

ANTECEDENTS OF GENEROSITY
IN NURSERY SCHOOL CHILDREN:
PRESCRIPTIVE VALUE ORIENTATION
IN THE FAMILY

Thesis for the Degree of M. A.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
ANTHONY B. OLEJNIK
1971





3 1293 10458 0554

~~_____~~ R16

353-0894

b-106

~~_____~~ R15

075 Pd 68

J 147

~~APR 8 11 02~~

~~IS _____ R~~
~~_____ 3~~

cont 102

APR 04 1991

M. G. 1/1

ABSTRACT

ANTECEDENTS OF GENEROSITY IN NURSERY SCHOOL CHILDREN: PRESCRIPTIVE VALUE ORIENTATION IN THE FAMILY

By

Anthony B. Olejnik

Generosity, value orientations, (prescriptive-proscriptive) and discipline emphasis (reward-punishment) were studied in 78 four year old children (44 girls) and their parents in a university community in the midwest. Generosity was measured by the number of M&M candies the children gave away to fictitious "needy children." An interview technique was used to measure the value orientation of the children, while a questionnaire was administered to the parents to measure value orientation and discipline emphasis. The finding of no significant sex differences in generosity scores supports earlier research. Significant main effects were found for the value orientation of the children, mothers, and fathers. Children with a prescriptive value orientation were more generous than children with a proscriptive value orientation, and mothers and fathers with a prescriptive value orientation had children who were more generous. While the data

Anthony B. Olejnik

revealed that fathers who were more rewarding had more generous children, there was no significant effect on generosity for mother's discipline emphasis.

Approved *J. M. Kelley*
Date *Nov 11, 1971*

ANTECEDENTS OF GENEROSITY IN NURSERY SCHOOL
CHILDREN: PRESCRIPTIVE VALUE
ORIENTATION IN THE FAMILY

By

Anthony B. Olejnik

A THESIS

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

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Psychology

1971

To Shirley and Matthew

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the members of my thesis committee, Drs. Hiram Fitzgerald and William Crano for their assistance in planning this research. I would like to especially thank Dr. John McKinney, chairman of the thesis committee, for the advice, time, and encouragement he offered during the entire course of the research and the masters degree program.

I would also like to thank the directors and teachers at the Edgewood United Church Nursery School, Wesley Foundation Nursery School, Mt. Hope Day Care Center, First Church of the Nazarene Day Care Center, Kendon Drive Day Care Center, Jack 'n Jill Playhouse, and the People's Church Nursery School for their cooperation and assistance in this research. My deepest thanks go to the parents and their children who volunteered to participate in the research.

A special thank you to Shirley for her patience, love and understanding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	v
INTRODUCTION	1
METHOD	9
RESULTS	14
DISCUSSION	26
REFERENCES	31
APPENDIX	34

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Analysis of variance of generosity scores: sex of the child and value orientation of the mothers.	19
2. Analysis of variance of generosity scores: sex of the child and value orientation of the fathers.	19
3. Analysis of variance of generosity scores: sex of the child and discipline emphasis of the mothers.	20
4. Analysis of variance of generosity scores: sex of the child and discipline emphasis of the fathers.	20
5. Analysis of variance of generosity scores: sex of the child and value orientation of the child.	21
6. Analysis of variance of generosity scores: discipline emphasis of the parents and value orientation of the parents.	21
7. Number of givers or non-givers whose parents had prescriptive or proscriptive value orientations on reward items.	22
8. Number of givers or non-givers whose parents had prescriptive or proscriptive value orientations on punishment items.	23
9. Number of givers or non-givers whose parents emphasized rewards or punishments on prescriptive items.	24
10. Number of givers or non-givers whose parents emphasized rewards or punishments on proscriptive items.	25

INTRODUCTION

In an early general study of morality, Osborn (1894) asked the following questions about the "ethical contents of children's minds": What kind of moral ideas do children have? How do they come by them? How are they determined by their environment? And are they developed by the direct instruction of parents and teachers, or do they arise through the observation of their own conduct and that of their associates? Today, seventy-five years later, many investigators are phrasing the same questions. Since Osborn's study, a great deal of research has been done on the development of moral values. The research on the development of moral character has been reviewed by Kohlberg (1964) and Hoffman (1970) while the measurement of moral values has been reviewed and critiqued by Pittel and Mendelsohn (1960). Much of the research on moral values has been done with paper and pencil tests, and few attempts have been made to relate moral reasoning or judgment to moral behavior. The reviews of this research have indicated that there are still unanswered questions on the development of moral values and that there is a need to improve the methodologies for studying moral development.

The research on moral development has been concerned with children's conscience, strength of character, moral characteristics, and judgment; and the theoretical impetus has come primarily from the works of Piaget (1932) and Freud (1959). Psychologists have devoted far more attention to the issues of anti-social behavior than to the factors affecting the acquisition and performance of pro-social behaviors. Emphasis has been placed on the prohibitions, the proscriptive, "thou shalt not" aspects of morality, such as cheating, stealing, and lying. Guilt about transgressions and resistance to temptation have been the primary aspects of prohibitions studied (Aronfreed, 1961, 1963, 1970; Burton, Maccoby & Allinsmith, 1961; Grinder, 1962; Hartshorne & May, 1928-1930; Sears, Rau, & Alpert, 1965). Hoffman (1963) has suggested that the reason research has focused on prohibitions is that most research on the parental antecedents of moral development has been inspired by psychoanalytic theory, which stresses the importance of repression in the internalization of moral standards.

Although in the past relatively little research attention has been given to behaviors that reflect the altruistic aspects of morality, recent research has revived the interest in studying generosity, kindness, cooperation, and sharing behaviors in children (Baldwin & Baldwin, 1970; Bryan & Walbek, 1970 a, b; Elliot & Vasta, 1970; Harris,

1970; Rosenhan & White, 1967; Rutherford & Mussen, 1968; Staub & Sherk, 1970). Two recent reviews on altruism have summarized the revived interest in this area of research (Bryan & London, 1970; Krebs, 1970). In the 1890's, altruism was a popular and widely discussed topic as a social panacea and a religious ideal, but the interest in it quickly passed away. The current revived interest in studying altruism may be due to some of the current social problems facing our society.

Research on altruism has been primarily interested in eliciting altruistic acts rather than the learning or antecedent conditions of altruism. Aronfreed (1968) and Rosenhan (1969) argued that the acquisition of altruistic responses requires a history of reinforcement and the development of a self-reward mechanism. The research on parent-child relations and altruism suggests that warm and nurturant parents tend to facilitate altruism in children. Rettig (1956) found that altruism in parents was positively correlated with scores made by college students on an altruism scale. There was some evidence that the effects of direct reinforcement of altruistic behavior by parents dissipates over time, whereas modeling effects were more enduring. Hoffman (1963) found that consideration for others in children was positively related to the mothers' use of an other-oriented induction type of discipline. Peck and Havighurst (1960) observed that parents of

altruistic children typically were warm, nurturant, and relatively non-punitive; and in his review, Becker (1964) concluded that warmth, use of love-oriented discipline techniques, and consistency of parental control facilitate learning of guilt or moral expectations. Rosenhan (1967) found that a group of active civil rights workers had a close relationship with at least one altruistic parent. In a study by Rutherford and Mussen (1968), generosity in nursery school boys was positively related to warm and nurturant fathers: generous boys saw their fathers as being more nurturant. More recently, Mussen, Rutherford, Harris, and Keasey (1970) found that both boys and girls who were altruistic in their relationships with others were the children of generally permissive, democratic, affectionate and nonpunitive parents. They also found that parental emphasis on high standards of behavior for the child, including acceptance of personal responsibility and elevated achievement goals, appear to be prominent antecedents of altruism. Similar findings have been reported by Whiting (1969). He found that children in six cultures in which mothers report that they assign important tasks to them (such as baby tending), behave more altruistically as measured by offers of help, support, and responsible suggestions, than children in cultures in which they are assigned fewer or less responsible tasks. Staub (1970) suggested that learning to take responsibility for others'

welfare may often begin through assignment of responsibility to children by socializing agents. It appears that families which are warm, nurturant, and non-punitive, which provide models of altruistic behavior, which support the expression of affect by the child, and which assign responsibilities to young children are most likely to raise children who are altruistic and concerned for others.

While Rutherford and Mussen (1968) studied generosity of boys in nursery school and found that the boys' generosity was related to perceptions of their fathers as warm and nurturant, they also found that generosity was part of a pattern of moral behaviors. Rutherford and Mussen suggested that parents and other agents of socialization may have many opportunities to "teach" children proscriptive rules, by rewarding approved responses and by punishing behaviors that violate such rules. They felt that proscriptive rules are "taught" by means of reward and punishment, while more positive--perhaps more complex characteristics--are acquired by means of developmental identification with a model.

Hill (1960) has suggested that the psychoanalytically derived terms of "identification, introjection, and internalization" be replaced by detailed analyses in learning theory terms of the acquisition of values. According to McKinney (1971), in both psychoanalytic theory and learning theory, there is the implication that children's

values develop as children are punished for doing what is wrong and rewarded for doing what is right. A recent modification of this two-fold process has been suggested by McKinney as instrumental in the development of moral behavior. McKinney pointed out that while learning theory and psychoanalytic theory have dealt with both positive and negative behaviors in the development of values, another consideration involves the possibility that children might be punished for "not doing" good, that is, what they should; or they might be rewarded for "not doing" wrong, or what they shouldn't. A four-fold model was suggested by McKinney with a reinforcement dimension (reward or punishment) and a behavioral dimension (right doing or wrong doing). According to McKinney's model, the child learns a prescriptive value orientation when he is rewarded for doing what is good and punished for not doing good (sin of omission); and he learns a proscriptive value orientation when he is punished for doing wrong and rewarded for not doing wrong. The difference in the two value orientations is the result of emphasis being placed on either doing right (prescriptive) or doing wrong (proscriptive). McKinney's (1971) research has indicated that individual values do develop on a prescriptive-proscriptive dimension and that college students with a prescriptive value orientation perceived their parents as being more rewarding and less punitive, while the proscriptively-oriented subjects perceived the opposite.

The present study was concerned with generosity in nursery school aged children and its relationship to the value orientation "taught" by parents to their children. While Rutherford and Mussen (1968) studied the effects of parental reward and punishment to doing good and doing wrong and explained their findings in terms of a child's identification with the parent, the present study attempted to apply the four-fold model suggested by McKinney (1971) to study the antecedents of generosity in nursery school children, and thereby eliminate the need to use the concept of identification in describing the acquisition of values as suggested by Hill (1960).

Some behavior-contingent learning takes place when socializing agents use their rewards and punishments with the intention of modifying the child's behavior. Concrete rewards and punishments, praise and blame, and various other explicit indicators of approval or disapproval are the most obvious and direct channels of behavior-contingent socialization. Since more information is needed on the child rearing practices which influence the development of children's altruistic behaviors, the purpose of the present study was to discover antecedent conditions of value orientations acquired through behavior-contingent learning and to find the relationship between these value orientations and generosity. The child who was guided by a prescriptive value orientation was expected to be more generous as

emphasis has been placed on doing good behaviors in the home. Emphasis is placed on doing good behaviors when parents either reward their children for sharing their toys, helping their friends, or doing household chores or punish children for not sharing their toys, not cleaning their room, or not being kind to friends. Since Rutherford and Mussen (1968) found that warmth and nurturance were related to generosity, and McKinney found that subjects having a prescriptive value orientation perceive their parents as being more rewarding, it was expected that generosity would be related to the prescriptive value orientation in the family. The empirical evidence suggests the following hypotheses: (a) the value orientation (prescriptive-proscriptive) can be measured and that there is a reliable difference between people holding prescriptive (ought to) values and those holding proscriptive (ought not to) values; (b) children will be more generous in those families in which the mothers and fathers have a prescriptive value orientation; (c) children with a prescriptive value orientation will be more generous; and (d) parents who are more rewarding than punitive in their discipline emphasis will have children who are more generous.

METHOD

Subjects

The parents of 34 boys and 44 girls between the ages of 4-0 and 4-11 enrolled in nursery schools and day care centers in a university community in the midwest agreed to be subjects and allowed their children to participate in the experiment.

While previous research on prescriptive and proscriptive value orientations has been primarily based on college students, nursery school aged children were chosen for this study because this age was most appropriate to measure the relationship between parent-child interactions and the acquisition of moral values; it was assumed that during these early years parental influences predominate over peer influences.

Procedure

There were two phases in the experiment. In the first phase, the children were observed for twenty minutes individually in a structured situation designed to determine the child's value orientation (either prescriptive or proscriptive) and the child's generosity to fictitious "needy children." While the child was at either a day care center

or nursery school, the teacher introduced the experimenter (E) to the child. The subject (S) was asked if he or she would like to play a game with E in another room. In the experimental room, E spent a few minutes developing rapport with Ss before the interview. Each S was asked to answer two questions: what makes a bad boy (girl) and what makes a good boy (girl)? Alternative questions such as when or why is a boy (girl) called a good boy (girl) were asked to make the questions clear and to obtain responses. Questions were asked in a random order. Subjects were then given a bag of 18 M&M candies which were poured out on a table. Subjects had an opportunity to give away some of their candy to "needy children," whose parents couldn't afford to buy them any candy. Two pictures of "needy children" (one boy and one girl) and a donation can were placed in front of the child on the table. Subjects were able to give some of their candy by placing it through a slot in a partially-filled donation can the contents of which were invisible to the Ss. Midlarsky and Bryan (1967) found that there were virtually no differences among Ss of varying grades regarding their tastes for M&M candies and that the differential preferences for M&Ms did not account for the variation in eight self sacrifice responses or donations exhibited by children. Each S was told that the size of the donation was his decision and that he did not have to give any candy if he did not want to do so. Subjects were told to put the

candies they wanted to give in the donation can and the ones they wanted to keep for themselves back into the plastic bag. In order to create anonymity for the donor, E left the room for a few minutes. Subjects were free to make their own choice without any additional pressure. Since all the M&M candies in the donation can were brown and Ss received other colored M&M candies, the amount donated by each S was easily obtained after S left the room. The generosity score was simply the number of candies S gave away. Each S was told that he could pick up his bag of M&Ms from the teacher at the end of the day. All Ss and teachers were satisfied with this procedure. Regardless of the amount of candy donated, all Ss received a bag of 18 M&Ms to take home.

Value Orientation Measures

The value orientation of the child was determined by scoring the responses to the two questions. The responses were scored prescriptive when they included either doing good or avoiding good behaviors, and proscriptive when they included either doing wrong or avoiding wrong behaviors. Responses which could not be classified as either prescriptive or proscriptive were not scored. The number of prescriptive and proscriptive responses were added separately and the differences between the number of prescriptive and proscriptive responses determined the child's value orientation.

In the second phase of the experiment, a questionnaire which measured the value orientation of the parents was sent home with each child. The questionnaire consisted of a list of 24 behaviors a child might do or avoid (see Appendix), and the mothers and fathers were asked how much they would either punish or reward the suggested behaviors. The behaviors included the four types suggested by the four-fold model of McKinney (1971). There were six examples of each of the following types of behaviors: doing wrong (items 3, 6, 8, 15, 17, 20), avoiding wrong (items 4, 7, 10, 12, 16, 24), doing good (items 2, 9, 13, 14, 21, 22), and avoiding good (items 1, 5, 11, 18, 19, 23). These were listed in a random order, and the parents were asked to circle one number from 1 to 5 (very little to very much) as to how much they would reward or punish their child. The value orientation of the parents was determined by adding separately the punishments and rewards for the 12 prescriptive items and the punishments and rewards for the 12 proscriptive items and taking the difference between the two scores. If there was a stronger emphasis placed on the prescriptive items, then that parent was considered prescriptive in his value orientation. If there was a stronger emphasis placed upon the proscriptive items, then that parent was considered proscriptive in his value orientation. Similarly the emphasis on rewards versus punishments was measured by adding the scores on the 12 reward items and

then adding the scores on the 12 punishment items. There were an equal number of prescriptive and proscriptive value orientation items within the punishment-reward dimension, that is, there were 6 prescriptive-reward items and 6 prescriptive-punishment items. The difference between the punishment and reward scores was used as a measure of discipline emphasis.

In addition, standard scores were computed for the prescriptive-reward items, the proscriptive-reward items, the prescriptive-punishment items, and the proscriptive-punishment items. These scores were computed so that the prescriptive items could be separated from the proscriptive items in analyzing the discipline emphasis (reward-punishment). Conversely, the reward items could be separated from the punishment items in analyzing the value orientation (prescriptive-proscriptive).

RESULTS

There were no significant sex differences ($t < 1$, $df = 76$) in the number of candies given away by the children; the mean number of candies given by boys was 4.29 M&Ms and by girls was 3.84 M&Ms. Among these, 21 boys and 23 girls gave from 1 to 18 M&Ms while 13 boys and 21 girls gave none away.

The reliability of the questionnaire was obtained by using the split-half technique corrected with the Spearman-Brown Formula. Reliabilities were obtained for each of the four types of scores: prescriptive ($r = .83$); proscriptive ($r = .82$); reward ($r = .82$); and punishment ($r = .74$). Since difference scores were used to determine both value orientations and discipline emphasis, a reliability was obtained for the prescriptive-proscriptive difference score ($r = .49$) and for the reward-punishment difference score ($r = .60$). According to Guilford (1954), it is important to know the reliability of the difference score because it comes from two fallible scores and the error variances from them summate. The reliabilities for the difference scores are lower than the reliabilities for each type of score since the number of items used to obtain them is smaller.

There was agreement between mothers and fathers in terms of both value orientation and discipline emphasis. In 41 pairs, both parents were considered as having a prescriptive value orientation; in 27 pairs, both parents were considered as having a proscriptive value orientation, while in 10 pairs, the parents differed in their value orientations. The following correlations were obtained between mothers and fathers: prescriptive scores ($r=.33$, $t=2.71$, $p<.005$); proscriptive scores ($r=.23$, $t=2.55$, $p<.025$); reward ($r=.14$, $t=2.25$, $p<.025$); and punishment ($r=.30$, $t=2.36$, $p<.025$).

Six different 2x2 factorial analyses of variance were carried out. The dependent variable was the number of M&M candies the children gave away. The independent variables were the sex of the child, the value orientation of the child, the value orientation of both mothers and fathers, and the discipline emphasis (either reward or punishment) of both mothers and fathers. While there were no significant differences due to main effects for the sex of the children nor any sex of child X value orientation interactions in any of the analyses, significant main effects were revealed for the value orientation of the mother [$F=91.3$ (1, 72), $p<.01$] (see Table 1); value orientation of the father [$F=35.1$ (1, 68), $p<.01$] (see Table 2); and the value orientation of the child [$F=7.4$ (1, 28), $p<.05$] (see Table 5). The children gave away more candy if

they themselves, their mothers, or their fathers had a prescriptive value orientation rather than a proscriptive value orientation. Only 32 children were considered in this analysis on the value orientation of the child because a large number of children did not make any responses to the questions asked. Therefore, it was decided prior to analysis to use only those subjects who responded to both questions concerning good and bad boys (girls) rating their responses as either prescriptive or proscriptive.

The analysis did not reveal any significant effect for the discipline emphasis of the mothers ($F < 1$). There was a significant main effect for the discipline emphasis of the fathers ($F = 9.0$ (1, 64), $p < .01$), as the fathers who were more rewarding than punitive had children who were more generous.

In the 2 x 2 factorial analysis of variance for discipline emphasis of parents X value orientation of parents (see Table 6), there was a significant main effect for the parents' value orientation [$F = 32.2$ (1, 74), $p < .01$]; but no significant effect for discipline emphasis of parents ($F = 3.09$) and no significant interaction between the discipline emphasis and value orientation ($F = 3.37$). Parents who were prescriptive in their value orientation had children who were more generous.

Since there were both reward items and punishment items on the parents' questionnaire and since McKinney

(1971) found an interaction, the effects of value orientation on generosity were analyzed separately for both types of items. Children were classified as either givers (donated at least 1 M&M candy) or non-givers (did not give away any candies), and the value orientation of the parents was either prescriptive or proscriptive. Standard scores were obtained for the 6 prescriptive-reward items and 6 proscriptive-reward items, as well as for the 6 prescriptive-punishment items and 6 proscriptive-punishment items for both mothers and fathers. The value orientation of the parents was determined by using the higher standard score between their prescriptive and proscriptive scores. This was done for both reward and punishment items separately. Conversely, the discipline emphasis of the parents was determined by taking the higher standard score between their reward and punishment score. This was done for both prescriptive and proscriptive items separately.

When the value orientation of the parents was analyzed for the reward items, there were significant findings (see Table 7) for: mothers of girls ($\chi^2=7.94$; $p<.005$); mothers of boys ($\chi^2=8.56$; $p<.005$); fathers of girls ($\chi^2=4.61$; $p<.05$); and fathers of boys ($\chi^2=6.10$; $p<.025$). When the boys and girls were combined there were significant findings for mothers ($\chi^2=15.07$; $p<.001$) and for fathers ($\chi^2=9.18$; $p<.005$). Parents whose value orientation was prescriptive had children who tended to be givers,

while parents whose value orientation was proscriptive had children who tended not to be givers.

When the value orientation of the parents was analyzed for the punishment items, there were significant findings (see Table 8) for: mothers of girls ($\chi^2=10.93$; $p<.001$); mothers of boys ($\chi^2=4.15$; $p<.05$); and fathers of boys ($\chi^2=4.52$; $p<.05$). There were no significant findings for fathers of girls ($\chi^2=1.59$). When the boys and girls were combined, there were significant findings for mothers ($\chi^2=12.78$; $p<.001$) and for fathers ($\chi^2=3.84$; $p=.05$). Parents whose value orientation was prescriptive had children who tended to be givers, while parents whose value orientation was proscriptive had children who tended to be non-givers. The relationship between the value orientation of the parents and the child's generosity was therefore consistent for both reward items and punishment items except in the case of fathers of girls.

When the parents' discipline emphasis was analyzed separately for the prescriptive items and proscriptive items, there were no significant findings (see Tables 9 and 10). Therefore, whether the children were givers or non-givers was not related to the discipline emphasis of the parents.

Table 1

Analysis of Variance of Generosity Scores:
Sex of the Child and Value Orientation
of the Mothers

Source	df	MS	F	P
Sex of child (A)	1	2.5	.25	ns
Value orientation of mother (B)	1	895.5	91.38	<.01
AxB	1	.5	.05	ns
Error (between)	72	9.8		

Table 2

Analysis of Variance of Generosity Scores:
Sex of the Child and Value Orientation
of the Fathers

Source	df	MS	F	P
Sex of child (A)	1	2	.10	ns
Value orientation of fathers (B)	1	671.5	35.16	<.01
AxB	1	.5	.03	ns
Error (between)	68	19.1		

Table 3

Analysis of Variance of Generosity Scores:
 Sex of the Child and Discipline
 Emphasis of the Mothers

Source	df	MS	F	P
Sex of child (A)	1	1	.04	ns
Discipline emphasis of mother (B)	1	22.5	.88	ns
AxB	1	6.5	.25	ns
Error (between)	70	25.5		

Table 4

Analysis of Variance of Generosity Scores:
 Sex of the Child and Discipline
 Emphasis of the Fathers

Source	df	MS	F	P
Sex of child (A)	1	.25	.01	ns
Discipline emphasis of father (B)	1	19.0	8.99	<.01
AxB	1	27.0	1.17	ns
Error (between)	64	24.4		

Table 5

Analysis of Variance of Generosity Scores:
Sex of the Child and Value Orientation
of the Child

Source	df	MS	F	P
Sex of child (A)	1	2	.12	ns
Value orientation of child (B)	1	128	7.39	<.05
AxB	1	0	--	ns
Error (between)	28	17.3		

Table 6

Analysis of Variance of Generosity Scores:
Discipline Emphasis of the Parents and
Value Orientation of the Parents

Source	df	MS	F	P
Discipline emphasis (A)	1	42.9	3.09	ns
Value orientation (B)	1	448.4	32.19	<.01
AxB	1	46.9	3.37	ns
Error (between)	74	1022		

Table 7
 Number of Givers or Non-givers Whose Parents
 Had Prescriptive or Proscriptive Value
 Orientation on Reward Items

	REWARD ITEMS				χ^2	P
	Prescriptive		Proscriptive			
	Givers	Non-Givers	Givers	Non-Givers		
mothers-girls	14	4	9	17	7.94	.005
mothers-boys	17	4	4	9	8.56	.005
fathers-girls	14	6	9	15	4.61	.05
fathers-boys	14	3	7	10	6.10	.025
mothers-girls and boys (combined)	31	8	13	26	15.07	.001
fathers-girls and boys (combined)	28	9	16	25	9.18	.005

Table 8
 Number of Givers or Non-givers Whose Parents
 Had Prescriptive or Proscriptive Value
 Orientation on Reward Items

	REWARD ITEMS				χ^2	P
	Prescriptive		Proscriptive			
	Givers	Non-Givers	Givers	Non-Givers		
mothers-girls	18	6	5	15	10.93	.001
mothers-boys	14	4	7	9	4.15	.05
fathers-girls	12	7	11	14	1.59	ns
fathers-boys	11	2	10	11	4.52	.05
mothers-girls and boys (combined)	32	10	12	24	12.78	.001
fathers-girls and boys (combined)	23	9	21	25	3.84	.05

Table 9
 Number of Givers or Non-givers Whose Parents
 Emphasized Rewards or Punishments
 on Prescriptive Items

	PRESCRIPTIVE ITEMS				χ^2	P
	Reward		Punishment			
	Givers	Non-Givers	Givers	Non-Givers		
mothers-girls	11	9	12	12	.10	ns
mothers-boys	12	7	9	6	.03	ns
fathers-girls	12	7	11	14	1.47	ns
fathers-boys	13	5	8	8	1.77	ns
mothers-girls and boys (combined)	23	16	21	18	.05	ns
fathers-girls and boys (combined)	25	12	19	22	2.93	ns

Table 10
 Number of Givers or Non-givers Whose Parents
 Emphasized Rewards or Punishments
 on Proscriptive Items

	PROSCRIPTIVE ITEMS				χ^2	P
	Reward		Punishment			
	Givers	Non-Givers	Givers	Non-Givers		
mothers-girls	13	10	10	11	.29	ns
mothers-boys	10	4	11	9	.94	ns
fathers-girls	14	8	9	13	2.10	ns
fathers-boys	12	4	9	9	2.24	ns
mothers-girls and boys (combined)	23	14	21	20	.55	ns
fathers-girls and boys (combined)	26	12	18	22	3.44	ns

DISCUSSION

The hypotheses of the present study appear substantially confirmed. The data revealed that:

(a) there was a reliable difference between people holding prescriptive values and those holding proscriptive values; (b) children were more generous when their parents had a prescriptive value orientation rather than a proscriptive value orientation; (c) children with a prescriptive value orientation were more generous than children with a proscriptive value orientation; and (d) fathers but not mothers who were more rewarding than punitive had children who were more generous.

The finding that there were no significant sex differences in generosity supports earlier research on altruism with nursery school children (Fischer, 1963) and elementary school children of both sexes (Handlon & Gross, 1959; Harris, 1968; Ugurel-Semin, 1952).

While the reliabilities obtained for the four types of scores were respectable for this kind of instrument, the reliability of the difference scores were lower. These reliabilities are lower because they each come from two fallible scores and the error variances from them summate

and the number of items is smaller. It is advisable that further analysis and research be done to improve the reliability of the instrument (see Appendix) used to measure value orientations. The agreement between mothers' and fathers' scores suggests some consistency within the homes of the children in terms of value orientations which are being taught by the parents.

Several major findings supporting the hypotheses of the study were obtained from the data as mothers and fathers who were considered prescriptive in their value orientation had children who gave away more candies to the fictitious "needy children." This relationship between the value orientation of the parents and the generosity of the children was also demonstrated in the separate analysis of the reward items and punishment items. Also, the children who had a prescriptive value orientation were more generous than those children who had a proscriptive value orientation. These results suggest that the emphasis in the home on doing good is one antecedent of generosity in nursery school aged children.

The finding that fathers who were more rewarding than punitive had children who were more generous, supports earlier research on parent-child relationships and altruism which found that parents who are warm, nurturant, and non-punitive most likely raise children who are altruistic and concerned for others (Hoffman, 1963; Peck & Havighurst,

1960; Mussen, Rutherford, Harris, & Keasey, 1970; Rutherford & Mussen, 1968). It is not clear why there was no significant effect for mothers on this dimension. It is possible that mothers spending most of the day at home with the children may perceive themselves as much more punitive, while fathers perceive themselves as more rewarding and less punitive. The tendency toward an interaction between value orientation and discipline emphasis supports earlier research by McKinney (1971) in which college students having a prescriptive value orientation perceived their parents as being more rewarding. Further research in this area should also study how the child affects the value orientation of the parents.

The results of this study suggest that generosity is related to a prescriptive value orientation in the family as well as to a discipline emphasis using rewards rather than punishments for fathers. A principle of parent-child interaction which may improve the parent-child dynamic might be to avoid prohibiting behavior like "don't touch that" and practice positive behavior guidance like "while I'm doing this keep your hands at your side." It seems that the emphasis on positive behaviors provides much more information to the child as to exactly how he should behave while emphasis on negative sanctions such as not doing something wrong provides little information to the child as to what he should be doing.

Future research on the antecedents of altruistic behavior involving the value orientation of the parents taught to children should consider either a longitudinal or cross-sectional study which would measure the relationship between prescriptive and proscriptive values and altruistic behaviors for children between nursery school and college. Observational studies in the home seem appropriate to actually measure the kind and amount of parent-child interactions and the values which are being taught. The influence of peers would seem to become more significant as the child grew older; and therefore their value orientations and influence would be necessary to consider. It is possible that when a child is younger the more effective value orientation is the proscriptive orientation; but, as he gets older, a prescriptive value orientation becomes more meaningful. There are many questions which might be asked. Is the type of value orientation also related to a pattern of moral characteristics including kindness, cooperation, sharing and aiding behaviors? Are there any cross-cultural or socio-economic differences with respect to the prescriptive and proscriptive value orientations? It is possible that there may be socio-economic class differences between the lower and middle classes with respect to the type of value orientation taught by the parents. The parents in the present study were primarily middle class. According to Becker's (1964) comprehensive review of parental

discipline techniques, middle class parents score higher than lower class parents on the amount of warmth, use of reasoning, isolation, show of disappointment and use of guilt-arousing appeals. It might be predicted that lower class children and their parents would be more proscriptively oriented, while middle class families would be more prescriptively oriented. Future research might also consider the experimental manipulation of prescriptive and proscriptive values in a game or puzzle situation prior to some measure of altruism.

In summary and conclusion, it is clear that generosity in nursery school aged children is related to the prescriptive value orientation of the parents as well as a rewarding rather than punitive discipline emphasis, but there is a great deal of future research needed on the child rearing practices which influence the development of children's altruistic behaviors. Research studies should address themselves to the question of how humans acquire the social responsiveness for their dispositions to be generous, to share, or to give aid. The prescriptive-proscriptive value orientation placed in an expanded learning theory model appears to be a viable approach to the study of the development of moral values and altruistic behavior.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Aronfreed, J. The nature, variety, and social patterning of moral responses to transgression. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 63, 223-241.
- Aronfreed, J. The effect of experimental socialization paradigms upon two moral responses to transgression. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 66, 437-448.
- Aronfreed, J. Conduct and Conscience: The socialization of internalized control over behavior. New York: Academic Press, 1968.
- Baldwin, C.P., & Baldwin, A.L. Children's judgments of kindness. Child Development, 1970, 41, 29-47.
- Becker, W. Consequences of different kinds of parental discipline. In Hoffman, M. and Hoffman, L. Review of child development research, Vol. I. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964.
- Bryan, J.H., & London, P. Altruistic behavior by children. Psychological Bulletin, 1970, 73, 200-211.
- Bryan, J.H., & Walbek, N.H. Preaching and practicing generosity: children's actions and reactions. Child Development, 1970. 41, 329-353.(a)
- Bryan, J.H., & Walbek, N.H. The impact of words and deeds concerning altruism upon children. Child Development, 1970, 41, 747-757.(b)
- Elliot, R., & Vasta, R. The modeling of sharing: effects associated with vicarious reinforcement, symbolization, age, and generalization. Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 1970, 10, 8-15.
- Fischer, W.F. Sharing in preschool children as a function of amount and type of reinforcement. Genetic Psychological Monographs, 1963, 68, 215-245.

- Freud, S. Collected papers. Vol. 4. Papers on metapsychology, Papers on applied psycho-analysis. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1959.
- Gore, P.M., & Rotter, J.B. A personality correlate of social action. Journal of Personality, 1963, 31, 58-64.
- Grinder, R. Parental child rearing practices, conscience, and resistance to temptation of sixth grade children. Child Development, 1962, 33, 802-820.
- Guilford, J.P. Psychometric Methods. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1954.
- Hanalon, B.J., & Gross, P. The development of sharing behavior. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1959, 59, 425-428.
- Harris, M.B. Reciprocity and generosity: some determinants of sharing in children. Child Development, 1970, 41, 313-328.
- Hartshorne, H., & May, M.A. Studies in the nature of character: Vol. I, Studies in deceit; Vol. II, Studies in self control; Vol. III, Studies in the organization of character. New York: Macmillan, 1928-1930.
- Hill, W.F. Learning theory and the acquisition of values. Psychological Review, 1960, 67, 317-331.
- Hoffman, M.L. Parent discipline and the child's consideration for others. Child Development, 1964, 34, 573-588.
- Hoffman, M.L. Moral Development. In Mussen, P.H. (Ed.) Carmichael's Manual of Child Psychology, Vol. II, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1970.
- Kohlberg, L. Development of moral character and moral ideology. In Hoffman, M., & Hoffman L. Review of child development research, Vol. I, New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964.
- Krebs, D.L. Altruism--an examination of the concept and a review of the literature. Psychological Bulletin, 1970, 73, 258-302.
- McKinney, J.P. The development of values--prescriptive or proscriptive? Human Development, 1971, 14, 71-80.

- Midlarsky, E., & Bryan, J.H. Training charity in children. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 5, 408-415.
- Mussen, P., Rutherford, E., Harris, S., & Keasey, C.B. Honesty and altruism among preadolescents. Developmental Psychology, 1970, 3, 169-194.
- Osborn, F.W. The ethical contents of children's minds. Educational Review, 1894, 8, 143-146.
- Peck, R.F., & Havighurst, R.S. The psychology of character development, New York: Wiley, 1960.
- Piaget, J. The moral judgment of the child, New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1932.
- Pittel, S.M., & Mendelsohn, G.A. Measurement of moral values: a review and critique. Psychological Bulletin, 1966, 66, 22-35.
- Rettig, S. An exploratory study of altruism. Dissertation Abstracts, 1956, 16, 2229-2230.
- Rosenhan, D., & White, G.M. Observation and rehearsal as determinants of pro-social behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 5, 424-431.
- Rutherford, E., & Mussen, P. Generosity in nursery school boys. Child Development, 1968, 39, 755-766.
- Sears, R.R., Rau, L., & Alpert, K. Identification and child rearing. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1965.
- Staub, E., & Sherk, L. Relationship between need approval and children's sharing behavior. Child Development, 1970, 41, 243-252.
- Ugurel-Simen, R. Moral Behavior and moral judgment of children. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1952, 44, 463-474.
- Whiting, J.W., & Whiting, B. Children in six cultures, Unpublished manuscript, Harvard University, 1969.

APPENDIX

(COPY OF PARENTS' VALUE ORIENTATION
QUESTIONNAIRE)

APPENDIX

(COPY OF PARENT'S VALUE ORIENTATION QUESTIONNAIRE)

Instructions for Parents' Questionnaire

Dear _____

We are interested in learning how parents teach their children at home by using rewards and punishments. We are not interested in the kinds of rewards or punishments used, as we realize that parents use a variety of techniques. We would like to know how much you feel you would either reward or punish the following behaviors. After each behavior, please print the letters P (punish) or R (reward) and circle a number (1, 2, 3, 4, or 5)--from very little to very much--the amount you feel you would either punish or reward that behavior. We would also like you to answer the questions on the back side of this questionnaire. If you are a father, be sure you use the questionnaire for fathers. If you are a mother, be sure you use the questionnaire for mothers. Each parent should work on the questionnaires separately. You may compare responses but please do not make any changes in your responses.

Value Orientation Questionnaire

	<u>P</u> or <u>R</u>	1	2	3	4	5
		very little			very much	
1. not listening to parents when spoken to	_____	1	2	3	4	5
2. behaving well when out shopping	_____	1	2	3	4	5
3. fighting with friends	_____	1	2	3	4	5
4. not bothering mother when she is busy	_____	1	2	3	4	5
5. sharing his toys	_____	1	2	3	4	5
6. telling lies	_____	1	2	3	4	5
7. not running into the street	_____	1	2	3	4	5
8. leaving toys scattered around the house	_____	1	2	3	4	5
9. cleaning up his room	_____	1	2	3	4	5
10. not being a poor loser in games	_____	1	2	3	4	5
11. not behaving when visiting relatives	_____	1	2	3	4	5
12. not cheating in school	_____	1	2	3	4	5
13. playing nicely with friends	_____	1	2	3	4	5
14. helping mother around the house	_____	1	2	3	4	5
15. purposely breaking toys	_____	1	2	3	4	5
16. not getting new clothes dirty	_____	1	2	3	4	5
17. playing with harmful objects	_____	1	2	3	4	5
18. not doing well in school	_____	1	2	3	4	5
19. not coming to the dinner table when called	_____	1	2	3	4	5
20. tracking dirt into the house	_____	1	2	3	4	5

	<u>P</u> or <u>R</u>	1	2	3	4	5
		very little			very much	
21. doing well at a new task	_____	1	2	3	4	5
22. sharing his toys with friends	_____	1	2	3	4	5
23. not keeping room clean	_____	1	2	3	4	5
24. not taking toys away from friends	_____	1	2	3	4	5

NOV 10 1971

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293104580554