•53	. 68
			Females	(<u>N</u> =61)	**************************************
GS	OBEDIENT	48			
	RESPECT		70	- .63	72
SP					
	FEELINGS	•33	•57	•34	. 59

Correlation with Each CI Score

Note.--All the correlations for males are significant at the .05 level (two-tailed) or above. For females, all the correlations are significant at the .Ol level (two-tailed) or above.

a Obtained on the first administration of list I.

 $^{
m b}$ Obtained on the second administration of list I.

list of the GS and SP attributes having the highert significant product-moment correlation with each CI score.

New attributes. Of the eight new behavioral attributes in list II, the one which showed the strongest positive relationship with the male students! CI scores for BOY and GIRL is CURIOUS. The new attribute in this same list which marifested the strongest regative relationship with the male students! CI scores for BOY is NEAT, and for GIRL, it is CONSIDER. For female students, the new attribute from list II which showed the strongest positive relationship with the CI scores for BOY is CREATIVE, and for GIRL, it is CURIOUS. The new attribute which manifested the strongest negative relationship is CONSIDER for BOY and HONEST for GIRL. In this case, strength of relationship was determined by comparing the magnitude of the significant product-moment correlations between new attributes in list II and each CI score and then noting the frequency with which these attributes correlated significantly with the CI scores (the cross-sex correlations were excluded). A list of the significant correlations between new attributes in list II and each CI score for male and female students can be found in Table 8.

Relationship Between CI Attributes and New Attributes

Are any of the attributes in list II strongly associated with the CI attributes from list I? Table 9 contains a list of the significant product-moment correlations between the attributes in list II and the GS and SP attributes in list I. It is important to notice that HONEST had significant positive correlations with the first and second SP attributes and a significant negative correlation with the third SP attribute. Thus, only two of the new attributes, CONSIDER

27

Table 8

Significant Correlations Between New Attributes

in List II and Each CI Score

the state of the

1

Ļ

 $\simeq 1$

Attributes	В	OY		GIRL
	CII	CI 2	CI 1	CI 2
			Males (<u>N</u> =27)	
CURIOUS	51	44	46	44
CAREFREE		45		
CREATIVE			42	
NEAT	-56	-55		
CONSIDER	-55	-42	-68	-35
HONEST			-42	
		Fe	emales (<u>N</u> =61)	
CREATIVE	37	48	39	47
CURIOUS			40	49
INTERACT				27
FRIENDS				29
CONSIDER	-30	-42	-38	-34
HONEST	-31	-35	-32	-41
NEAT		-44		-48

Note.--All correlations are significant at the .05 level (two-tailed) or above.

20

Table 9

Significant Correlations Between List II Attributes

and List I GS and SP Attributes

Attributes		Males	(<u>N</u> =27)	F	emales	(N=61)
		BCY	GIRL	В	OY	GIRL
GS						
WORKER and	HONEST	43	48		37	
FR	IENDS			. -	-32	-35
RE	SPECT					26
CA	REFREE			-	•27	
cc	NSIDER		38		48	
RESPECT and	CURIOUS					-46
RE	SPECT	58	70		59	56
AS	SERT					-34
CR	EATIVE					-36
CC	NSIDER	43				40
OBEDIENT an	d CURIOUS	5				-49
IN	TERACT					-26
RE	SPECT	68	69		30	37
AS	SERT	-51				
CR	EATIVE			-	·43	-27
NE	AT	40				34

Attributes	Males	(N=27)	Females	(N=61)
	воу	GIRL	воу	GIRL
SP				
FEELINGS and HONEST		-46		
CURIOUS	44			36
RESPECT	-40			
CAREFREE	49	55		
CREATIVE				31
NEAT			-38	-25
ALERT and HONEST				-28
INTERACTS			31	25
FRIENDS		38		27
RESPECT		-44	-33	-27
CAREFREE				35
CREATIVE			35	36
CONSIDER			-40	
NEAT		-39	-32	-43
ASSERT and HONEST	41			
RESPECT	-62	-52	-46	-35
ASSERT	61	63	64	60
NEAT			-31	-35

Note.--All correlations are significant at the .05 level (two-tailed) or above.

and NEAT are clearly related to the GS attributes. Five of the new attributes, CAREFREE, CURIOUS, CREATIVE, FRIENDS, and INTERACT are clearly related to the SP attributes.

Discussion

Preferences for Behavioral Attributes

Preferences for list II attributes of students nominating these attributes and of students not nominating these attributes. Students who nominated CURIOUS, FRIENDS, CAREFREE, CREATIVE, CONSIDER and NEAT viewed these attributes as more important for BOY and/or for GIRL than students who did not nominate them. This indicates that there is a relationship between the students' nomination of attributes and their preferences for attributes in list II and that the student's rankings of list II attributes actually do reflect their preferences.

Attributes preferred in list I. Male and female students were in almost total agreement on the ranks to be assigned to each of the attributes for BOY. They preferred that BOY have the attributes of the SP; that is, they preferred BOY to be ALERT, ASSERT, and openly expressive of feelings (ranked first, second, and third, respectively). Male and female students did not agree on the ranks to be assigned to seven of the attributes in list I for GIRL. The average difference between the ranks assigned to these attributes by males and females was approximately three. The many discrepancies between the preferences of males and females for these attributes in GIRL suggest that girls are subject to conflicting expectations and thus may experience problems in assuming their role. The males assigned rank one to ALERT and ranks three and five to RESPECT and OBEDIENT. Females assigned rank one to ALERT, rank two to FEELINGS, rank three to WORKER, and rank four to RESPECT. For the first five ranks, males selected as most preferable one attribute of the SP

and two attributes of the GS while females selected two attributes of the SP (ranked first and second) and two attributes of the GS. Thus, the trends are for males to prefer girls who are "good slaves" while the females prefer girls who have a combination of the characteristics of the GS and SP, with an emphasis on the attributes of the latter.

These findings are not surprising if one is of the opinion that boys in our culture have been encouraged to be more active and independent than girls. Inklings of a change in the woman's role may be reflected in the students' ranking an attribute of the SP first in importance for GIRL as well as BOY. The "good slave" is probably not as strongly preferred for girls as it was in the years before the feminist movement when women were denied higher education, careers, and the right to vote. These trends suggest that the women seem to have accepted or encouraged this role change more wholeheartedly than the men have since they prefer girls to have more attributes of the SP than men do.

Being a STUDENT was perceived by the males to be important for GIRL (ranked second) but not so important for BOY (ranked ninth). Females considered that being a STUDENT is relatively unimportant for both sexes (ranked ninth for BOY and eighth for GIRL). It would seem that for girls, pressure for scholastic achievement is exerted by males. It seems surprising that a college population ranks BRIGHT so low (ranked tenth for BOY and ninth for GIRL). Perhaps this reflects the general population's anti-intellectual bias.

Attributes preferred in list II. Male and female students did not agree on the ranks to be assigned to seven of the attributes for BOY and eight of the attributes for GIRL. The average difference between the ranks assigned to these attributes was two for BOY and approximately two for GIRL. Thus, conflicting expectations seem to exist for both boys and girls. These conflicting expectations may cause role problems for both sexes.

What attributes did the students consider to be most important in Males ranked INTERACT and FRIENDS first and second in imlist II? portance for BOY and GIRL; female students ranked them first and fourth for BOY and first and third for GIRL. Thus, the students agreed that interpersonal characteristics are very important for both sexes. The males viewed attributes like CONSIDER and HONEST, which seem intuitively to be related to the GS image, as next in importance for GIRL. However, the females viewed attributes like CREATIVE and CONSIDER, which seem intuitively to be a combination of attributes of the SP and GS, as first in importance for GIRLS after the interpersonal characteristics. (These intuitions are consistent with the empirical data in Table 9.) Thus, at this level of importance females prefer girls to have a combination of attributes of the SP and GS while males prefer girls to have attributes of the GS. In addition, the males place more emphasis on GSlike attributes in boys than females do. The males ranked HONEST third in importance for BOY and the females ranked CREATIVE second in importance.

Males and females agreed that curiosity and assertiveness and self-reliance are more important for boys than for girls. Male students ranked CURIOUS fourth for BOY and eighth for GIRL and the female students ranked CURIOUS third for BOY and sixth for GIRL. ASSERT was ranked seventh for BOY and tenth for GIRL by the males and fifth for BOY and eighth for GIRL by the females.

NEAT and CAREFREE, which seem to be at opposite ends of a continuum of control versus spontaneity (see Appendix D for correlations between these attributes), tend to be rejected by the students as being desirable for children. There was, however, agreement that being NEAT is more important for girls.

ASSERT and RESPECT, the attributes which appeared in both lists, tend not to be preferred in list II for BOY or for GIRL as they were in list I. The males ranked ASSERT second in list I and seventh in list II for BOY, and they ranked this same attribute seventh in list I and tenth in list II for GIRL. The females ranked ASSERT second in list I and fifth in list II for BOY, and they ranked this same attribute sixth in list I and eighth in list II for GIRL. The attribute RESPECT was ranked seventh in list I and ninth in list II for BOY and third in list I and sixth in list II for GIRL by male studerts. RESPECT was ranked seventh in list I and ninth in list II for BOY and fourth in list I and seventh in list I for GIRL by the female students. The context of the attributes, which varies from one list to the other, seems to have importantly influenced the desirability of these two attributes.

Relationship Between Attribute Preferences and MR

Five of the 18 individual attributes had statistically significant product-moment correlations with the MR index. Thus, preferences for these attributes are associated with attitudes toward child-rearing practices, which in turn are linked with parents' reported intentions

- ÷

to punish children. Two of these five attributes were strongly correlated with tendencies to punish in only one of the sexes. A Preference for CAREFREE has a strong negative association with punishment tendencies in males but not females. A preference for CURIOUS (in girls only) has a strong negative association with punishment tendencies in females but not males. Males' preferences for RESPECT have strong positive associations with their tendency to punish children, and their preferences for FEELINGS has a negative association with these tendencies. Females' preferences for RESPECT and OBEDIENT have strong positive associations with their punishment tendencies, and their preference for FEELINGS has a strong negative association with these same tendencies.

For males and females the CI index for BOY was the index most strongly associated with the tendency to punish children. Sex Differences in Attribute Desirability and the CI Index

The trend is for males and females to prefer any given attribute in a child to the same degree and to consider any particular attribute to be equally important for BOY as it is for GIRL. Thus, males and females' perceptions of the relative importance of certain attributes in an 8-year-old tend to be similar and adults' perceptions of the relative importance of certain attributes in BOY and GIRL tend to be the same. When the CI index is being considered rather than individual attributes, the trend is for males' and females' CI scores to be the same. Adult's CI scores for BOY and GIRL are, however, not the same. The GIRL receives a lower CI score, that is, a score more in the direction of the GS, than the BOY. Perhaps significant

26

differences in preferences for more individual attributes (which could be attributed to the sex of the child being ranked) would have occurred if an older child were being considered. A child's age is likely to influence preferences for attributes in boys and girls.

Relationship Among List II Attributes

It must be noted that when the 10 behavioral attributes in lists I and II are ranked ordered, a preponderence of negative correlations occurs among the ranks assigned to the attributes in each list. These intrinsic negative correlations occur among the ranks assigned to members of any set when these members are rank ordered. As ranks are assigned to each member, the number of ranks available to choose from decreases since a given rank may be used only once. For example, there are four ranks to choose from in ranking the seventh member of a set of 10, six ranks having been previously assigned. The limited and decreasing choice inherent in rank ordering produces the negative correlations. The formula for computing the negative correlation is -1/K-1, where K is the number of ranks assigned to the members. ² This formula makes the assumption that there is no correlation between the ranks. When K equals 10, the negative correlation is -. 11. Thus the positive correlations between the ranks assigned to the attributes in list I and in list II are reduced by .ll and the negative correlations are increased by .ll.

How do the attributes in list II relate to each other? Could they be dichotomized in much the same manner as the behavioral attributes in list I? An overview indicates that six of the eight attributes can be classified as belonging to one of two opposing groups. HONEST, CONSIDER and NEAT belong in one group, and CURIOUS,

CAREFREE and CREATIVE belong in the other. The groups were constructed in the following manner. In each of the four categories (sex of student x sex of child), significant negative productmoment correlations between the new attributes were noted, and on the basis of these correlations and apparent similarities among attributes (like HONEST, CONSIDER and NEAT) the attributes were placed in either group A or group B. Only those attributes which had a significant positive correlation with at least one other member of its own group were included in the final groups in each category. The intrinsic negative correlation between ranks was taken into account in determining the significance of these correlations. The attributes which meet these requirements for membership in one of the two groups in each of the four categories are given in Appendix None of the attributes ranked by males meet these requirements. E. Thus, the overview only applies to attributes ranked by females. Research Implications

The next step in this investigation might well be to discover behavior other than reported intentions to punish to which adults' preferences for behavioral attributes in children are related. A comparison of the results of this study with data from other segments of the populations, whose preferences for behavioral attributes in children are likely to be different than those of college students, who are primarily middle-class, might prove fruitful. Also it would seem important to compare the preferences of 8-year-olds with the preferences of their parents. The age of the child for whom the behavioral attributes are being ranked or nominated as important is a dimension which needs to be examined. Is a child's age influencial in determining the desirability of behavioral attributes? The sex of the child for whom the attributes are being ranked or nominated might prove to be more important at the upper age levels. Any further investigation should take into consideration the probable importance of the context of the individual attributes in determining their desirability. Preferences for an attribute seem to vary as the attribute is transferred from one list of attributes to another.

References

Guilford, J. P. Psychometric Methods. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1954.

- Hurley, J. R. Parental Acceptance-Rejection and Children's Intelligence. <u>Merrill-Palmer Quarterly</u>, 1965, 11(1), 19-31.
- MacClenathan, R.H. Teachers and Parents Study Children's Behaviors. Journal of Educational Sociology, 1933-1934, 7, 325-334.

Medinnus, G.R. Q-Sort Descriptions of Five-Year-Old Children by Their Parents. Child Development, 1961, 32, 473-489.

Stogdill, R. M. Attitudes of Parents, Students, and Mental Hydienists Toward Children's Behavior. Journal of Social Psychology, 1933, 4, 486-489

.

Walker, H. M., & Lev, J. Statistical Inference. Chicago: Holt, Rinehard and Winston, 1953.

Footnotes

- ¹ J. R. Hurley, personal communication, spring, 1965.
- 2 $_{\rm M}$ McSweeney, personal communication, fall, 1967.

----CHILD RELATIONS INVENTORY

The how star man Fle cir	following statements are to be judged by you to indicate well they agree or disagree with your own opinion. The tements themselves are both agreed and disagreed with by y people, so there are no "right" or "wrong" answers. ase read each statement, then show your opinion by cling the letters which best represent your own view. Your own sex is: male; female	rongly Afree S	nd to Agree p	ither Agree or Disagree	nd to Disagree P	rongly Disagree G
٦.	Tt is hard to make some children really "feel bad."	び SA	e Eil	22 N	러 a	ି ଆ SD
2.	Children do not "act lazy" without some important reason.	SA	a	N	đ	SD
3.	Children should not be allowed to argue with their parents.	SA	8.	N	đ	SD
4.	It is healthy for children to sometimes express anger toward	SA	` a .	N	đ	SD
5.	parents. A wise parent will teach the child just who is boss at an	SA	a	N	đ	SD
6.	early age. When children get into serious trouble it is really their	SA	a	N	đ	SD
7.	parents' fault. Young children who refuse to obey should be whipped.	SA	a	N	đ	SD
8.	Spanking children usually does more harm than good.	SA	a	N	a	SD
9.	Most children get more sympathy and kindness than is good	SA	a	N	đ	SD
10.	for them. Making a child feel loved is the surest way to get good	SA	a	N	đ	SD
11.	behavior. Most children need some of the natural meanness taken out	SA	a	N	đ	SD
12.	of them. It is good for children to sometimes "talk-back" to their	SA	ล	N	d	SD
13	parents.	SA	<u>я</u>	N	a	SD
_յ. լև	properly.	54	A	13	a	SD
15	quickly end trouble.	SA	9	N	a	50
16	Firm and strong dissipling make for a strong character in	SV.	•	N	a	50
17	later life.	SA	a 9	N	a	SD
18	Children must be constantly "kent after" if they are to do	SA	ц В	N	a	SD
10	well later in life.	SA SA	6	N	a	SD
20	Children should be granked for terror tentrums	GA	•	N	a	50
20.	Often de is a mistake te demodicable munich e shild ube hee	SA CA	a	N	u a	מס
21.	been very bad.	DA	a	IN	u a	עם
22. 02	A naughty child sometimes needs a stap in the face.	AG	8	IN	a a	עם
23.	obey parents.	DA.	8	11	a	50
24.	Most children need more discipline than they get.	SA C	8.	11	a	50
27.	foodover-	SA	8.	N	đ	SD

- 12 -

26.	When parents speak, children should obey	SA	a	N	đ	SD
27.	Sneakiness in children is usually caused by poor training	SA	a	N	đ	SD
28.	Children are happier under strict training than they are	SA	8	N	a	SD
29.	Very strict discipline may destroy what might have developed	SA	a	N	đ	SD
30.	Most children need more kindness than they usually receive.	SA	8	N	đ	SD
31.	Children should be neat and orderly at all times.	SA	a	N	đ	SD
32.	The sooner children are toilet trained, the better	SA	a	N	d	SD
33.	Most children should have music or other special lessons.	SA	a	N	đ	SD
34.	Children tend to neglect their school work if parents do not	SA	a	N	đ	SD
35.	When children do not eat well it helps to tell them how	SA	a	N	d	SD
36.	Early weaning and toilet-training are important in preparing abildren for life	SA	a	N	đ	SD
37.	For their own sake children should be pressed to excel in	SA	a	N	d	SD
38.	Children should be trained early to keep their toys in order.	SA	a	N	đ	SD
39.	The sooner children realize that they must fight their own	SA	a	N	đ	SD
40.	Almost any child who is not plain lazy can do good school	SA	a	N	đ	SD
41.	Older children are more fun than babies.	SA	a	N	đ	SD
42.	Children should generally be encouraged to choose their own	SA	a	N	đ	SD
43.	Few parents worry about hurting their babies while handling	SA	A	N	đ	SD
44.	Children should be permitted to have secrets from parents.	SA	a	N	đ	SD
45.	Women who like parties often make good mothers.	SA	a	N	đ	SD
46.	Children who always obey parents do not grow up to become the most desirable kind of adults.	SA	a	N	d	ຮັງ
47.	Even the best of parents make many mistakes in dealing with their children.	SA	a	N	đ	SD
48.	By the age of 7, most children are old enough to spend part of summer away from home at a camp.	SA	a	N	đ	SD
49.	Young people should choose jobs which they really like regardless of their parents' feelings.	SA	æ	N	đ	SD
50.	Children must learn to do things on their own without always waiting for parents' approval.	SA	8	N	đ	SD
51.	It is the duty of parents to make certain their children play only with the "right class" of youngsters.	SA	a	N	đ	SD
52.	Children who do not keep up with their classmates usually need special tutoring more than anything else.	SA	8	N	đ	SD
53.	It is foolish to push children to stand upon their own feet at the earliest possible age.	SA	a	N	đ	SD
5 ¹ 4•	The sooner that children are weaned from emotional ties to their parents, the better they will handle their own problems.	SA	a	N	đ	SD
5 5.	Special after-school activities are of greater character- building value to the child than is ordinary neighborhood play	SA	a	N	đ	SD

•

APPENDIX B

RESPONSE SET

I want vou all to try and visualize an 8-year-old child. Perhaps you have an 8-year-old brother or sister or possibly your neighbor has a child of this age. Eight-year-old boys and girls are generally in the third grade. Although they spend a part of each day in school, play itself is still an important part of their lives. Most of their waking hours are spent at play rather than at school.

At this age, most children prefer to play in groups instead of alone. They usually have special friends, and they can be very hurt if they are excluded from the group. Very often their friendships are transitory and based on such things as who brought the nicest lunch to school or who has a new toy. They are guick to break off with their friends over trivial things but just as guick to make up an hour or so later.

Eight-year-old boys and girls still play such games as Cops and Robbers, Cowboys and Indians and tag. They enjoy games that require physical activity and give them a chance to let off steam. Many of them also like quieter games that can be played in the house, such as cards, checkers and chess. Children at this age tend to be very involved with their play; it is as important to them as anything else they do. Their play can be a source of pride and accomplishment or a source of disappointment.

The boys are very conscious of what game is in season, playing football in the fall, basketball in the winter and basefall in the spring and summer. The learning of the rules seems to be as important to them as the game itself. This is also the age at which boys build models and collect things, trading cards, bottle caps and what have you. The girls are usually involved in less strenuous games than the boys. Hopscotch and jump rope seem to be favorites. Playing dress-up and putting on plays are popular pastimes among the girls. In order not to be out done, the boys themselves may put on plays.

In school, the 8-vear-old is learning to write as well as practicing his printing. He spends much of his time trying to improve his reading skills and is expected to learn how to multiply. He is actively engaged in working with a variety of art materials, cravolas, water colors, construction paper, etc., and is learning the rudiments of music. At this age, children are usually curious and eager to participate and to please the teacher. They seem to enjoy working on class projects and are capable of independent work given some supervision. However, they are often fidgety and restless and anxious to get attention. They like to move around and to make noises and to talk to their friends in class.

APPENDIX C

List of Behavioral Attributes

Name and sex:_____

Ranking instructions: Assign rank one (use the number one) to the attribute which you believe to be the most important, rank two to the next important, etc. Please assign ranks to all ten of these attributes, even if it is difficult to make these choices. No tie scores, please.

1.	8-year-old h	ooy:	2.	8-year-old girl:
		good, dependable worker		
		openly expresses feeling	S	
		alert and active		
		good student		
		respectful towards adult	S	
		assertive and self-relia	nt	
		very intelligent		
		good in games and sports		
		obedient to parents		
		expresses thoughts clear	ly	
З.	16-year-old	boy:	4.	l6-year-old girl:
		good, dependable worker		

	good, dependable worker
	openly expresses feelings
	alert and active
	good student
Anna ann a Marchaetha - Chuir an S	respectful towards adults
	assertive and self-reliant
	verv intelligent
	good in games and sports
	obedient to parents
	expresses thoughts clearly

APPENDIX D

Correlation Matrix of CI Scores, MR Scores, and Rankings of Attributes Key to the Variables 1 CI BOY (first administration of list I) 2 CI BOY (second administration of list I) 3 CI GIRL (first administration of list I) 4 CI GIRL (second administration of list I) 5 MR scores BOY List I 6 good, dependable worker 7 openly expresses feelings 8 alert and active 9 good student 10 respectful toward adults 11 assertive and self-reliant 12 very intelligent 13 good in games and sports 14 obedient to parents 15 expresses thoughts clearly 16 good, dependable worker GIRL 17 openly expresses feelings 18 alert and active 19 good student 20 respectful toward adults 21 assertive and self-reliant 22 very intelligent 23 good in games and sports 24 obedient to parents 25 expresses thoughts clearly List II 26 responsible and trustworthy BOY 27 curious 28 interacts well with others 29 able to make friends 30 respectful toward adults 31 assertive and self-reliant 32 fun-loving and carefree 33 imaginative and creative 34 considerate and cooperative 35 neat and clean 36 responsible and trustworthy GIRL 37 curious 38 interacts well with others 39 able to make friends 40 respectful toward adults 41 assertive and self-reliant 42 fun-loving and carefree 43 imaginative and creative 44 considerate and cooperative

45 neat and clean

For males (N=27), a correlation of .38 is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed), and at the .01 level (two-tailed), a correlation of .49 is significant.

For females (N=61), a correlation of .25 is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed), and at the .01 level (two-tailed), a correlation of .33 is significant.





		1 CI BOY 2 CI BOY 1 CI GIRL 2 CI GIRL MR	
List I GIRL	List I BOY		
12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 1	しょりやいしょう	うたいた	
	32 53 23 45 65 -39 00 02 -0713 -42 -10 -10 18 -33 -57 -37 -56 42 -41 -26 -42 -17 -33 -4 07 -36 18 -10 -12 -07 -07 -07 -12 -10 -3 -02 06 -07 -11 -071 -1 -4 -28 -56 -17 06 -20 03 -28 -55 -27 -02 06 -07 -11 -071 -1 -4 -28 -26 -40 -12 -12 -10 -13 -50 -27 -28 -27 -24 -28 -38 -26 -40 -12 -12 -15 -16 -05 -07 -33 -21 -16 -31 -01 -38 -26 -40 -12 -12 -15 -16 -05 -07 -33 -21 -16 -31 -01 -38 -26 -40 -12 -12 -15 -07 -16 -07 -10 07 -25 -17 -14 -07 -07 -07 -07 -12 -12 -15 -07 -16 -07 -10 -12 -12 -12 -13 -55 -12 -12 -15 -07 -16 -07 -10 07 -25 -17 -14 -08 -07 -07 -07 -12 -12 -15 -07 -12 -12 -25 -17 -14 -08 -07 -07 -07 -07 -23 -01 -06 -07 -12 -13 -35 -32 -07 -14 -09 -07 -07 -07 -07 -23 -07 -24 -25 -17 -14 -08 -07 -07 -07 -07 -23 -07 -24 -25 -17 -14 -08 -07 -07 -07 -07 -07 -06 -07 -12 -25 -27 -25 -17 -14 -07 -07 -07 -07 -07 -07 -12 -25 -17 -14 -07 -07 -07 -07 -07 -07 -12 -25 -17 -14 -07 -07 -07 -07 -07 -07 -14 -08 -07 -07 -07 -07 -07 -07 -12 -25 -17 -14 -07 -07 -07 -07 -07 -12 -25 -17 -14 -07 -07 -07 -07 -12 -25 -17 -14 -07 -07 -07 -07 -07 -12 -25 -17 -14 -07 -07 -07 -07 -07 -07 -12 -25 -17	88 86 65 43 45 48 02 43 65 45 32 32 46 -14 58 86 65 43 45 48 02 43 65 -55 32 32 46 -14 51 53 69 77 -76 31 -64 61 35 73 -54 -45 -19 69 -18 67 82 63 62 34 -64 13 27 44 -40 -44 20 46 -23 67 82 63 62 34 -64 13 27 44 -40 -44 20 46 -23 -31 -24 -27 -31 -20 68 -22 -31 -43 -4 34 60 -36 01	123456734101112131415
-434 = -0507 = 3-10 = 25-01 $-32 = -12-53=2511 = 2127 = 4718$ $-07 = 3 = -25-27 = 13 = -2807 = 27105$ $-07-41-23 = 23-28 = 14-5534 = -35$ $-17-32-13-02 = -57-31 = 03 = 57-32$ $-14-03 = 07 = -15-34 = -01-02-51 = 11$ $-31 = 00-46 = 12-37 = 03 = -17-04-23$ $-42-02 = 07-02 = -07-05 = 04 = -250$ $-13 = 05-13-17-37-071 = 8-18-20$			16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

•

List I BOY

List I GIRL

List I	GIRL
シュシ	12 12 23

223

3

:2

20

12

 $\sum_{i=1}^{n}$

-31-46-31-54 03-18 11 21 -00-21 63 02-17-26-11 -24-24-34-59 33/20 83 03 -35-14 05 (6-18-21 06 -25-28-07-23 27 29 19 24 " 4016 81 04-28-20 -116-50-53-68 61 -48 7. 45 37-13 05 14 09-21 15 53 63 52 64 33/17 -22-25 -21 44 -30-27 -0589 -09 -29-11-25-20 03 -37-06 02-02-03-11 08 63-17-11 33-24-28-19-01-22 03-14 24-36 01 74-03-29 11 32 35 31 54 05/96-9 -11 05 10 01 -19 -28 07-19 -22-28-65-2-070732-10-61-13 02-12-69-26.84 -15-15-16-16-38 OI 02-10-14-37-0526-22-25 85 60 64 63 72 3/15-3/ we 13 72-35-40 01 53-24 -18-21-11-41 (3 -0605 44-13 -C2 10-26 22-15-20 28 56 21 68-22/19-29-01 11 35-34-23 21 73-48 -15-45-47-663 103 09 02 05-37 66 2 -44-21 02 -03-14-08-23 -02 02 19 71 -11 03 -13 -02-19 -07-0 1 CI BOY 15 23 27 52-32 12-5316 38 21 0601 23 27-31 31 17 112 33 23 16-57 36 20-05 16-25-22-18-10 10-03 01 19 -16 22-25 01 72-14-00-0-12-20-11 10 64-07-21 04 02 25-21 01 30-23-24 09-29 18 60 77 40 78-57 (4-52 68 17 72-5351 23 4642 2 CI BOY (... 1 CI GIRL 🗠 2 CI GIRL ଙ୍କ MR ଟ -1 *ع*ر 9 1011 12 13 14 15 List I BOX .

1-1 1-2

25

5

 $\overline{\zeta}$,

1.1

5

13

List II BOY

82366283228		
11 35 27 35 13 57 21 -17 13 22 -07 -13 -36 14 12 11 35 27 35 13 57 21 -17 13 22 -07 -13 -36 14 12 10 24 22 -17 -00 11 -00 31 -05 -18 05 14 17 -13 -05 -0 -28 00 -17 -04 -29 04 15 -00 -13 10 -02 40 -08 -17 21 51 33 47 27 12 -16 71 -07 -05 -18 05 14 17 -13 -05 -11 -18 -07 -13 -07 -27 14 21 -11 -17 -04 -05 31 1 -24 -11 -18 -07 -13 -07 -27 14 21 -11 -17 -04 -05 31 1 -24 -11 -18 -07 -13 -07 -27 14 21 -11 -17 -04 -05 31 1 -24 -11 -18 -07 -13 -07 -27 14 21 -11 -17 -04 -05 31 1 -24 -11 -18 -07 -13 -07 -27 14 21 -11 -17 -04 -05 31 1 -24 -10 -14 -03 -31 00 -20 -38 -32 17 11 -31 17 -02 -21 17	$ \begin{array}{c} 12 15 22 17 -11 43 -36 +16 12 -31 41 15 -12 -01 -01 \\ -51 -14 -51 -27 25 -27 41 -61 -23 23 -12 -02 \\ -19 -10 -10 -11 -17 -17 -17 -17 -18 -12 -12 -12 \\ -51 -10 -17 -17 -17 -17 -18 -17 -18 -10 -24 \\ -52 -18$	- 1 CI BOY 2 CI BOY 1 CI GIRL 2 CI GIRL 2 CI GIRL 45 MR List I BOY 57 C 7 S 9 IC = 12.13 $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{5}$
ひかいなかりん	List II GIRL 法法的行生的思想巡察	
$\begin{array}{c} 39 33 32 41 11 31 -10 -16 01 20 -11 -17 -41 17 12 \\ -31 -41 -42 -41 31 -11 -31 26 04 -33 00 21 -02 -41 30 \\ -25 -21 -12 -27 01 -14 05 17 01 -17 13 22 11 -20 15 \\ -25 -21 -12 -27 01 -14 05 17 01 -17 13 22 11 -20 15 \\ -25 -21 -15 -29 -00 21 03 00 -02 -17 02 04 52 -21 -01 \\ -25 -21 -27 -25 04 -11 07 -10 01 43 -32 -30 (1 -12 -17 -17 -17 -17 -17 -17 -17 -17 -17 -17$	29 22-142 30-28 50-57 04 03-01 31 00-32 10 13 -2-35-26-42-44 26 24 28 13 -01-22 01-23 10 03 02-25 -27-22-17-10 18 01 13 30-25-22-15 01 32-32 02 -17-22-17-10 18 01 17 30-25-22-15 01 32-32 02 -17-22-17-10 18 01 17 30-25-22-15 01 32-32 02 -17-22-17-17-18 01 17 30-25-22-15 01 32-32 02 -17-22-17-17-18 01 17 30-25-22-15 01 32-32 02 -17-22-17-17-18 01 17 30-25-22-15 01 32-32 02 -23-29-42-22 07 28 11 32-25 03 06-21-07-03-21-11 -02-01-21 02 -03-21 01 -03-21-07-03-25 01 25-27 08 35-21 25-10 04 28 29 -18 03-27-05-15 01 27-24 34 33-17 23-19-37 18 -08-08 05 19 08-15	- 1 CI BOY 2 CI BOY 1 CI GIRL 2 CI GIRL 4 5 6 7 3 9 10 11 12 13 14 5

List II BOY

<u> </u>	ن: پن	22	<u></u>	<u></u> С,	201	[3 (~	21	; ; Ç	رن 17		ယ် ယ	्र १२	ن <u>نميا</u>	32	1.2	1.5	r-1 -1	12
16-16-14 0220-12-0923 15 16 07-37-29 02 05-09200920 12	-18 30 22 - Charlest 19 02 20 - 4012	13 12 00 -14-03 -03 14 3L	06-07-07-03-20-37-66-30-03-01	15-15-21 06-45 34-18-0431-13	-26-03 27 02-05-0501 14-06-08	- C3 C1 2C-02-07 13 13 -14-21 C1	-(327-03-18-09-05-022)-15 05	30-27-32 15 21-02-01-53 11 11	06-39-12-03 13 06-07 10 11-14	07-63-03-11 19-de-06-24 16-ce	20-11-11-18-19 CO-11 JI 20	-27-51-04-06-18-23-35 16-07-15	12. 02. 13 :07-3031 09 22-32-02	-15-32 00 17 54 -4	04-04-09-08 10-19-13-14 15 23	24 01 19-10-11-01-22-13-23 38	-43 31-11 -13-24 21 64 11 -03 11	45-12-0923-201013-13-13-02

List I GIRL

List II GIRL

ふま					jr° 1	45 1	14	43 -	- 1	4 -	40 -	3		10	36		
10-15-43 19 23 35 2	-15 08 35 22 -06 -06 -1 17 31 36 -11 -36 16 0	05-04-24-07-34 60 2	-35 03 17 -03 -12 02 11 -16 -11 -17 10 K-12 02 11	-1732 10-07-46 10 0 -14 05 25 02-06 22 1	41 -21 -28 22 20 -13 -1	10 -24 - 37 50 14 -03 1	3 -26 07 13 12 -32 1	- 04 16 15-29-c6 24-1	-27.55-00-33-07-011	-071517-23-3763-	-23-24-44 21 70-52 1	05-02-33 01-13-11 0	14 03 26-02-18 -08-1	-25 36 14 00 -33 30 -0	48-46-18 21 03 11 -(16 17 18 19 20 21 2	List I GI
11-28 23-03 3 09 34 -15	18 25 19-13	3-16-11-12	0 20 24 01 10 -12 27 -28	2-12-26-07	12 35 18 00	10-16 17 01	8-23 cž-13	40 02 -14 20	2. 42-13-62	13-15-28-65	0-6769-35	L-03-15 13	12-12-32 26	24 01-01-14	05-26-02.06	12 23 211 25	IRL

- 51 -

ŧ.

ì

ŧ

ł

List II GIRL

あたまるニモンはとど	的过去时的时候的	
81 -11 -27 -15 11 12 -13-22 15 13 -24 03 -03 -22 -28 -17 18 59 -17 -15 -16 -18 18 32 -10 10 -21 -13 -10 -01 -21 -25 -29 69 -05 -08 01 -05 -16 -11 -17 -10 -17 -21 -24 -25 17 01 -21 -25 -21 -27 02 -10 -02 -68 -21 -25 -21 -05 -17 04 -28 03 -25 -22 -09 -12 -24 02 01 61 -02 -35 -31 -14 -13 -16 18 -01 -24 -07 48 -23 -30 -03 -22 -09 11 -24 07 -35 01 53	$\begin{array}{c} 17 - 19 - 01 & 01 & 12 - 01 - 01 - 17 & 17 & 28 \\ -17 & 10 - 10 - 28 - 24 & 20 & 12 & 54 - 28 - 25 \\ -22 - 10 & 12 & 52 - 28 - 17 & 20 - 56 - 41 \\ -10 - 19 & 20 & 50 - 27 - 62 & 24 - 17 - 22 - 17 \\ 08 - 28 - 17 & 55 - 76 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 12 \\ -39 - 65 & 10 - 65 - 70 - 16 & 24 - 61 - 64 - 12 \\ -43 - 44 & 17 - 18 - 24 - 18 & 24 - 61 - 64 - 12 \\ -43 - 44 & 19 - 18 - 26 - 16 & 24 - 61 - 64 - 12 \\ -43 - 44 & 19 - 18 - 26 - 16 & 24 - 61 - 64 - 12 \\ -43 - 44 & 19 - 18 - 26 - 18 & 24 - 61 - 64 - 12 \\ -43 - 44 & 19 - 18 - 26 - 18 & 24 - 61 - 64 - 12 \\ -43 - 44 & 19 - 18 - 26 - 18 & 24 - 61 - 64 - 12 \\ -43 - 44 & 19 - 18 - 26 - 18 & 24 - 61 - 64 - 12 \\ -43 - 44 & 19 - 18 - 26 - 18 - 21 - 61 - 64 - 12 \\ -43 - 44 & 19 - 18 - 26 - 18 - 21 - 61 - 64 - 12 \\ -43 - 44 & 19 - 18 - 26 - 16 - 18 - 14 - 14 \\ -48 - 44 & 19 - 18 - 26 - 16 - 18 - 14 - 14 \\ -48 - 44 & 19 - 18 - 26 - 16 - 18 - 14 - 14 \\ -48 - 44 - 56 - 62 - 16 - 18 - 14 - 14 \\ -48 - 44 - 56 - 62 - 16 - 18 - 14 - 14 \\ -48 - 44 - 56 - 62 - 16 - 18 - 14 - 14 \\ -48 - 44 - 56 - 62 - 16 - 18 - 14 - 14 \\ -48 - 44 - 56 - 62 - 16 - 18 - 14 \\ -48 - 44 - 56 - 62 - 16 - 18 - 14 - 14 \\ -48 - 44 - 18 - 56 - 62 - 16 - 18 - 14 \\ -48 - 44 - 18 - 56 - 62 - 16 - 18 - 14 \\ -48 - 44 - 18 - 56 - 62 - 16 - 18 - 14 \\ -48 - 44 - 18 - 56 - 62 - 18 - 18 - 14 \\ -48 - 48 - 18 - 56 - 62 - 18 - 14 \\ -48 - 48 - 18 - 56 - 62 - 16 - 18 - 14 \\ -48 - 48 - 18 - 18 - 18 - 18 - 18 \\ -48 - 18 - 18 - 18 - 18 - 18 \\ -48 - 18 - 18 - 18 - 18 - 18 - 18 \\ -48 - 18 - 18 - 18 - 18 - 18 - 18 \\ -48 - 18 - 18 - 18 - 18 - 18 - 18 \\ -48 - 18 - 18 - 18 - 18 - 18 - 18 \\ -48 - 18 - 18 - 18 - 18 - 18 - 18 - 18 $	List II BOY 2027 28 29 30 24 22 28 34 35
List II GIRL たたたたいので、その	List II BOY 次父のどくではなくで	
	-34 - 13 - (26 - 05 + 5 - 112 - 27 - 07 - 34) $-27 - 24 - 35 - 27 - 16 + 5 - 37 - 37 - 34 - 25 - 17 - 16 - 25 - 17 - 16 - 25 - 17 - 16 - 25 - 17 - 16 - 25 - 17 - 16 - 27 - 16 - 25 - 17 - 16 - 27 - 24 - 16 - 27 - 24 - 16 - 27 - 26 - 15 - 20 - 25 - 17 - 14 - 23 - 20 - 10 - 20 - 25 - 22 - 41 - 10 - 24 - 35 - 66 - 11 - 16 - 37 - 23 - 35 - 13 - 16 - 20 - 11 - 14 - (7 - 41) - 12 - 18 - 13 - 16 - 20 - 11 - 14 - (7 - 41) - 12 - 18 - 13 - 16 - 20 - 11 - 14 - (7 - 41) - 12 - 18 - 13 - 16 - 20 - 11 - 14 - (7 - 41) - 12 - 18 - 13 - 16 - 20 - 11 - 14 - (7 - 41) - 12 - 18 - 13 - 16 - 20 - 11 - 14 - (7 - 41) - 12 - 18 - 13 - 16 - 20 - 11 - 14 - (7 - 41) - 12 - 18 - 13 - 16 - 20 - 11 - 14 - (7 - 41) - 12 - 18 - 18 - 18 - 16 - 20 - 11 - 14 - (7 - 41) - 12 - 18 - 18 - 18 - 18 - 18 - 18 - 18$	List II BOY 21, 17 7월 29 30 31 32 33 34 35
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		List II GIRL ふし 37 ふ? ふう 40 41 42 43 4445

•

APPENDIX E

New Attributes in List II Which Meet the Requirements for

Membership in One of Two Opposing Groups

Sex of Child	Group A	Attributes	Group B
	Male Students	(<u>N</u> =27)	
воу	none		none
GIRL	none		none
	Female Student	s (<u>N</u> =61)	
воу	HONEST		CURIOUS
	CONSIDER		CAREFREE
	NEAT		CREATIVE
GIRL	HONEST		CURIOUS
	CONSIDER		CAREFREE
	NEAT		CREATIVE

Note.--The requirements for membership are (a) a significant negative correlation (at the .05 level, two-tailed, or above) with at least one member of the other group, and (b) a significant positive correlation (at the .05 level, two-tailed, or above) with at least one member of its own group.

ENVE \$ 4 12.3

• .

