



RETURNING MATERIALS:
Place in book drop to
remove this checkout from
your record. FINES will
be charged if book is
returned after the date
stamped below.

6001-8883
APR 07 '83 11:17

APR 18 '83 11:17

NOV 15 1983

127

ABSTRACT

MOTIVATION FOR PARENTHOOD AND PARENTAL BEHAVIOR AS PERCEIVED BY DISTURBED AND NORMAL CHILDREN

by Charlene A. Carter

The purpose of the present investigation was to explore motivations for parenthood as they relate to child perceptions of parental behavior, and as they relate to the mental health of children. Since an adequate direct measure of motivation for parenthood was not available, the present study included the development of a questionnaire for this purpose.

Two groups of subjects were selected for the study. The Disturbed group consisted of 15 boys who were diagnosed as having emotional problems, and their parents. The Adjusted group consisted of 15 boys whose teachers rated them as well-adjusted, and their parents. Groups were matched with respect to age of child, religion, and socio-economic level.

Three instruments were used to explore parental motivation and behavior in both groups. The Family Opinion Survey (FOS), a questionnaire measure of motivation for parenthood developed in the context of the present research, consisted of 86 third-person statements. In conjunction

with the questionnaire, a projective instrument was also used to study motives of parents for having children. The Picture Story Free Response Test, adapted from Major's Picture-Story Completion Technique, consisted of four pictures with story beginnings for which subjects were required to write story endings. Responses to both direct and projective measures of motivation for parenthood were classified as parent-need oriented (Narcissistic, Instrumental, Parent-Centered), child-need oriented (Nurturant, Child-Centered), or non-need oriented (Humanitarian, Fatalistic, By-Product). Perceived parental behavior was measured by the 45 item Bronfenbrenner Parent Behavior Questionnaire from which child ratings of parental behavior can be assessed along three dimensions: Demanding, Punishing, and Loving.

Results of the study pertaining to motivation for parenthood can be summarized as follows:

- I. Adjusted Group parents showed more parent-need oriented motivation for parenthood (FOS) than Disturbed Group parents, contrary to the prediction.
- II. Adjusted Group parents showed more child-need oriented motivation for parenthood (FOS) than Disturbed Group parents, in accord with the prediction.
- III. Adjusted Group parents showed more Humanitarian and By-Product motivation for parenthood (PSFRT). The prediction that there would be no differences between groups on the non-need oriented motivations

was not substantiated, but the hypothesis was basically confirmed because there were actually few differences between groups.

Results of the group comparisons on perceived parental behavior are summarized below:

- IV. Disturbed Group parents were rated as more Demanding and more Punishing than Adjusted Group parents, in accord with the prediction. The expectation of a positive association between parent-need oriented motivations and demanding and punishing behavior was not confirmed, but there were trends in the predicted direction for the Adjusted group.
- V. There were no differences between group ratings on Loving and the prediction that parents of the Adjusted group would be judged as more Loving was not confirmed. The expectation of a positive association between child-need oriented motivation for parenthood and loving behavior was not confirmed, but there were trends in the predicted direction for the Adjusted group.

Results also showed sex differences in motivation for parenthood (PSFRT) and perceived parental behavior. Females showed more Nurturant and males more Instrumental motivation for parenthood, while mothers were perceived as more Demanding and fathers more Loving in behavior. Finally, although low correlations between motivational categories on the questionnaire and projective instrument indicated that

the two measures were tapping different levels of awareness of motives, Adjusted Group parents showed more consistency between tests.

It was concluded that motivation for parenthood and perceived parental behavior variables bear complex relationships to one another as well as to child level of adjustment. The present paper raised a series of puzzling questions. Suggestions, which should prove helpful to future investigations, were made for modifications of existing measurement techniques.

MOTIVATION FOR PARENTHOOD AND PARENTAL BEHAVIOR AS
PERCEIVED BY DISTURBED AND NORMAL CHILDREN

By

Charlene A. Carter

A THESIS

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Psychology

Spring, 1968

G 51454

To Ross

For his patience, for his support, for his
tolerance, and for his respecting my wish
to become a psychotherapist.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my thanks to each of the members of the dissertation committee. I am especially grateful to Dr. Bert Karon and Dr. Norm Abeles for help in simplifying the research design and for suggestions as to appropriate, straightforward statistical procedures. Dr. Bill Mueller gave me much needed practical help and emotional support in the somewhat panicky first stages of data analysis. Dr. Albert Rabin has been my academic advisor for the nearly six years I have spent at Michigan State University and was the committee chairman. I am, and will remain, grateful to him for his confidence in me and for his support, guidance, and encouragement on this and my other undertakings.

Special thanks go to Mr. Robert L. Little, Administrative Director of Lincoln School, and to other Lincoln School personnel for their ready cooperation in making Disturbed Group subjects available to me. Mrs. Hilda Parker of the Michigan State University Psychological Clinic was also helpful in my search for subjects to complete the emotionally disturbed sample. I am, in addition, appreciative of the efforts of the many principals and teachers in local area schools who supplied me with the names of well-adjusted children.

I owe a good deal, further, to Ken Nunnelly and Ross Carter for their efforts in rating the projective measure. They worked patiently and conscientiously together at the often-times frustrating task of establishing reliability and judging story-completion protocols.

I wish to thank the professors, practicum instructors, and supervisors who taught, encouraged and nurtured me and who expressed confidence in my ability to become a competent clinician. Most of all, perhaps, I shall always be grateful to those of my fellow students who befriended me, worried with me, discovered with me, and shared with me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Motivation for Parenthood	1
Parenthood: A Developmental Phase	2
Types of Parental Motivation	4
Normal Motivations	5
Parenthood and Pathology	8
Childlessness and Habitual Abortion	10
Psychologically Motivated Pre-marital Pregnancy	11
Post-partum Psychosis	12
Psychosis Associated with Fatherhood	13
Studies in Motivation for Parenthood	14
Theoretical Orientation	19
Need Focus: Support from the Literature	21
Parental Attitudes and Behavior	24
Attitudes	24
Parental Behavior	26
Studies Showing Positive Relationships between Parental Attitudes or Parental Behavior and Child Adjustment	29
Parental Motivation, Parental Behavior, and Child Adjustment	33
Measuring the Motivation for Parenthood Variable	33
Instruments	34
Direct Device	35
Projective Device	35
II. PROBLEM AND HYPOTHESES	37

Chapter		Page
III.	METHOD AND PROCEDURE	39
	Subjects	39
	Techniques	41
	Family Opinion Survey	41
	Parental Picture Story Completion Test	49
	Bronfenbrenner Parent Behavior Questionnaire	51
	Administration of Measures	52
	Scoring and Statistical Treatment of Data	53
IV.	RESULTS	55
	Parent-need Oriented Motivation:	
	Hypothesis I	55
	Child-need Oriented Motivation:	
	Hypothesis II	60
	Additional Motivations for Parenthood:	
	Hypothesis III	64
	Perceived Parental Behavior; Demanding and Punishing: Hypothesis IV	68
	Perceived Parental Behavior; Loving:	
	Hypothesis V	72
	Additional Findings	77
	Sex Differences in Parental Motivation	77
	Sex Differences in Parental Behavior	78
	Parental Motivation and Planned Parenthood	79
	Relationship between Objective and Projective Measures of Parental Motivation	79
V.	DISCUSSION	81
	Hypotheses	81
	Outcome	83
	Additional Findings	84
	Confirmed Hypotheses and Additional Findings	86
	Parental Motivation	86
	Sex Differences in Parental Motivation	87
	Perceived Parental Behavior	89
	Sex Differences in Perceived Parental Behavior	90

Chapter	Page
Planned Parenthood	93
Relationship between FOS and PSFRT	93
Unconfirmed Hypotheses	95
Theoretical Foundations	96
Parental Motivation	96
Perceived Parental Behavior	104
Parental Motivation and Perceived Parental Behavior	106
Measurement Techniques	108
FOS	108
PSFRT	113
Relationship between FOS and PSFRT	114
Subject Variables	114
Suggestions for Further Research	120
VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	124
REFERENCES	128
APPENDICES	137

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Narcissistic motivation: means, standard deviations, and between-group t values on the Family Opinion Survey and Picture-Story Free Response Test	56
2. Instrumental motivation: means, standard deviations, and between-group t values on the Family Opinion Survey and Picture-Story Free Response Test	58
3. Parent-centered motivation: means, standard deviations, and between-group t values on the Family Opinion Survey and Picture-Story Free Response Test	59
4. Nurturant motivation: means, standard deviations, and between-group t values on the Family Opinion Survey and Picture-Story Free Response Test	62
5. Child-centered motivation: means, standard deviations, and between-group t values on the Family Opinion Survey and Picture-Story Free Response Test	63
6. Fatalistic motivations: means, standard deviations, and between-group t values on the Family Opinion Survey and Picture-Story Free Response Test	65
7. Humanitarian motivation: means, standard deviations, and between-group t values on the Family Opinion Survey and Picture-Story Free Response Test	66
8. By-product motivation: means, standard deviations, and between-group t values on the Family Opinion Survey and Picture-Story Free Response Test	67
9. Demanding behavior: means, standard deviations, and between-group t values on the Bronfenbrenner Parent Behavior Questionnaire (BPBQ)	69

Table	Page
10. Punishing behavior: means, standard deviations, and between-group t values on the BPBQ	70
11. Correlations between scores on the Demanding scale of the BPBQ and scores on Narcissistic, Instrumental, and Parent-centered motivation on the Family Opinion Survey and Picture-Story Free Response Test . . .	71
12. Correlations between scores on the Punishing scale of the BPBQ and scores on Narcissistic, Instrumental, and Parent-centered motivation on the Family Opinion Survey and Picture-Story Free Response Test	73
13. Loving behavior: means, standard deviations, and between-group t values on the BPBQ . .	74
14. Correlations between scores on the Loving scale of the BPBQ and scores on Nurturant and Child-centered motivations on the Family Opinion Survey and Picture-Story Free Response Test	75
APPENDIX TABLES	Page
15. Means, standard deviations, and between-sex t values of scores on the Family Opinion Survey	163
16. Means, standard deviations, and between-sex t values of scores on the Picture-Story Free Response Test	164
17. Means, standard deviations, and between-sex t values of scores on the BPBQ	165
18. Means, standard deviations, and between-sex t values for Adjusted and Disturbed Groups on scores on the BPBQ	165
19. Intercorrelations of the Family Opinion Survey and Picture-Story Free Response Test for the Adjusted and Disturbed Groups	166

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX		Page
A.	CRITERIA FOR TEACHER SELECTION OF WELL-ADJUSTED CHILDREN	137
B.	ADJUSTED-DISTURBED PAIRS MATCHED ON CONTROL CRITERIA	138
C.	PICTURE-STORY FREE RESPONSE TEST	140
	1. Scoring Manual	140
	2. Interjudge Reliabilities	148
	3. Story Stems	149
D.	FAMILY OPINION SURVEY (FOS)	150
	1. Subscale Reliabilities	150
	2. Subscale Correlations with One Another	150
	3. Items by Motivational Categories	150
E.	BRONFENBRENNER PARENT BEHAVIOR QUESTIONNAIRE.	159
F.	LETTER FROM LINCOLN SCHOOL	161
G.	ADDITIONAL FINDINGS (TABLES)	162

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Social scientists have long been concerned with the factors which lead to healthy adjustment or psychological disturbance in children. Volumes of data, sometimes with equivocal results, have been collected in attempts to link parental child-rearing practices, attitudes and behavior with eventual mental health of children. Recent research efforts would suggest that parental attitudes and behavior, as they relate to child adjustment, be placed in the larger context of parental motivation for and toward children.

Motivation for Parenthood

The reports of recent research studies indicate that, in spite of the availability of contraceptive information and birth control methods, American family size is increasing (U.S. Dept. of Commerce, 1961). The increase in the size of families is not simply the result of improved medical procedures but of voluntary and active choice on the part of parents (Truxal & Merrill, 1953; Hoffman & Wyatt, 1960; Campbell, 1962). As might be anticipated, family size has been found to be related to socio-economic status and the feelings of economic security of the parents. In addition,

however, the desire for children has been shown to be related to marital happiness (Cavan, 1942) and to "feelings of personal adequacy" (Kiser, 1962, p. 151). What, then, is the psychological significance of parenthood for adult men and women?

Parenthood: A Developmental Phase

Parenthood has been described by a series of workers as a phase in the process of personality development. Pregnancy, the birth of the first and then subsequent children can be highly integrative experiences for mature men and women and can foster a new high level of psycho-sexual development. Pregnancy is seen as a time of developmental crisis in preparation for the state of parenthood. Bibring (1959) and Bibring, Dwyer, & Huntington (1961) conducted longitudinal research projects designed to study the psychological status of pregnant women. They found that pregnancy is a time of intense psychological upheaval in which defenses are loosened, fantasies about the subjects' own mothers appear and severe psychological symptoms of a borderline nature may develop. The women who progressed normally through the crisis period initially showed enhanced narcissism, then a concern with the child as an object within the self, and finally a conception of the child as a part of the self but outside of the self -- an external object. Loesch & Greenberg (1962) also see normal pregnancy as a developmental crisis period. In a study comparing 22 married and

31 unmarried pregnant women, however, they found that for the unmarried women pregnancy was merely a time of psychological disturbance while for the married women the pregnancy crisis fostered personality growth.

A series of workers see the birth of the child as a maturing experience for both parents (Taylor, 1955; Wasserman, 1958; Benedek, 1959). Benedek points to the fact that both mother and father achieve new personality integration as they see their baby thrive and they introject the gratifying experience of successful mothering and fathering. Wasserman views childbirth as "the passing of the threshold to advanced adulthood, to those stages called by Erikson generativity and finally ego-integrity" (1958, p. 56). He contends that parenthood is a final attempt to overcome the basic tendency to remain dependent and a child.

Deutsch (1944), Bressler (1958), and Benedek (1952; 1959) point to motherhood as the completion of the process of psycho-sexual development in women. Deutsch mentions that motherhood strengthens contact with reality demands and can even lead to a kind of "late maturation" in emotionally infantile women. Benedek contends that total personality determines the developmental outcome of motherhood. She maintains that motherliness involves repetition and working through primary, oral conflicts with the woman's own mother and that the process of mothering allows resolution of conflicts and facilitates psycho-sexual development to completion.

The birth of children subsequent to the first may enhance developmental progress of both parents. The more authoritarian behavior of women toward their first as opposed to subsequent children is viewed by Loveinger & Sweet (1961) as related to level of mother's ego development. They see authoritarian behavior on the part of the mother as indicative of a weak ego and fear of the child within herself. With the birth of successive children, the ego of the mother is strengthened and she behaves in a more flexible way toward her later offspring.

Types of Parental Motivation

Although parenthood is a natural developmental phase, men and women may bring to it varying levels of personal maturity. The contention of this investigation is that conscious and unconscious motivations for parenthood vary with the level of personality development, and psychosexual maturity of the parents at the time of the child's conception. The discussion to follow will consider, first, the types of parental motivation that may be held by fairly healthy and mature potential parents. Second, there is a consideration of motivations and dynamics underlying pathological conditions associated with parenthood (habitual abortion, psychologically motivated pre-marital pregnancy, psychoses associated with parenthood).

Normal Motivations

Typically, motivation for parenthood is traced to three types of sources: (1) basic biological drives, (2) psychological need involvement, (3) social and cultural influences.

A fundamental biological basis for motherhood has been established as arising from genetic constitution, endocrine secretion, and the female sexual cycle (Beach, 1948; Benedek, 1952). Benedek maintains that "there is a primary drive toward motherhood" (p. 417). The drive for motherhood is based upon the female sexual cycle which includes alternate secretion of estrogen and progesterin with concomitant emotional changes. The emotions of the estrogen phase include an active sexuality leading toward intercourse while the progesterone phase leads a woman to concentrate on herself and her own welfare in preparation for motherhood. Although males do not undergo hormonal preparation for parenthood as do women, Benedek sees a biological basis for the drive toward fatherhood. She maintains that there "are two sources of fatherliness: one, biological bisexuality; and the other, the biological dependency upon the mother" (p. 398). The early primary identification of a male with his mother (oral-dependent phase) in the normal course of events, gives way to an identification with the father as provider and protector. Bernstein & Cyr (1957) point to the fact that, if there is no actual hormonal basis for fatherhood, at least men show "a strong capacity for responding to the birth of their children" (p. 480).

Other workers have referred, in general terms, to biological foundations of parenthood (Hart, 1935; Truxal & Merrill, 1953; Winch, 1964). Ackerman (1958) speaks of a "parental urge" and Woods (1959) mentions an "urge toward self-perpetuation" as leading to parenthood.

Innumerable types of psychological motivation for parenthood have been suggested. Bowen (1942) postulates that people have children for immortality and to carry on the family name, for companionship in old age, because they derive satisfaction from the child's dependence upon them, because they enjoy an "intimate response", because they delight in watching the child's development, and in order to relive their own childhood. Groves & Groves (1947) list motives for parenthood as: (1) providing social security in the sense of establishing a family life; conforming, not being "peculiar"; (2) religious obligation; (3) social conformity; (4) self-fulfillment through the child. Winch (1964) sees parental motivation as stemming from the desire to validate the self as a man or a woman and as a means of testing and proving ability to love.

Three types of psychological motivations for parenthood are postulated by Hoffman & Wyatt (1960); (1) parenthood as a way to avoid the loneliness and alienation of modern life; (2) parenthood as gratification of the dependency needs of the mother to have a child dependent upon her while, at the same time, retaining her own dependent role with her husband; (3) parenthood as an art and a

valuable creative function in response to information emphasizing the impact of the parents upon the child's personality.

Two interview-type studies relating to the satisfactions and problems of having and rearing children are relevant here. Jersild, Woodyard, & Solar (1949) obtained data from interviews with parents of 544 families. They found that "one of the prominent sources of parental satisfaction resides in the opportunity of observing the phenomena of development -- the fact of growth and change -- the unfolding of the child's qualities and characteristics" (p. 106). Repeatedly, their subjects mentioned the fact that parenthood is both emotionally and intellectually stimulating. The other interview study by Tasch (1955) found that both mothers and fathers ranked enjoyment of the child's companionship, his personality characteristics, and his intellectual abilities high among satisfactions of parenthood.

In our society parenthood is the basis of the social structure and marriage, the legitimate way to have children (Sait, 1938). Bell (1963) presents the three basic functions of parent-child relationships: (1) reproduction within marriage, (2) responsibility for caring for dependent offspring, (3) training the child to function in society. Tradition prescribes that parenthood is the culmination of marriage. There is unfailing cultural approval shown for children within marriage and inflexible social disapproval for conception outside of marriage and for abortion (Truxal & Merrill, 1953). The societal norms regarding reproduction

parenthood are culturally determined and the norm for our society appears to be to have some, but not too many children.

Hoffman & Wyatt (1960) state that "motives for reproduction are not fixed but respond to social change, and that the current increase in family size is in part a reflection of increased motivation for larger families" (p. 235). The social trends that may have affected American attitudes toward parenthood as the authors see it are:

1. Changes in woman's role.
2. Changes in parent role and concept of parenthood.
3. Loneliness and alienation characteristic of our society.

Cultures other than American may foster different motivations for childbearing than our own. In the primitive family, for example, children were regarded as valuable property at the disposal of the parents (Goodsell, 1926). Both the present Hebrew (Truxal & Merrill, 1953) and Hindu (Ross, 1961) societies highly value children since offspring are required to carry out culturally perscribed functions. Finally, the Soviet government has encouraged parenthood through techniques such as money allotments to mothers of large families and taxes on childless couples (Mace, 1963).

Parenthood and Pathology

The preceding section has outlined usual motivations for parenthood as they occur in typical, fairly well-adjusted and mature adults. To the extent, however, that personality development has been retarded or has miscarried

in some way, motives for parenthood will depart from the norm. Specifically, unconsciously determined needs may become involved.

The fact that unconscious reasons for desiring children exist has been attested to by a number of writers. Groves & Groves (1947), for example, state ". . . it is not safe to assume that the real reason why children are chosen or not is clear or conscious" (p. 402). Workers in the field of child placement and adoption often make the plea that any possible covert motivations for the parents wanting the child be recognized and discussed as a measure necessary to protect the psychological well-being of the child (Ross & Anderson, 1965). Veiga (1965) based a study on four years of experience working in a large child placement agency with foster care, institutional, and residential treatment programs. He maintains that there must be an evaluation of unconscious neurotic needs which might make some foster or adoptive parents risks. Less attention has been paid to the unconscious needs of natural parents in regard to having their children.

There are available for consideration a number of extreme cases of parenthood "gone awry". It has been shown that unconscious motivations and neurotic needs are involved in: childlessness and habitual abortion; psychologically motivated pre-marital pregnancy; post-partum psychosis in women; and, psychosis associated with parenthood in men. These examples demonstrate that becoming a parent is much

more than a matter-of-fact happenstance. The consideration of "miscarriages" of parenthood to follow, point to the central role of conflicts in handling oral needs and dependency. People with oral conflicts have trouble with being parents. It should be kept in mind that oral conflicts are those ordinarily resolved earliest in the stages of psychosexual development. Again, it appears that developmental immaturity and neurotic disorder open the door for a multitude of unconscious motives to become involved in parenthood.

Childlessness and Habitual Abortion

Lantz & Snyder (1962) suggest that lack of desire for children is indicative of emotional immaturity. Winch (1964) asserts that parenthood may be rejected in order to continue emotional dependency on the spouse. The various physiological disorders which prevent conception are known to be influenced by psychological factors. Fodor (1958) suggests that, in women, motives for psychological sterility may include fear of punishment by parents and unwillingness to accept a feminine role. A psychosomatic interdisciplinary approach to the study of spontaneous and habitual abortion was conducted by Weil & Tupper (1960). They found that, characteristically, habitual aborters are women who appear aloof and "independent". Often these women exhibit great confusion about their own sexual identity and assume a masculine role. They have the acute sense of being rejected

and unloved yet compensate for their unfulfilled dependency needs by assuming more and more responsibility and attempting to appear self-sufficient and competent.

Psychologically Motivated Pre-marital Pregnancy

A series of research studies indicate that pregnancy can be motivated by an attempt to solve problems or compensate for an object loss. The psychological make up and interpersonal relationships of 31 unmarried, pregnant women were studied by Greenberg, Loesch, & Larkin (1959). They found that in the women studied, pregnancy resulted from neurotic sources rather than mature strivings. Specifically, in 29 of the 31 subjects pregnancy was associated with an object loss within six months of the time of conception. The loss usually involved death or separation from parents or other significant persons. The authors speculate that the child was probably seen as a replacement for the lost object rather than an individual-to-be in its own right.

The results of another investigation of the motivations of unwed mothers by Loesch & Greenberg (1962) yielded results similar to those above regarding object loss and pregnancy. Many of the subjects in this second study were able to point out that their pregnancy may have resulted from attempts on their part to solve problems. For a time at least, their pregnancy did remove anxiety and depression.

Post-partum Psychosis

Women who experience severe psychological upsets after they give birth are believed to be suffering from intense oral conflicts and unfulfilled dependency needs. Benedek (1959), for example, states that post-partum pathology is brought about by the mother's regression to the oral phase and her identification with the oral needs of the infant.

In the course of treatment of a case of post-partum psychosis, Rosberg & Karon (1959) found that the patient had viewed pregnancy as "being filled with milk", the final solution to her oral problems. Childbirth signified catastrophic loss of oral gratification and precipitated psychosis.

A study by Ginsparg (1957) showed that women with post-partum psychosis, as opposed to normals, choose narcissistic love objects and are less mature in relationships with significant figures.

Another approach to post-partum psychosis is to explore the husband-wife relationship in cases of puerperal breakdown. Lomas (1959) reports that the husband-wife relationship in such cases is characterized by a dominant wife and passive husband. The wife assumes a pseudo-maternal attitude toward her husband as a sort of substitute for being taken care of herself. When the baby is born, however, the system breaks down because the wife turns to her husband for support rather than giving it to him.

Essentially, the mother becomes disturbed because she cannot tolerate all the demands upon her.

Psychosis Associated With Fatherhood

It is interesting to note that severe pathological reactions are sometimes shown by men in response to threatened or actual fatherhood. Zilboorg (1931) traces such psychoses associated with parenthood to an early and continuing, unresolved attachment to one of the parents. He contends that when a male is incestuously attached to his mother, the birth of his own child is a symbol of the illicit, fantasied relationship. The case of a 36 year old Catholic physician who became upset whenever his wife had another child is cited. "His children he treated as rivals; they were so many 'mouths' which competed with him, not as if he were the father of the children, but the brother of so many younger brothers he hated" (p. 930). Six cases in which the threat of parenthood precipitated mental illness in males are explored by Freeman (1951). He points to the same sort of Oedipal involvement as did Zilboory as a causal factor in the breakdowns.

The temporal relationship between a psychotic outbreak on the part of 28 hospitalized males and pregnancy or birth of a child in the patient's family has been investigated by Towne & Afterman (1955). The authors found a common theme in the husband-wife relationships of their patients. The husbands were very dependent upon the wives while the

wives were dominating, controlling "mothers" toward them. It is the opinion of the investigators that there has been too much emphasis on incest conflict in the etiology of disorders precipitated by fatherhood. Their impression is that pregenital dependency needs are the greatest contributors to the difficulty. "The father senses the child more as a rival for dependency than as a phallic competitor" (p. 26).

Other workers have found dependency conflicts in men to be aroused by the births of their children. In a study of the health of 327 husbands during their wife's pregnancy it was found that expectant fathers show more physical symptoms than do husbands of non-pregnant women (Trethowan & Conlon, 1965). The authors hypothesize that the symptoms may arise from the husband's attempts to deal with his hostile feelings about soon losing dependency gratification from his wife as a result of the birth of the baby.

Studies in Motivation for Parenthood

In all there have been only five actual research studies of motivation for parenthood. The material on parental motives cited earlier is largely hypothesis and speculation about parental motives, observation from clinical experience, and deduction from research studies of related matters.

The early method used to approach the question of motivation for parenthood was simply to ask subjects why they or people in general want babies. Dennison (1940)

questioned 400 members from the Princeton graduating classes of 1902, 1912, 1913, and 1921 about their reasons for wanting children. The answers the subjects gave are listed below by percentage of frequency mentioned:

1. Companionship -- 82%.
2. Perpetuation of family -- 66%.
3. Sense of creating and developing a new life -- 63%.
4. Wish for an ideal relationship between the parents -- 59%.
5. Meeting social obligations -- 40%.
6. Desiring to be conventional -- 35%.

A rather simple direct questionnaire approach was also used by Cavan (1959). He asked New Jersey and Iowa couples why they wanted babies. The five most frequent responses are below (p. 402-403):

- "1. We have always wanted to be parents.
2. We enjoy children.
3. It is the only way to fulfill a desire for a home of our own.
4. It is the only 'normal' thing for a couple to do.
5. Old age is happier for those who have children."

A series of research studies in motivation for parenthood have been carried out at Michigan State University. In 1965, Rabin administered 30 incomplete sentences regarding parental motives to 194 undergraduates. All of the subjects except two planned to have children eventually. "Large families" were viewed positively by 56% of the subjects, while two-thirds of the sample saw "childless marriage" negatively.

Although there were no significant differences between men and women in types of reasons given for having children, differences significant at the .001 level did appear in differential motivation attributed to men and women by both sexes. Narcissistic motivations such as self-enhancement, self-perpetuation, and proof of masculinity and virility were most often attributed to men. Motherhood, on the other hand, was seen as an instinctive and predestined function.

Rabin found that responses by the subjects could be placed in motivational categories. Altruistic responses were those which indicated a wish to care for and watch children develop. Responses classified Fatalistic were those which pointed to a predestined, instinctual type of motivation. The Narcissistic classification was used for responses indicating self-enhancement of the parents through parental identification with the child. Responses were designated Instrumental when they showed the intention of "using" the child for a purpose, such as to hold the marriage together or for social status.

In 1966, Rabin & Greene developed an 18-item questionnaire called the Child Study Inventory. The instrument was constructed for the purpose of tapping relatively conscious motivation for parenthood. They abstracted 14 of Rabin's (1965) sentence completion items and combined them with four filler items to complete the scale. A multiple-choice format from which it was possible to classify

responses into the four previously mentioned categories was used. Preliminary study of the Inventory with 36 college student subjects indicated no significant correlations between scoring categories and two and one-half week reliabilities as follows: Altruistic, .79; Fatalistic, .54; Narcissistic, .68; Instrumental, .53.

The most recent investigation in the motivation for parenthood area was conducted by Major (1967). The study was carried out for two purposes: (1) to develop a semi-structured projective technique called the Parental Picture-Story Completion Test in order to assess covert levels of motivation; and (2) to ascertain whether parents of well-adjusted children differ from parents of disturbed children in motives for parenthood.

The Parental Picture-Story Completion Test involved presentation of 9 pictures dealing with parents and children and subjects were asked to select and rank story endings for the story stem furnished with each picture. The endings offered corresponded to Altruistic, Fatalistic, Narcissistic, and Instrumental motivation categories. In addition, a second instrument, the Child Study Inventory developed by Rabin and Greene (1966) above was used. The direct measure was given to tap more conscious levels of motivation.

The instruments were administered to parents of 20 disturbed and to parents of 20 well-adjusted children. The Disturbed group consisted of parents of children referred to a child guidance clinic while the Adjusted group was composed

of parents of children judged well-adjusted by their teachers. The groups were approximately matched on sex, age of child, race, religion, and socio-economic level.

The results indicated sex differences in favored motivational categories. The direct instrument, for example, showed that females scored higher in Fatalistic motivation while males more often endorsed the Instrumental category. The differences between sexes were brought out more clearly in response to the projective instrument. Females scored higher on Altruistic and Fatalistic motivation while males responded more often in the Narcissistic and Instrumental categories. Sex differences were more salient in the Disturbed group.

Comparison of Adjusted and Disturbed groups on motivational categories with both tests yielded the same findings. Parents of well-adjusted children showed higher Altruistic motivation than parents of disturbed children. Although there were no significant differences between groups on the Narcissistic and Instrumental categories, as it was predicted parents of the disturbed children did more often tend to endorse those categories.

It was Major's overall impression that the instruments used "did not seem to be as sensitive as would be desirable in measuring the motivation for parenthood variables. Many of these (Child Study Inventory) items appear superficial and may not be tapping the critical motivations" (p. 85). She suggested a search through the relevant literature to

gather an extensive group of items for a more sensitive direct measure as the next logical step. Further, she contended that there may have been too much similarity in level of motivation tapped between her projective and direct devices. The results pointed to utilization of a more extensive and less transparent direct device and "more projective" type of picture device as fruitful for future study of parental motivation variables.

Theoretical Orientation

Social scientists have for many years been concerned with the influence of parental attitudes and behavior upon child adjustment. It has recently been suggested that parental motivational states are antecedent to attitudes and behavior of parents (Rabin, 1965; Major, 1967). Major's results would support the hypothesis of a relationship between parental motives and eventual adjustment of the child. The underlying motivational or need states are thought to give rise to parental attitudes and behavior which, in turn, carry the impact of the parental need states with their consequences for child adjustment.

Of the many possible reasons for having children what, then, are the motivations for parenthood critical in their impact upon the child? Both the needs of the parents as well as those of the child can normally be met in parent-child relationships. It is the contention of this paper, however, that when the dominant focus is upon the satisfaction

of parental needs with little emphasis on satisfaction of the child's needs, then the situation has pathological implications for child adjustment. Such a focus would be indicated by high Narcissistic and Instrumental motivation for parenthood. Nurturant or Altruistic motivation, on the other hand, implies that the focus for satisfaction in the parent-child relationship is primarily upon meeting the needs of the child. Such a situation would be indicative of good child adjustment. Support for this position is derived from the findings of Major (1967) with respect to the motivations of parents in the Disturbed as opposed to the Well-adjusted groups. It is, further, the position of this paper that those parents who focus primarily on their own needs in relation to the child do so because their own personality development has been in some way retarded or distorted.

Since motivation for parenthood is founded in the level of personal maturity and in the personality structure of the parents, parental motivation is likely to hold over time. In other words, the basic reasons that people have their children (motivation for parenthood) are likely to carry over into motivation toward their children (parental motivation) and will be consistently evidenced in parent-child interaction. Barring some sort of intervention in the parent-child relationship, focus upon satisfaction of either parent or child needs is likely to be consistent.

Need Focus: Support From the Literature

A number of workers have found that the most mature parents are those who view the child as an "end" in himself, rather than as a means of meeting their own needs. Lantz & Snyder (1962), for example, state: "The motivation for parenthood is mature when the child is not viewed as a means to a parental end but rather as an end in itself" (p. 302). Taylor (1955) maintains that of the four sets of parental attitudes (children are responsibilities, sources of satisfaction, nuisances, and potentialities), the only healthy approach is to view children as bundles of "potentialities to be released" (p. 465). Wise parents, he states, take a good deal of pleasure in watching the growth, development, and progress of their child. Finally, Rabin (1965) reports that the good mental health of children in Kibbutzim may be partly accounted for on the grounds that parents are not motivated to have them for specific purposes. Motivations for parenthood here are probably other than those of an instrumental nature because the children are cared for away from the parents.

More appears in the literature about the characteristics of "bad" than of "good" parents. Essentially, the reports support the contention that primary focus upon parental needs leads to unfavorable consequences for the child.

Lantz & Snyder (1962) hypothesize the presence of "immature motives for parenthood when the child is used to

aid the parent in the resolution of a personal difficulty such as loneliness, or as a source of fulfillment for frustrated personal wishes" (p. 300). It is pointed out that sometimes parents look upon children as a sort of "social security" -- security in old age and security in knowing that they have fulfilled society's expectations by having children.

Ackerman (1958) details innumerable "ulterior motives" for having children. He states that women may want a child "to neutralize anxiety concerning frigidity or sterility; to please or punish the husband; to use as a pawn in parental conflict", etc. (p. 167). He stipulates that whenever there is a disturbance in the husband-wife relationship, the motivations of the father toward his child will also be disturbed. Specifically, he mentions incidence of "noisy" fathering. In such cases the fathers may "put on a loud show of fatherly concern because of their intense need to exhibit themselves favorably, to win approval in other people's eyes" (p. 182).

The fact that being a housewife and not a mother is "not respectable" today is pointed out by Hoffman & Wyatt (1960). Having a baby may allow a woman to continue in her dependent relationship to her husband, prevent her from going to work, and give her a creative job while she continues in the traditionally feminine role. A woman may choose to have a baby more for the advantages that motherhood will bring her than for desire of a child.

Parents sometimes look to the birth of their child as a magic panacea or a solution to their sense of having been thwarted (Taylor, 1955). These parents may "tend to think of the child primarily as an instrument for fulfilling their own needs for affection, recognition, and mastery, and seek to manipulate him to their own ends" (p. 463). The manipulation may take the form of overindulgence or domination but in either case it sets the stage for behavior disorder. Levy (1943), in fact, has found that overprotective mothers of children who show various types of behavior disturbance were at one time very much thwarted in their actual desire for a child. Because of the strength of their own needs for children, such women dominate and overprotect their offspring when they do arrive.

Very often children who have been adopted are referred, at some time or another, to agencies for help with emotional problems. Humphrey & Ounsted (1964) and Ross & Anderson (1965) trace the course of such referrals to unconscious motivations of the parents toward the children. Ross and Anderson detail unconscious or withheld motivations of mothers in three cases of adoption. The first mother hoped that natural pregnancy would follow adoption. The second was a phobic woman who adopted a baby in order to avoid situations fearful to her. The third mother was bored with collecting antiques and on the verge of alcoholism so she sought a child as the solution to her situation.

Parental Attitudes and Behavior

It is the assumption of this investigation that parental attitudes and behavior may be regarded as variables intervening between motivation for parenthood and child adjustment. Research in the parental attitude and behavior area is voluminous, contradictory, and confusing.

One reason for the lack of clarity in the research literature is that parental attitudes and behavior are often treated as identical variables. On the contrary, an attitude may be regarded as a predisposition to respond in a cognitive or affective manner, while behavior is the actual parental response. Much confusion can be avoided, in addition, if it is kept in mind that perception of his own attitudes and behavior on the part of the parent probably differs from the child's perception of the same attitudes and behaviors. Finally, because a person expresses an attitude it does not necessarily follow that he will behave in accordance with that attitude (Thurstone, 1936). Attitude scales are often confounded because persons tend to answer the items in the socially approved way.

Attitudes

Many devices have been developed for the purpose of measuring parental attitudes. Often these instruments are used in connection with research which attempts to relate parental attitudes to child adjustment variables. Schaefer & Bell (1958) state that research up to 1958 had not been

successful in demonstrating relationships between attitudes and personality development. Studies examined attitude variables as parental dominance, control, restrictiveness, possessiveness, ignoring, and parent-child rapport without result.

In 1958, a device called the Parent Attitude Research Instrument (PARI) was constructed by Schaefer & Bell. The PARI has been used extensively in attitude research since it was devised. Two types of attitude dimensions have been factored from the instrument: (1) love-hostility; (2) autonomy-control. These two dimensions of parental attitudes are similar to those isolated in a series of other investigations of parental attitudes and parental behavior. Schaefer (1961) makes a series of hypotheses about dimensions of maternal behavior and child social-emotional behavior on the basis of the earlier PARI study.

Although many other attitude instruments have been developed since 1958, the PARI has been used most frequently for research purposes relating parental attitudes to child adjustment. Many research results using the instrument have been discouragingly negative (Zucherman, Oltean & Monashkin, 1958); Zucherman, Barrett, & Bragiel, 1960; Zunich, 1962; Medinnus, 1963; Brody, 1963; Zunich, 1966). Zucherman, Oltean, & Monashkin (1958), for example, found no differences on the PARI between attitudes of mothers of schizophrenics and of controls. Another example is furnished by Zunich (1966) who found that child behavior in a structured laboratory cannot

be predicted from analysis of PARI parental attitudes.

Probably one of the reasons that research with the PARI has failed to relate parent attitudes to child adjustment is that scores on the instrument are correlated with education of respondents (Schaefer & Bell, 1958; Zucherman, Ribback, Monashkin, & Norton, 1958). The better educated mothers often report more favorable child-rearing attitudes while the less well educated mothers show more authoritarian, suppressive, and hostile attitudes. It may be that the better educated mothers are sophisticated enough to give the "correct" responses.

The PARI is not the only attitude scale to result in negative findings. Burchinal (1958) employed the Shoben attitude survey (California Parent Attitude Survey, 1949) to test the relationship between parental attitudes and child adjustment scores. Contrary to his hypothesis, he found no relationships between the variables. Either parental attitudes are not related to child adjustment or most of the existing attitude instruments are not adequate to demonstrate the relationship. In any case, it appears that the attitude scale approach is simply not a fruitful one to consider including in the present study.

Parental Behavior

Schaefer (1959; 1961) contends that all existing conceptions of maternal behavior can be viewed as falling along the love-hostility, autonomy-control dimensions

mentioned above. The behavior of parents has been assessed through questionnaires, interviews, and observation of parent-child interaction.

An approach that has proved fruitful in studying the relationship between parental behavior and child adjustment variables is that of using children's perceptions of parent behavior. Ausubel, et. al. (1954) detail the rationale for such a method: "First, although parent behavior is an objective event in the real world, it affects the child's ego development only to the extent and in the form in which he perceives it. Hence, perceived parent behavior is in reality a more direct, relevant and proximate determinant of personality development than the actual stimulus content to which it refers . . . Second, it seems reasonable to suppose that children's perceptions of parent behavior and attitudes can be measured more validly than these latter phenomena themselves" (p. 173). In other words, children are probably more naive and, thus, more "honest" respondents than their more "devious" parents.

A number of measures of perceived parent behavior have been developed (Ausubel et. al., 1954; Williams, 1957; Roe & Sieglman, 1963). A recent device, the Bronfenbrenner Parent Behavior Questionnaire, has been constructed for the purpose of evaluating children's perceptions of their parent's behavior toward them. The BPBQ consists of 45 statements about parental behavior. The child is asked to indicate the extent to which the statements in the questionnaire are true

of the behavior of his mother and of his father toward him. The same items are used for both parents. The response options include such choices as: in most cases, sometimes, seldom, never, etc. Scores per item range from one to five so that a final high score shows endorsement of certain behavior while a low score indicates denial of a behavior tendency. The BPBQ purports to measure 15 behavior variables, with three items per variable. Some of the variables included are: nurturance, instrumental companionship, affiliative companionship, social isolation, expressive rejection, etc. (See Appendix E for items.)

Siegelman (1965) administered the BPBQ to fourth, fifth and sixth grade boys (N=81) and girls (N=131). Responses to the scale were factor-analyzed and the three factors of "Loving", "Punishing", and "Demanding" were derived. The three factors are described by Siegelman (1965, p. 168) below:

Factor I., labeled "Loving", depicts a parent who is readily available for counsel, support, and assistance. This parent enjoys being with his child, praises him, is affectionate, concerned, and has confidence in him.

Factor II., "Punishment", shows the greatest amount of consistency on factor scale loadings. This factor characterizes a parent who often uses physical and nonphysical punishment with little concern for the feelings and needs of his child, and frequently for no apparent reason. Although rejection or hostility by the parent is not explicitly noted in the item, it is strongly suggested.

A controlling, demanding, protecting, and intrusive parent is depicted in Factor III, "Demanding". This parent insists on high achievement, explains to his child why he must

be punished when such discipline is necessary, and becomes emotionally upset and distant when the child misbehaves.

It is possible to assign each subject a factor-score by combining the raw scores from variables high in factor loadings. Factor score reliabilities ranged from .70-.91 based upon the merged scores. Internal consistency of the combined scores was found to be higher than reliabilities of individual scales. Analysis of the test results indicates both sex differences in mother-father behavior toward the child and subject agreement that mothers and fathers behave differently, depending on the sex of the child. Siegelman suggests that the BPBQ shows considerable promise as a research instrument.

Studies Showing Positive Relationships between Parental Attitudes or Parental Behavior and Child Adjustment

In 1949, Shoben reviewed the literature relating parental attitudes and behavior to child adjustment. He concluded that the child's personality and behavior problems are related to child-rearing policies and their method of execution. He found, further, that overprotection, rejection, domination and repressiveness were parental behaviors associated with children's difficulties.

Since 1949, numerous studies have been conducted in the area. Research findings are summarized in a three part discussion below. First, two general studies in the field of child adjustment are considered. Second, there is

a discussion of those parental attitudes and behaviors shown to lead to emotional disturbances in children. Third, parental antecedents of delinquency are explored.

Ausubel et. al. (1954) studied the relationship between children's perceptions of acceptance-rejection and intrinsic-extrinsic valuation by parents, on the one hand, and components of the child's ego structure on the other. The Parent Attitude Rating Scale, a 36 item measure of the child's perception of the attitudes and behaviors of his parents toward him, was administered to 40 fourth and fifth grade children. The ego structure of the children was also assessed along dimensions such as level of ego aspiration, goal frustration tolerance, and personality maturity. Although perceived parental rejection was not found to be related to any ego structure variables, there was a significant relationship between extrinsic valuation of the child and lower quality of ego structure. Extrinsic valuation, or valuing the child for the functions he performs, would appear closely related to the Instrumental type of parental motivation mentioned previously.

The second study, by Gildea, Glidewell, & Kantor (1961), involved teacher ratings of 830 third grade pupils on a four point scale of adjustment. Mothers of the children were interviewed and questioned about possible emotional symptoms of the children in order to supplement the teacher ratings. The mothers were also asked to complete a 17 item attitude questionnaire. Mothers of the best adjusted children were able to perceive that there are many

influences on the behavior of their children, yet they felt themselves to be potent in influencing their children's behavior.

Many studies have investigated the attitudes and behavioral characteristics of parents of children referred to agencies for help with emotional problems. Becker, Peterson, Hellmer, Shoemaker, & Quay (1959), for example, found that when both parents suffer from emotional problems, give vent to unbridled emotions and are arbitrary in their dealings with the child, the family is likely to become a clinic referral.

In addition to being non-too-stable themselves emotionally, clinic parents have been frequently described as rejecting and controlling of their children.

Winder & Rau (1962) point to "parental ambivalence" as antecedent to social deviancy in preadolescent boys. They found that children who exhibit hostile aggression, inappropriate bids for attention, and other deviant behaviors have parents who scored high on affection and rejection attitude scales. The affection was seen by the authors as compensation for underlying rejection.

In a study by Krung (1965) the Parent Attitude and Behavior Check List was given to 167 parents of clinic "behavior problems" referrals. The clinic parents scored low in Warmth and high in Use of Isolating, Visible Suffering, Power Assertion, and Deprivation of Privileges. The subjects were characterized as hostile, having a negative

attitude toward the spouse, and strict in disciplinary technique.

Numerous studies have found that the parents of emotionally disturbed children differ from those of normal children in discipline techniques. Parents of disturbed children are said to be either too controlling and restrictive (Radke, 1946; Peterson, Becker, Heilmer, Shoemaker, & Quay, 1959), or too lax and indulgent (Abbe, 1958). Freeman & Grayson (1953) found a sort of subtly controlling behavior characteristic of mothers of schizophrenics as opposed to controls.

Disturbance in the control function of parental behavior appears antecedent to delinquency as well as to emotional disorder. Stogdill (1936), studied the parents of a group of children held on probation by the Juvenile Court. He found these parents to advocate much stricter discipline over children than the other groups of parents studied. Another example of overly strict control by parents of delinquent children is furnished by Madoff (1959). He compared the attitudes of 50 mothers of institutionalized delinquents and 57 mothers of normal children. The mothers of the delinquents showed more motivation to control the child through overt dominance and covert messages. It seems that, covertly, mothers of delinquents control the child by keeping him "indebted to the mother, dependent and passive" (p. 502).

In summary, then, parents of disturbed children have been shown to extrinsically value the child. They lack the feeling that they are potent to influence the child's behavior and are often rejecting and controlling in their behavior toward him.

Parental Motivation, Parental Behavior, and Child Adjustment

The present study deals with relationships between motivation for parenthood, parental behavior, and child adjustment variables. Briefly, it is the position of this paper that motivation for parenthood with focus on parental needs, punishing and demanding parental behaviors, and child emotional disorder will vary together. It is, further, the position of this paper that motivation for parenthood with focus on child needs, loving parental behavior, and good child adjustment will vary together.

Measuring the Motivation for Parenthood Variable

Before a variable can be measured, some consensus as to its definition must be reached. Edwards (1964) defines a motive as a construct or an inferred organismic variable. Motives cannot, however, be equated with a physiological substrate in the organism, according to Rappaport (1960). He maintains that they are, rather, "appetitive internal forces" (p. 187). McClelland (1965) has demonstrated that motives can be learned. He defines motives as "affectively toned associative networks" (p. 322) arranged in a hierarchy of strength.

Instruments

Since motivations have both conscious and unconscious components, the most efficient way to tap them is by concurrent utilization of a projective and an objective device. Allport (1953) asserts that both types of instruments are essential for the measurement of motivation because in a healthy personality most motivational components are available to conscious awareness. A neurotic individual, on the other hand, may reveal deep motivations only in response to a projective instrument. By asking subjects about their motives directly and by arousing repressed motives in response to projective stimuli, the motivational networks of all subjects are likely to be tapped. Getzels & Walsh (1958) advocate coupling of projective and direct devices because direct measures used alone are likely to elicit censored responses. When responding to a direct question, the subject is likely to temper his spontaneous reaction by noting the situation and his own motives and, then, answer in the way that appears appropriate to him.

The case for dual administration of direct and projective devices is further supported by Davids & Pildner (1958). The authors contend that the results of projective and direct devices should not be treated as essentially different poles. Rather, they should be looked upon as showing different quantitative results which help make up an accurate qualitative picture. Contrary to the position of Allport, they find that projective assessment instruments can

contribute a good deal to the study of the normal, as well as the neurotic personality.

Summing scores in motivational categories across measures would appear to give the most valid information on both covert and overt need states (Purcell, 1958; Sherwood, 1966).

Direct Device

A third-person questionnaire instrument, the Family Opinion Survey, to tap the more conscious levels of motivation for parenthood was developed for the purpose of this study. A detailed description of the instrument and its development is given in the Method and Procedure section.

Projective Device

Suggestions have been made as to the characteristics of the most efficient projective device for tapping unconscious levels of motivation.

It has been shown that a moderate level of stimulus ambiguity elicits the most information (Weisskopf, 1950; Kenny & Bijou, 1953; Kenny, 1954; Epstein & Smith, 1956; Lasser, 1961; Epstein, 1966). Both Kagan (1959) and Rabin (1961) point to the fact that the stimulus content should be suggestive or have a "pull" for the motive to be measured.

The advantages of custom-building projective devices for specific research purposes have been outlined by Little (1959), Lesser (1961), and Rabin (1961). Such an approach

increases the validity of the instrument by designing it to measure certain personality variables in the context of a specific theoretical framework.

The projective measure chosen for this research is a modification of the Parental Picture-Story Completion instrument used by Major (1967). The level of response ambiguity was increased by eliminating the original multiple-choice endings and requiring an open-ended story completion for each picture. It was hoped that such a modification of the projective instrument, in correspondence with the suggestions by Major, would facilitate the tapping of different levels of motivation by the objective and projective devices.

CHAPTER II

PROBLEM AND HYPOTHESES

The aim of the present investigation was to measure motivation for parenthood, both conscious and unconscious; to assess children's perceptions of their parents' behavior toward them; to examine the association between motivation for parenthood and children's perceptions of parental behavior; and, to determine the relationships of both motivation for parenthood and parental behavior (as viewed by children) to disturbed or healthy child adjustment.

In accordance with the aims of the study, the following hypotheses were tested:

- I. Parents of disturbed children will show more motivation for parenthood oriented toward satisfaction of parental needs. (2-tailed)
 - A. Parents of disturbed children will show more Narcissistic motivation for parenthood. (2-tailed)
 - B. Parents of disturbed children will show more Instrumental motivation for parenthood. (2-tailed)
- II. Parents of well-adjusted children will show more motivation for parenthood oriented toward satisfaction of child needs. (2-tailed)

Parents of well adjusted children will show more Nurturant motivation for parenthood.

(2-tailed)

III. There will be no differences between groups in Humanitarian, Fatalistic, or By-Product Scale motivation. (2-tailed)

IV. Parents of disturbed children will be more often perceived by their children as Punishing and Demanding (2-tailed)

A. There will be positive associations between Parent-Centered, Narcissistic and Instrumental motivations, in both groups, and child perceptions of parents as Punishing and Demanding.

(Pearson r 's)

V. Parents of well-adjusted children will more often be perceived by their children as Loving (2-tailed). There will be positive associations between Nurturant and Child-Centered motivations, in both groups, and child perceptions of parents as Loving (Pearson r 's).

CHAPTER III

METHOD AND PROCEDURE

Subjects

Subjects for the study were 30 parent couples and their male children. Two groups of 15 couples each were chosen on the basis of whether their children were disturbed (i.e., placed in a classroom for the emotionally disturbed or referred to a psychological clinic) or rated as well-adjusted by their teachers. Children with evidence of organicity or retardation were excluded.

The Disturbed group included 13 boys who displayed maladjustive behavior in the school situation to an extent which necessitated their removal from a regular classroom and placement in a special school (Lincoln) for the emotionally disturbed and 2 boys who were referred to a psychological clinic for help with adjustment problems. Group I for the study, then, consisted of 15 such children and their parents.

The Well-adjusted group of boys were those designated by their teachers as showing good emotional adjustment in the classroom situation, following a set of criteria used by Hereford (1963 -- see Appendix A). Group II, for the study, then consisted of 15 such well-adjusted children and their parents. Each child in the Disturbed group was

matched by finding a well-adjusted child with comparable family socio-economic level, age, and religion. Similar socio-economic level was approximated by matching fathers' educational levels (Miller & Swanson, 1960). Appendix B shows the control characteristics (age, religion, socio-economic level) by matched Adjusted-Disturbed family pairs. Exact educational levels and occupations of fathers are also given. The Appendix indicates that 12 of the 15 Adjusted-Disturbed pairs were matched perfectly on all three control criteria.

The final sample consisted of 30 children, ages 8-11, in the Disturbed and Adjusted groups combined. Each child in the Disturbed group was appropriately matched with an Adjusted child, and all child subjects were currently living with their natural parents. It was thought that the impact of parent motivations would be most evident in younger as opposed to older aged children. Subjects in the 8-11 year range were chosen because they are young enough to show maximal evidence of the variables considered but old enough to comprehend the requirements of the Bronfenbrenner scale. Finally, children in this age range are less likely than are younger children to show symptoms of transient disturbance (Gildea, et. al., 1961; Major, 1967). Only male child subjects were used in order to simplify sex difference effects and because disturbances in adjustment are more frequently reported for boys than for girls in the 8-11 year range.

Techniques

I. The Family Opinion Survey is a direct measure of parental motivation and was developed as part of the present research. It consists of 86 third person statements dealing with reasons for having children and parental expectations of them.

Instructions for the parent subjects are as follows:
 "We are interested in the opinions people have about the family. Please read the statements printed in the booklet. Show how strongly you agree or disagree with the opinions expressed by putting the appropriate number for each item on the answer sheet: as follows

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Mildly Disagree	Mildly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

Be certain that you have responded to every statement. If you have a question about how to respond to a statement, just do so on the basis of your own feelings and experience."

The 86 items of the Family Opinion Survey were classified into two groups of motivational subscales, with eight subscales in all. The first group of subscales is similar in motivational category content to that used by previous researchers in parental motivation (Rabin & Greene, 1966; and Major, 1967).

For this investigation the first group of subscales was defined as follows:

1. Nurturant motivation

Responses were classified Nurturant when they indicated

that the parent gains satisfaction from his ability to satisfy the child's needs. The parent is happy to care for the child, watch over him, and provide for him. He enjoys watching the growth, development, and maturing of the child. Nurturant motivation implies that the parent expects nothing in particular from the child in return for the parent's attention. The child does not have to do anything special. Although the welfare of the child is of primary importance, the parent does gain satisfaction from watching and participating in the developmental process. Finally, the parent actively chooses to have a child, to be nurturant toward him, and may wish to teach him things.

2. Humanitarian motivation

Responses were placed in this category when they indicated that the parent feels an internal sense of duty or obligation to have and raise his children. The obligation may be felt toward someone, an idea, a value, a religion, or society. This category includes ideas as to the "mature, right, proper, good" way to proceed. Items here may contain the inference that the good of society or all people is being served by the parent having children. Although parents who endorse many of these items may actively choose to have children, the child is thought of as secondary in importance to the "general good". The only parental expectancy of the child implied in Humanitarian motivation may be that the child behave in proper, "right", "good" ways.

3. Fatalistic motivation

Responses in the Fatalistic category indicate that parenthood is seen as an "Act of God", fate, nature, or a "natural consequence" of getting married. Notions about biological determination, or instinct, are included here. There are no parental preconceived expectancies toward children implied. Rather, parenthood is passively accepted and the attitude of parents toward the child is likely to be more casual than in the other types of motivation.

4. Narcissistic motivation

Narcissistic motivational responses indicate an attempt by the parent to meet his own infantile needs through the child. The parent may see the child as an extension of himself or as a way to relive his own youth. The child as a person is of secondary importance. He is a vehicle through which a parent can passively satisfy infantile needs. The child may meet parental needs simply through being the way he is and he is not required to perform a specific function or play a certain role. This category implies that the parent does actively choose to have the child and that he gains satisfaction from him. The satisfaction, however, relates to the unfulfilled needs of the parent and not those of the child. Narcissistic responses indicate that the parent reaps a sort of "intangible" need satisfaction from his offspring. Often the focus is on the child's meeting needs of either one parent or the other.

5. Instrumental motivation

Instrumental motivational responses indicate that the parent actively uses the child to gain rather "tangible" benefits. There is the definite parental expectation that the child has a role to fulfill, a function to perform. The child must behave in certain ways and be used for something. The child himself is largely of secondary importance to the special use for which he is intended. The parents may use him to gain approval from others, to give them companionship, or to help hold their marriage together. Often the child, by performing a special role, meets the needs of the parents taken together. Instrumental responses differ from Narcissistic responses in that the child must do something, and that he is somewhat incidental in the sense that any child could be used in such a way. Narcissistic responses contain references to parental needs and include the notion that the child is not incidental (i.e., this child is meeting certain parent needs by virtue of the way he is, not necessarily what he does).

The 86 items of the Family Opinion Survey were also classified into a second group of motivations consisting of three scales. The three motivational "need focus" scales, developed especially for this research, are defined below.

1. Child-centered motivational focus

Child-centered motivational focus is shown by responses indicating a primary concern for the welfare of the child and an enjoyment of the child for himself.

Satisfaction of parental needs is given only secondary emphasis. The parent does take pleasure in the qualities and characteristics of the child but places no special demands upon him. The child is only expected to be himself. The parent actively chooses to have the child and offers him love, respect, security, discipline, protection, nurturance, interest. Responses in this category may contain references to the parent teaching the child things and concern that the child avoid the mistakes the parent feels himself to have made.

2. Parent-centered motivational focus

Parent-centered motivation includes primary concern with the needs of the parent and the child is seen as an avenue for meeting them (either actively as in Instrumental motivation above, or passively as in Narcissistic motivation above). The child, as a person, is secondary in importance while the needs of the parents are primary. The child may be used as a tool for parent need satisfaction or as an object to be manipulated, a commodity. A parent who endorses many parent-centered responses will not offer his child much nurturance or respect. He may offer love, security, and protection if the child is able to satisfy him by fulfilling a specific function.

3. By-product motivation

Responses which show emphasis on neither the emotional needs of parent nor child were placed in the By-product category. Here, children are seen as a natural

happening, instinctual product, or as the consequence of duty and obligation. There may be passive acceptance of children as a natural occurrence or active planning to have children as a matter of duty. In any case, little is invested in the child from the standpoint of the needs of the parent and there may be only minimal concern with the child as a person.

Stages in the development of the instrument were:

1. Collection of a large item pool (200 items) relating to motivation of parents was carried out. The material was gathered from the literature and from inspection of some of Rabin's (1965) original sentence completion responses.

2. Third-person statements of motivation were developed from the item pool in accordance with suggestions for motivational measurement by Edwards (1964). The statements included references to subjects' feelings, behavior, beliefs.

3. Approximately 50 of the 200 items were eliminated because they were poorly worded, ambiguous, or redundant.

4. Pilot study: The 151 item instrument which remained was administered to introductory psychology student subjects (27 males; 25 females).

5. As a result of the pilot study using the instrument with the student subjects, many items were eliminated from the scale. Twenty-five items were discarded because they did not appear to contribute information relating to the motivational scales in mind. Omitted items were of the filler type, as those on birth control, and questions about the family in general.

For the 126 items remaining, time one-time two tetrachoric correlations were computed in order to provide an approximate index of reliability (Chesire, Saffir, Thurstone, 1933; Jenkins, 1955; Guilford, 1965). Ten of the 126 items were eliminated because they were found not to be stable at the minimal criterion of the .01 level of significance. The cut-off point used here was a test-retest correlation of .35, the minimal level at which a Pearson product moment correlation is significant at .01 ($N=52$). The retained 116 items were estimated to be approximately stable at or beyond the .01 level.

6. The stable 116 items were classified by the author into the two groups of scales on the basis of subscale descriptions as given above.

- a. 105 items in the first group of categories (five subscales)
- b. 106 items in the second group of categories (three subscales)
- c. Two items, although reliable, were found to be unclassifiable by either system and, hence, eliminated.

7. Item analysis: Complete data from the 52 subjects' first and second administration of the device was submitted to the computer for analysis of the 114 apparently usable items. The data analysis was an attempt to gain information about item reliability and subscale validity so that a final form of the FOS could be refined from the 114 item pool. All intercorrelations and reliabilities in this final stage of the data analysis were exact Pearson product moment r 's.

Data obtained included:

- a. Total item intercorrelations
- b. Reliability $T_1 - T_2$ of the complete scale
- c. Exact $T_1 - T_2$ item reliabilities
- d. Analysis of the eight subscales
 - 1) Correlations of each item with its subscale
 - 2) Reliability of subscales
 - 3) Correlations between subscales

In order for an item to be included in the final form of the FOS it had to meet the following criteria:

- (1) ~~Test-retest~~ reliability at or beyond the .01 level of significance.
- (2) Correlation of the item with its own subscale .35 or higher (.01 level of significance).
- (3) The correlation of the item with its own subscale higher than its correlation with any other subscale.

Of the total 114 items submitted for analysis, 86 items were found to satisfactorily meet the criteria outlined above. These 86 items constitute the final form of the FOS. Test-retest reliability of the instrument is .976. Subscale reliabilities range from .64 to .79 (see Appendix D-1). Correlations of the motivational subscales with one another range from .11 to .67 (see Appendix D-2).

8. The Family Opinion Survey was devised to measure the more conscious motivations of parents for and toward their children. As it stands in final form, the FOS has demonstrated adequate reliability. Further, motivational subscale consistency has been established in that there is a higher degree of association among the items within each

subscale than between items across subscales. Appendix D-3 lists all 86 items of the FOS by the motivational categories in which they are classified.

II. Four selected pictures of the Parental Picture-Story Completion test (Major, 1967) were used as an indirect measure of parental motivation.

In a pilot study for the present investigation, Major's original nine picture device was modified by the elimination of the forced-choice endings. The device consisted, then, of nine projective pictures with a story stem for each, and asked for an open-ended completion response. The nine pictures with story stems were administered to 10 subjects (5 male; 5 female). Each of the subjects was married and the parent of one or more children.

Open-ended responses of the pilot study subjects were rated as to type and strength of motivations for parenthood expressed. It was found that four of the stimulus cards (Cards I, II, III, and IX) were most productive of the motivation for parenthood material desired. These four cards with their story stems were used, then, for the major study and the projective instrument was called the Picture-Story Free Response Test (PSFRT).

The parent subjects for the present study, consequently, were instructed: "Four pictures concerning parents and their children will be shown to you. Each picture is accompanied by the beginning of a story about the picture. You are to write an ending to the story for each picture.

Be sure to include in the ending something about the reasons that the parents in the picture want or wanted children and what they will or do expect from them. Use your imagination as to the thoughts and feelings of the adults in the pictures."

After story endings were collected, they were scored in accordance with the two groups of motivational categories as described above. The scoring system was developed on the basis of the same category descriptions as was used for the FOS (see Appendix C-1 for scoring manual). Adequate reliability in scoring by two judges using the system was demonstrated. Spearman-Brown estimates of interjudge reliabilities for all subjects on each motivational category were calculated from Pearson product-moment correlations based on the responses of a random sample of 15 subjects. Appendix C-2 shows both Pearson r and Spearman-Brown interjudge reliabilities by motivational classification. Based on the estimate of correlations between judges for all subjects, the reliabilities vary from .71 for Narcissistic motivation to .98 for Fatalistic motivation.

Using the projective instrument, then, each parent received a score for each type of motivation for every story (1-4 points per story).

1 point - no evidence for the motivation

2 points - some evidence

3 points - moderate evidence

4 points - strong evidence

Scores were then summed across stories for motivational

categories. The minimum possible motivational score per category was 4, while the maximal motivational score for each category was 16. (Story stems for the four projective pictures are listed in Appendix C-3.)

III. The unpublished Bronfenbrenner Parent Behavior Questionnaire was administered to all child subjects as a measure of the behavior of their fathers and mothers toward them. The questions about mothers and fathers are identical but answered separately. The questionnaire consists of 45 statements about each parent to which the child is asked to respond (see Appendix E). Responses generally indicate how frequently the parent shows the behavior in question. When the scale was factor analyzed (Siegelman, 1965) it was found to assess parental behavior along three dimensions:

(1) Loving, (2) Punishment, (3) Demanding.

The directions are to be read aloud by the teacher (or another adult) while the children read silently. The directions for the mother form of the questionnaire are: "The following questions are about different ways mothers act toward their children. Read each question carefully and think how well it describes the way your mother acts toward you.

"Put a circle around the number in front of the answer which you think is most true of your mother. For example, if your mother always lets you off easy when you are bad, you would put a circle around number 5 in the following example:

She lets me off easy when I am bad

1. never
2. hardly ever
3. sometimes
4. most of the time
5. always

Names of disturbed and well-adjusted boys were supplied by Lincoln School, MSU Psychological Clinic, and six area schools. Parents of disturbed children from Lincoln were sent a letter directly from school personnel explaining the purpose of the study and stating that they would be contacted soon by the writer to set a convenient time for testing (see Appendix E). Names of boys, rated by their teachers as well-adjusted, were supplied by the principals of six local elementary schools. Parents of the well-adjusted children were sent two letters (one from the school and one from the writer) explaining the study and asking for participation. All subjects were called for appointments, and in all cases testing was carried out in the family homes.

Administration of Measures

The instruments were first administered to the Disturbed children and their parents in their homes. The parents were given PSFRT materials at the beginning of the testing session and then the child was asked to join the writer in another room to complete his questionnaires. Finally, each child subject was assured that his parents would not be told of his responses. In all cases, the projective device was given to parents before the direct

measure of parental motivation. Administration of the projective before the direct measure has been recommended by Davids & Pildner (1958) and Getzels & Walsh (1958) as a way to maximize the effectiveness of the projective material. As soon as matched Well-adjusted children were located, the same administration procedure was followed for them and for their parents as for the Disturbed group.

After completing the two motivation instruments the parents were asked to answer questions as to: age, number of years of marriage; number of children, ages of children; husband's occupation and education; if they used planned parenthood for any of their children; if the child in this sample was a planned birth.

Scoring and Statistical Treatment of Data

Each parent subject received parental motivation scores by categories for the projective and direct device. It was not possible, as originally planned, to sum scores by categories across both instruments since correlations between questionnaire and projective responses for all motivations were low. The score of a couple, however, was equal to the sum of the father's and the mother's scores for each type of motivation. Total possible scores on the categories varied because of different numbers of items per motivational category in the subtests. Scores of motivational subscales were not comparable for individual subjects but means of subscale scores were compared for the Disturbed and

Well-Adjusted groups. Both mother and father received total scores from their child for each of the three behavior factors of the BPB. Since Adjusted and Disturbed group subjects were paired on the basis of the control criteria, dependent t-tests for the significance of the difference between the means of matched group were carried out in all cases (Guilford, 1965). Dependent t-tests were also used in sex difference comparisons to determine the significance of the difference between married pairs in motivation for parenthood and perceived parental behavior.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Parent-need Oriented Motivation: Hypothesis I

Hypothesis I was a prediction stating that parents of disturbed children would show more motivation for parenthood oriented toward satisfaction of their own needs than would parents of well-adjusted children. Specifically, it was predicted that parents of disturbed children would show more Narcissistic, Instrumental, and Parent-Centered motivation. It should be noted that all five hypotheses of the study concern predictions about parents (i.e., mother and father taken together) of disturbed as opposed to well-adjusted children. Since subgroup comparisons (as, Adjusted Group mothers--Disturbed Group mothers) are relevant to each of the hypotheses, however, these comparisons will be reported and discussed along with material on the parents combined.

Table 1 gives the results of a series of dependent t-tests comparing the mean scores of parents in the Adjusted group with those of parents in the Disturbed group on Narcissistic motivation for both instruments. Reference to the Family Opinion Survey section of Table 1 indicates that the means of Adjusted Group mothers and fathers taken alone and as a pair were higher than those of parents in the

Disturbed group for Narcissistic motivation. The trend, then, is opposite to the predicted direction. There were, however, no significant differences between groups.

Table 1. Narcissistic motivation: means, standard deviations, and between-troup t values on the Family Opinion Survey and Picture-Story Free Response Test.

FOS	Mean	SD	Between-Group t
Mothers			
Adjusted	70.13	9.05	
Disturbed	60.33	15.67	1.866 N.S.
Fathers			
Adjusted	64.47	9.05	
Disturbed	57.67	15.64	1.445 N.S.
Combined Pairs			
Adjusted	134.60	13.07	
Disturbed	118.00	24.01	2.097 N.S.
PSFRT	Mean	SD	Between-Group t
Mothers			
Adjusted	6.93	2.60	
Disturbed	7.13	1.46	-0.252 N.S.
Fathers			
Adjusted	7.13	2.56	
Disturbed	6.53	1.46	0.638 N.S.
Combined Pairs			
Adjusted	14.07	4.25	
Disturbed	13.67	1.50	0.324 N.S.

N = 15 in each group.

Reference to Table 1 with regard to the Picture-Story Free Response Test similarly indicates that there were no significant differences between Adjusted and Disturbed groups for mothers and fathers taken alone or together on Narcissistic motivation. Since there were no significant differences

between groups on either instrument, Hypothesis I with respect to Narcissistic motivation was not confirmed.

Table 2 shows mean scores relating to differences between the Adjusted and Disturbed groups on Instrumental motivation. The top portion of the table concerns between group comparisons on the Family Opinion Survey, while the bottom portion shows between group differences on the Picture-Story Free Response Test. Reference to the Family Opinion Survey section of Table 2 shows that mothers of the Adjusted group gave significantly more Instrumental responses (.05 level) than did mothers of the Disturbed group. The table, further, indicates that for the questionnaire there were no additional differences between Disturbed and Adjusted groups on Instrumental motivation. That is, neither Disturbed Group fathers taken alone nor Disturbed Group fathers and mothers taken together differed significantly from their Adjusted Group counterparts.

Of the six possible group comparisons relating to Instrumental motivation, then, five resulted in no significant differences between the means of Adjusted and Disturbed Groups. One comparison on the questionnaire, that of Mothers-Adjusted vs. Mothers-Disturbed, showed the mean of the Adjusted group to be significantly higher than that of the Disturbed group and the results were in the direction opposite that predicted. Thus, Hypothesis I with respect to Instrumental motivation was not confirmed.

Table 2. Instrumental motivation: means, standard deviations, and between-group t values on the Family Opinion Survey and Picture-Story Free Response Test.

FOS	Mean	SD	Between-Group t
Mothers			
Adjusted	59.07	13.54	
Disturbed	48.33	14.20	2.202 *
Fathers			
Adjusted	54.53	10.72	
Disturbed	50.13	12.80	0.876 N.S.
Combined Pairs			
Adjusted	113.60	17.20	
Disturbed	98.47	19.22	2.102 N.S.
PSFRT	Mean	SD	Between-Group t
Mothers			
Adjusted	6.13	1.64	
Disturbed	5.53	2.00	0.831 N.S.
Fathers			
Adjusted	7.67	2.82	
Disturbed	6.13	1.64	1.527 N.S.
Combined Pairs			
Adjusted	13.80	3.45	
Disturbed	11.67	2.50	1.502 N.S.
N = 15 in each group		* = Sig. .05 level	

Table 3 indicates that the third prediction relating to Hypothesis I, that parents of the Disturbed group would show more Parent-Centered motivation than parents of the Adjusted group, was also not confirmed with either instrument. Considering the Family Opinion Survey alone, it can be seen that the mean scores of the Adjusted group mothers and fathers are consistently, although nonsignificantly, higher than those of the Disturbed group.

Table 3. Parent-centered motivation: means, standard deviations, and between-group t values on the Family Opinion Survey and Picture-Story Free Response Test.

FOS	Mean	SD	Between-Group t
Mothers			
Adjusted	131.40	21.04	
Disturbed	110.66	29.83	2.101 N.S.
Fathers			
Adjusted	125.27	21.97	
Disturbed	110.93	30.33	1.385 N.S.
Combined Pairs			
Adjusted	256.67	29.77	
Disturbed	221.60	45.15	2.260 *
PSFRT	Mean	SD	Between-Group t
Mothers			
Adjusted	8.60	2.29	
Disturbed	8.67	1.54	-0.085 N.S.
Fathers			
Adjusted	9.00	2.70	
Disturbed	8.27	2.55	0.679 N.S.
Combined Pairs			
Adjusted	17.60	4.03	
Disturbed	16.93	3.15	0.461 N.S.

N = 15 in each group

* = Sig. .05 level

When the mean scores of Adjusted and Disturbed group parents were taken together mothers and fathers of the Adjusted group gave significantly more Parent-Centered responses (.05 level) to the Family Opinion Survey and results were opposite the predicted direction. There were no significant differences between groups on the Picture-Story Free Response Test for Parent-Centered motivation. Hypothesis I with respect to Parent-Centered motivation was not confirmed.

Thus, since no significant differences between groups in motivation for parenthood oriented toward satisfaction of parental needs were found by means of the PSFRT, and since parent-need oriented motivation in two out of nine group comparisons on the FOS was higher in the Adjusted than in the Disturbed group, no portion of Hypothesis I was confirmed.

Child-need Oriented Motivation: Hypothesis II

Hypothesis II stated that parents of well-adjusted children would show more motivation for parenthood oriented toward satisfaction of the child's needs. Specifically, it was predicted that parents of the Adjusted group would show more Nurturant and Child-Centered motivation than parents of the Disturbed group. Reference to Tables 4 and 5 will indicate that this hypothesis was, by means of the Family Opinion Survey only, partially confirmed.

Table 4 concerns Adjusted-Disturbed group comparisons for Nurturant motivation. It shows that, on the Family Opinion Survey, Adjusted Group means for fathers alone and for mothers and fathers together were significantly higher (.05 level) than means of the Disturbed group. Although the difference between the mean scores of Adjusted and Disturbed group mothers was not statistically significant, Table 4 indicates that consistent with the other comparisons, Adjusted Group mothers also tended to score higher on Nurturance. There are, on the other hand, no significant differences between means of the Adjusted and Disturbed

groups on the Picture-Story Free Response Test Nurturant motivation category.

Table 5 shows that results of t-tests of differences between the means of Adjusted and Disturbed groups for Child-Centered motivation were similar to those for Nurturant motivation. Here, means of the Adjusted group were consistently higher than those of the Disturbed group on both instruments. The only significant differences between groups, however, were found in scores on the Family Opinion Survey. Adjusted Group fathers taken alone and Adjusted Group fathers and mothers together gave significantly (.05 level) more Child-Centered responses to the FOS than did Disturbed Group fathers alone or mothers and fathers together. There were no significant differences between groups for Child-Centered motivation on the projective instrument.

Hypothesis II, then, with regard to the Family Opinion Survey was confirmed at the .05 level for four out of a possible six comparisons. On both Nurturant and Child-Centered motivation, fathers of well-adjusted children and mothers and fathers of well-adjusted children together scored higher than did fathers of disturbed children or mothers and fathers of disturbed children as a pair.

Table 4. Nurturant motivation: means, standard deviations, and between-group t values on the Family Opinion Survey and Picture-Story Free Response Test.

FOS	Mean	SD	Between-Group t
Mothers			
Adjusted	48.40	7.71	
Disturbed	44.40	11.97	1.029 N.S.
Fathers			
Adjusted	48.53	6.47	
Disturbed	40.33	11.22	2.438 *
Combined Pairs			
Adjusted	96.93	10.04	
Disturbed	84.73	17.85	2.416 *
PSFRT	Mean	SD	Between-Group t
Mothers			
Adjusted	7.93	2.74	
Disturbed	8.53	2.77	-0.542 N.S.
Fathers			
Adjusted	6.73	2.19	
Disturbed	6.87	2.23	-0.172 N.S.
Combined Pairs			
Adjusted	14.67	3.52	
Disturbed	15.40	3.92	-0.562 N.S.

N = 15 in each group

* = Sig. .05 level

Table 5. Child-centered motivation: means, standard deviations, and between-group t values on the Family Opinion Survey and Picture-Story Free Response Test.

FOS	Mean	SD	Between-Group t
Mothers			
Adjusted	55.93	8.27	
Disturbed	51.27	12.99	1.124 N.S.
Fathers			
Adjusted	55.40	7.48	
Disturbed	46.00	12.71	2.426 *
Combined Pairs			
Adjusted	111.33	12.04	
Disturbed	97.26	19.85	2.527 *
PSFRT	Mean	SD	Between-Group t
Mothers			
Adjusted	8.00	2.85	
Disturbed	7.73	1.95	0.253 N.S.
Fathers			
Adjusted	7.13	1.81	
Disturbed	6.93	2.15	0.305 N.S.
Combined Pairs			
Adjusted	15.13	3.25	
Disturbed	14.67	3.27	0.394 N.S.

N = 15 in each group

* = Sig. .05 level

Additional Motivations for Parenthood:
Hypothesis III

Hypothesis III was a 2-tailed prediction that there would be no significant differences between Adjusted and Disturbed groups on Fatalistic, Humanitarian, or By-Product motivation. Tables 6, 7, and 8 show that Hypothesis III was confirmed for Fatalistic motivation by both instruments, and for Humanitarian and By-Product motivation by the Family Opinion Survey only. Some further support for the hypothesis is furnished by the Picture-Story Free Response Test, however. There were no significant differences by means of the projective instrument between groups on Humanitarian motivation except for the mothers and fathers together comparison. Contrary to the prediction here, Adjusted Group mothers and fathers scored higher on Humanitarian motivation than did Disturbed Group mothers and fathers (.05 level). Finally, there were no significant differences with the projective instrument between the Adjusted and Disturbed group mothers on By-Product motivation. The PSFRT did, however, show significant differences between Adjusted and Disturbed groups on the other two comparisons for By-Product motivation, i.e., fathers alone and mothers and fathers together. Table 8 indicates that the Adjusted Group subjects scored higher here (.02 level). Thus, the prediction that there would be no significant differences between groups was confirmed for 15 of the 18 possible Adjusted-Disturbed group comparisons relevant to Hypothesis III. Hypothesis III must

be regarded as basically confirmed.

The outcome of Hypotheses I-III which related specifically to differences in motivation for parenthood between mothers and fathers (combined) of well-adjusted and disturbed children are summarized below. Hypothesis I proposed that parents of disturbed children would show more parent-need oriented motivation for parenthood. The hypothesis was not confirmed and, in the case of Parent-Centered motivation in fact, when means of mothers and fathers were combined the Adjusted group scored higher and results were in the direction opposite that of the prediction.

Table 6. Fatalistic motivations: means, standard deviations, and between-group t values on the Family Opinion Survey and Picture-Story Free Response Test.

FOS	Mean	SD	Between-Group t
Mothers			
Adjusted	34.80	4.54	
Disturbed	31.66	9.00	1.169 N.S.
Fathers			
Adjusted	33.67	3.87	
Disturbed	28.47	11.49	1.698 N.S.
Combined Pairs			
Adjusted	68.47	6.62	
Disturbed	60.13	16.93	1.750 N.S.
PSFRT	Mean	SD	Between-Group t
Mothers			
Adjusted	4.73	1.05	
Disturbed	4.33	.82	1.103 N.S.
Fathers			
Adjusted	4.33	.82	
Disturbed	4.53	1.19	-0.564 N.S.
Combined Pairs			
Adjusted	9.07	1.39	
Disturbed	8.87	1.30	0.360 N.S.

N = 15 in each group

Table 7. Humanitarian motivation: Means, standard deviations, and between-group t values on the Family Opinion Survey and Picture-Story Free Response Test.

FOS	Mean	SD	Between-Group t
Mothers			
Adjusted	32.47	4.81	
Disturbed	30.60	9.68	0.747 N.S.
Fathers			
Adjusted	31.60	6.25	
Disturbed	30.33	8.47	0.429 N.S.
Combined Pairs			
Adjusted	64.07	7.29	
Disturbed	60.93	14.51	0.703 N.S.
PSFRT	Mean	SD	Between-Group t
Mothers			
Adjusted	6.27	2.22	
Disturbed	5.40	1.50	1.233 N.S.
Fathers			
Adjusted	6.20	1.82	
Disturbed	5.00	1.25	2.016 N.S.
Combined Pairs			
Adjusted	12.47	3.25	
Disturbed	10.40	1.72	2.318 *

N = 15 in each group

* = Sig. .05 level

Table 8. By-product motivation: means, standard deviations, and between-group t values on the Family Opinion Survey and Picture-Story Free Response Test.

FOS	Mean	SD	Between-Group t
Mothers			
Adjusted	74.27	9.28	
Disturbed	66.53	16.74	1.572 N.S.
Fathers			
Adjusted	70.47	7.88	
Disturbed	62.73	17.86	1.505 N.S.
Combined Pairs			
Adjusted	144.73	13.49	
Disturbed	129.27	28.79	1.849 N.S.
PSFRT	Mean	SD	Between-Group t
Mothers			
Adjusted	6.47	1.64	
Disturbed	6.07	1.83	0.685 N.S.
Fathers			
Adjusted	7.73	2.87	
Disturbed	5.27	1.33	2.902 **
Combined Pairs			
Adjusted	14.20	3.63	
Disturbed	11.33	2.29	2.954 **
N = 15 for combined		** = Sig. .02 level	

Hypothesis II proposed that parents of well-adjusted children would show more child-need orientated motivation for parenthood. The hypothesis was confirmed for both Nurturant and Child-Centered motivation by the questionnaire, but for neither motivation by the projective instrument. Hypothesis III proposed that there would be no differences between mean scores of parents of well-adjusted and disturbed children on three additional motivations for parenthood: Fatalistic, Humanitarian, By-Product. The hypothesis was

confirmed by both instruments for Fatalistic motivation and by the conscious measure for Humanitarian and By-Product motivations. Contrary to the predictions, however, parents of well-adjusted children showed more Humanitarian and By-Product motivation on the projective device.

Perceived Parental Behavior; Demanding Punishing: Hypothesis IV

Hypothesis IV stated that parents of disturbed children would be perceived by their offspring as more demanding and punishing than would parents of well-adjusted children. It was also predicted that there would be positive associations between parent-need oriented motivation for parenthood and perception of the parents by the child as demanding and punishing.

Tables 9 and 10 show that the first portion of Hypothesis IV, that parents of disturbed children would be perceived by their children as more demanding and punishing, was confirmed.

Disturbed Group mothers and fathers taken together were rated significantly higher by their sons on the Demanding scale of the BPBQ than parents of the Adjusted Group (.05 level) were rated. Parents of the Disturbed group were also rated significantly higher by their children on Punishing (.02 level). The tables also indicate that all differences between means of the sub-groups (with the exception of mothers: Adjusted vs. Disturbed on Demanding), for both demanding and punishing behavior, were significant and in the direction predicted.

Table 9. Demanding behavior: means, standard deviations, and between-group t values on the Bronfenbrenner Parent Behavior Questionnaire (BPBQ).

Group Comparisons	Mean	SD	Between-Group t
Mothers			
Adjusted	40.33	5.64	
Disturbed	45.20	7.89	-1.794 N.S.
Fathers			
Adjusted	36.40	5.22	
Disturbed	43.27	8.77	-2.497 *
Combined Pairs			
Adjusted	76.73	10.22	
Disturbed	88.46	15.47	-2.284 *

N = 15 in each group

* = Sig. .05 level

The second portion of Hypothesis IV stated that there would be a positive correlation between parent-need oriented motivation for parenthood (namely, Narcissistic, Instrumental, and Parent-Centered motivations) and ratings of parents as demanding and punishing. It was expected that a positive relationship would be found here regardless of a parent's Adjusted or Disturbed group membership. Tables 11 and 12 indicate that, on the whole, the predicted relationships were not found for either punishing or demanding behavior, and hence the latter portion of Hypothesis IV was not confirmed.

Table 11 gives the Pearson product moment correlations between scores on the Demanding scale of the BPBQ and the three parent-need oriented motivations. It can be seen that the significant correlations were in a negative, rather than the predicted positive direction. Further, it should be noted that each of the correlations which was large enough to

Table 10. Punishing behavior: means, standard deviations, and between-group t values on the BPBQ.

Group Comparisons	Mean	SD	Between-Group t
Mothers			
Adjusted	24.73	5.75	
Disturbed	33.73	9.30	-2.593 *
Fathers			
Adjusted	24.67	5.45	
Disturbed	33.40	10.27	-2.453 *
Combined Pairs			
Adjusted	49.40	10.22	
Disturbed	67.13	18.27	-2.707 **

N = 15 in each group

* = Sig. .05 level

** = Sig. .02 level

be significant resulted from the relationship between Demanding and a motivational scale on the Family Opinion Survey. There was no significant correlation between Demanding and any parental motivation with the projective instrument. Within the Disturbed group, however, the PSFRT showed an interesting pattern of high, although nonsignificant, correlations. For both Narcissistic and Parent-Centered motivation the projective instrument showed a high positive correlation with Demanding for the Disturbed group mothers, and an equally high but negative correlation with Demanding for the Disturbed group fathers. The correlations of Adjusted Group mothers and fathers here, on the other hand, were both in the same direction. It would appear that, in the Disturbed but not the Adjusted group, mothers with high Narcissistic and Parent-Centered motivation are perceived by their sons as demanding while fathers with

Table 11. Correlations between scores on the Demanding scale of the PBPQ and scores on Narcissistic, Instrumental, and Parent-Centered motivation on the Family Opinion Survey and Picture-Story Free Response Test.

BPBQ	Group	Mothers		Fathers		Combined	
		Narcissistic FOS	PSFRT	Narcissistic FOS	PSFRT	Narcissistic FOS	PSFRT
Demanding	Adjusted	.01	-.15	-.06	-.01	-.00	-.13
	Disturbed	-.02	.43	-.32	-.48	-.22	-.03
	All Subjects	-.14	.10	-.33	-.24	-.31*	-.10
BPBQ	Group	Mothers		Fathers		Combined	
		Instrumental FOS	PSFRT	Instrumental FOS	PSFRT	Instrumental FOS	PSFRT
Demanding	Adjusted	-.16	.39	.01	.15	.01	.21
	Disturbed	.12	-.07	-.59*	-.13	-.17	-.26
	All Subjects	-.12	-.31	-.42*	-.14	-.26*	-.17
BPBQ	Group	Mothers		Fathers		Combined	
		Parent-Centered FOS	PSFRT	Parent-Centered FOS	PSFRT	Parent-Centered FOS	PSFRT
Demanding	Adjusted	-.04	.46	-.06	.10	.02	.34
	Disturbed	.15	.33	-.45	-.33	-.15	-.20
	All Subjects	-.06	.34	-.41*	-.20	-.26*	-.00

N = 30 Adjusted Subjects (15 female, 15 male)

N = 30 Disturbed Subjects (15 female, 15 male)

N = 60 All Subjects (30 female, 30 male)

* = Sig. .05 level.

equally high Narcissistic and Parent-Centered motivation are not.

Table 12 gives the Pearson product moment correlations between scores on the Punishing scale of the BPBQ and the three parent-need oriented motivations. The significant correlations between Narcissistic motivation and Punishing were again in a negative direction and occurred only with the objective instrument. There were no significant correlations between Punishing and Instrumental motivation, on either instrument. The only support found for the prediction of a positive relationship between Punishing and parent-need oriented motivation was furnished by the two significant correlations between Punishing and Parent-Centered motivation. On the projective instrument, Parent-Centered motivation and Punishing correlated positively for Adjusted Group fathers (.52) and for the Adjusted group mothers and fathers combined (.42). The two correlations significant here, however, could possibly be due to chance.

Perceived Parental Behavior;
Loving: Hypothesis V

Hypothesis V stated that parents of well-adjusted children would be perceived by their offspring as more loving than would parents of disturbed children. It was also predicted that there would be a positive association between child-need oriented motivation for parenthood and perception of the parents by the child as loving.

Table 12. Correlations between scores on the Punishing scale of the BPBQ and scores on Narcissistic, Instrumental and Parent-Centered motivation on the Family Opinion Survey and Picture-Story Free Response Test.

BPBQ	Group	Mothers		Fathers		Combined	
		Narcissistic FOS	PSFRT	Narcissistic FOS	PSFRT	Narcissistic FOS	PSFRT
Punishing	Adjusted	-.61*	.19	-.04	.16	-.26	.25
	Disturbed	-.12	-.24	.00	.06	.01	-.30
	All Subjects	-.38*	.02	-.13	.01	-.25*	-.01
BPBQ	Group	Mothers		Fathers		Combined	
		Instrumental FOS	PSFRT	Instrumental FOS	PSFRT	Instrumental FOS	PSFRT
Punishing	Adjusted	-.06	.19	.19	.45	.29	.34
	Disturbed	.08	.13	-.08	-.18	.20	.08
	All Subjects	-.17	.04	-.09	-.04	-.12	-.04
BPBQ	Group	Mothers		Fathers		Combined	
		Parent-Centered FOS	PSFRT	Parent-Centered FOS	PSFRT	Parent-Centered FOS	PSFRT
Punishing	Adjusted	-.31	.31	.29	.52*	.21	.42*
	Disturbed	.04	-.23	-.04	.01	.03	-.16
	All Subjects	-.25	.03	-.04	-.09	-.16	.01

N = 30 Adjusted Subjects (15 female, 15 male)

N = 30 Disturbed Subjects (15 female, 15 male)

N = 60 All Subjects (30 female, 30 male)

* = Sig. .05 level

Table 13 shows the differences between mean scores attributed to parents of the Adjusted and the Disturbed groups by their sons on loving behavior. As the table indicates, none of the three comparisons made resulted in significant differences between groups. Parents of well-adjusted children were not seen as more loving, and the first portion of Hypothesis V was not confirmed.

Table 13. Loving behavior: means, standard deviations, and between-group t values on the BPBQ.

Group Comparisons	Mean	SD	Between-Group t
Mothers			
Adjusted	45.93	5.41	
Disturbed	47.13	6.01	-0.589 N.S.
Fathers			
Adjusted	52.20	6.18	
Disturbed	51.73	6.09	0.194 N.S.
Combined Pairs			
Adjusted	98.13	10.94	
Disturbed	98.87	10.83	-0.178 N.S.

N = 15 in each group.

The second portion of Hypothesis V stated that there would be a positive correlation between child-need oriented motivation for parenthood (namely, Nurturant and Child-Centered motivations) and perception by the child of his parents as loving. A positive relationship was expected here regardless of a family's Adjusted or Disturbed Group status. Correlations between scores of parents on Loving, and Nurturant and Child-Centered motivations are given in Table 14.

Table 14. Correlations between scores on the Loving scale of the BPBQ and scores on Nurturant and Child-Centered motivation on the Family Opinion Survey and Picture-Story Free Response Test.

BPBQ	Group	Mothers		Fathers		Combined	
		Nurturant FOS	PSFRT	Nurturant FOS	PSFRT	Nurturant FOS	PSFRT
Loving	Adjusted	.12	-.11	.53*	.24	.35	.07
	Disturbed	.21	-.17	-.21	-.10	.14	-.21
	All Subjects	.14	-.13	.07	.07	.18	-.07
BPBQ	Group	Mothers		Fathers		Combined	
		Child-Centered FOS	PSFRT	Child-Centered FOS	PSFRT	Child-Centered FOS	PSFRT
Loving	Adjusted	.11	.33	.43	.02	.31	.28
	Disturbed	.18	-.10	-.20	.06	.12	-.05
	All Subjects	.13	.13	.05	.04	.16	.11

N = 30 Adjusted Subjects (15 female, 15 male)

N = 30 Disturbed Subjects (15 female, 15 male)

N = 60 All Subjects (30 female, 30 male)

* = Sig. .05 level

Since only one of the correlations in Table 14 reached significance, the second portion of Hypothesis V was not confirmed. Inspection of the table will indicate that for the Adjusted group all correlations, with one exception, between the child-need oriented motivations and Loving were positive, i.e., in the predicted direction. One of these correlations, that for Adjusted Group fathers on Nurturant motivation with the objective instrument was high enough to differ significantly from chance (.05 level). Several other positive correlations narrowly missed reaching a significant level. The Disturbed group, in contrast, showed no consistent relationship between scores on Loving and either Nurturant or Child-Centered motivations.

Hypotheses IV and V, then, related to perceived parental behavior and the association between perceived parental behavior and parental motivation. The outcomes of the hypotheses are summarized below. Hypothesis IV predicted, first, that disturbed children would perceive their parents as more punishing and more demanding than well-adjusted children. The first part of Hypothesis IV was confirmed. The second portion of Hypothesis IV proposed that there would be positive relationships between parent-need oriented motivation for parenthood and ratings of parents on demanding and punishing behavior. The second part of Hypothesis IV was not confirmed. In fact, many of the significant correlations found here were in a negative rather than the expected positive direction. Hypothesis V proposed, first, that

well-adjusted children would perceive their parents as more loving than would disturbed children. No differences between groups were found and the first part of Hypothesis V was not confirmed. Hypothesis V also predicted that there would be positive relationships between child-need oriented motivation for parenthood and perception of parents as loving. A suggestion of the positive association predicted was found for the Adjusted but not for the Disturbed group, and thus, the second part of Hypothesis V was not confirmed.

Additional Findings

Sex Differences in Parental Motivation

There were no significant differences between the mean scores of males and females for any motivational category on the Family Opinion Survey (Table 15, Appendix G). Although the means of the females were a good deal higher than those of the males on Fatalistic, Narcissistic and By-Product motivations, none of the sex differences was large enough to be significant.

Table 16 (Appendix G) indicates that there were significant sex differences in parental motivation on the projective instrument. Females gave significantly more Nurturant (.05 level), and males gave significantly more Instrumental responses (.05 level) to the Picture-Story Free Response Test. It appears, then, that of the two instruments the projective device was more sensitive to sex differences in parental motivation.

Sex Differences in Parental Behavior

There were significant differences between mean scores assigned by child subjects to their mothers and fathers on two of the three Bronfenbrenner Parent Behavior scales (Table 17, Appendix G). The boys in the sample rated their mothers as more demanding (.01 level) and their fathers as more loving (.01 level). There were no significant differences between parents in mean scores on punishing behavior.

Table 18 (Appendix G) shows the mean parental behavior scores assigned to mothers and fathers, separately by group. It can be seen that Adjusted Group females were rated as more demanding than males (.01 level). There were no significant differences between mean scores of males and females in the Disturbed group on demanding behavior. Adjusted Group boys saw their mothers as more punishing than their fathers (.02 level), but there were no differences between ratings of mothers and fathers on punishing behavior in the Disturbed group. Finally, boys in both the Adjusted and Disturbed groups judged their fathers as showing more loving behavior toward them than their mothers (.01 level). The consistently higher *t* value within the Adjusted group would suggest that well-adjusted boys were able to discriminate between the behavior of their mothers and fathers toward them more clearly than were disturbed youngsters and/or that there are, in fact, more clear cut differences in behavior of mothers and fathers within the Adjusted group.

Parental Motivation and Planned Parenthood

It was anticipated that parents who planned the time of the birth of the child included within the sample might show a different pattern of parental motivations than parents who did not plan their child's birth. Only five couples in the Adjusted group and two couples in the Disturbed group claimed that the birth of the child included in the study was planned. The ratio of planned to unplanned births was so small that no statistical comparisons of parental motivation were made on that basis. A tally of the answers of parents in both groups to a question about whether they had planned the time of the births of their children showed that eight couples in the Adjusted group planned the births of one or more children, while only three Disturbed group couples claimed to have done so.

Relationship between Objective and Projective Measures of Parental Motivation

The Adjusted group showed a consistent series of low to high positive correlations between corresponding motivational categories on the Family Opinion Survey and Picture-Story Free Response Test (Table 19, Appendix G). Humanitarian motivation $r = -.44$) was the single exception in this series of positive associations for parents of well-adjusted children. Four of the eight correlations between projective and questionnaire motivational categories for the Disturbed group, however, were negative.

Since none of the correlations between motivational categories on the two instruments for either group reached significance, there did not appear to be a high consistency between the two devices with respect to level of conscious awareness tapped. The projective device would seem to have measured parental motivation at a different level of awareness than did the questionnaire. Of the two groups, however, Adjusted Group parents showed the most consistency in their answers.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The present study was based upon two central propositions. It was suggested, first, that the conscious and unconscious motivations of parents for having a child have an impact on the ultimate psychological adjustment of that child. Secondly, it was proposed that the means by which parental motivations have their impact upon eventual child adjustment is through the behaviors of the parents toward the child, as the child perceives them.

Hypotheses

In order to test the validity of the two central propositions five hypotheses, founded on the theoretical orientation outlined in Chapter I, were developed. It was postulated that if a parent's own personality development was incomplete or distorted, his conscious and unconscious motivations for parenthood would include the hope or expectation that the child meet his unfulfilled emotional needs and that disturbed child adjustment would result (Hypothesis I). If, on the other hand, a parent had reached a sound and mature level of personality development himself, he would expect to find primary satisfaction from parenthood in meeting the emotional needs of the child and

good child adjustment could be expected (Hypothesis II). There are motivations for parenthood such as those arising from cultural, religious, and naturalistic beliefs which do not imply an expectation on the part of the parent to meet either his own or the child's emotional needs. It was proposed that both parents who are mature and those who have immature or distorted personality development would have equal amounts of the non-need dominated types of parental motivations (Hypothesis III). If parents of disturbed children are concerned with the child's meeting their emotional needs, they would be perceived by the child as behaving toward him in punishing and demanding ways (Hypothesis IV). Finally, if parents of well-adjusted children do seek satisfaction in meeting the needs of the child they would be perceived by the child as behaving toward him in loving ways (Hypothesis V).

The results of the study indicate clear-cut differences, statistically significant with one instrument or the other, between parents of disturbed and well-adjusted children on six of the eight motivations for parenthood measured. No significant differences with either instrument were found between groups for the Fatalistic or Narcissistic categories. In all cases of significant differences between groups, with both measures, the parents of well-adjusted children received higher motivational scores.

Outcome

The outcomes of the hypotheses and additional findings of the investigation are briefly reviewed below. Hypothesis I was not confirmed, and results were in the direction opposite the prediction, since parents of well-adjusted children gave responses showing more parent-need focused motivation (Parent-Centered and Instrumental categories) for parenthood. Hypothesis II was partially confirmed since parents of well-adjusted children gave more child-need focused motivational responses to the questionnaire, but not to the projective instrument, than did parents of disturbed children. Hypothesis III was basically confirmed because there were few differences between groups on the non-need oriented motivations. The projective instrument, however, elicited more responses in the Humanitarian and By-Product categories from parents of well-adjusted than from parents of disturbed children.

There were significant differences between the Adjusted and Disturbed groups on ratings of perceived parental behavior as well as in parental motivation. Hypothesis IV was confirmed for the prediction that parents of disturbed children would be judged by their sons as showing more demanding and punishing behavior than parents of well-adjusted boys. The positive association expected between demanding and punishing behavior and parent-need oriented motivation was not confirmed. In fact, the results allow no basis upon which to make a definitive statement

of the relationship when Adjusted and Disturbed groups are combined. There was the suggestion, however, of a negative relationship between punishing and demanding behavior and parent-need focused motivation within the Disturbed group. As opposed to the Disturbed group and in accordance with the prediction, within the Adjusted group the results pointed to more of a positive association between the variables. Hypothesis V was not confirmed for the prediction that parents of well-adjusted children would be perceived as more loving, since child subjects in both groups perceived their parents as showing equal amounts of loving behavior. Again, when both groups were combined, there was no clear-cut positive association between loving behavior and child-need focused motivation. And again, as for Hypothesis IV above, the results suggest confirmation of the predicted positive association between parental motivation and behavior for the Adjusted but not for the Disturbed group.

Additional Findings

The study showed several interesting additional findings. The FOS questionnaire was not sensitive to sex differences in parental motivation. The projective instrument did indicate differences between the sexes, however, since fathers gave significantly more Instrumental and mothers significantly more Nurturant responses. There were sex differences in perceived parental behavior with both the groups combined and within each group separately. When

ratings of the well-adjusted and disturbed groups were combined, mothers were judged more demanding and fathers were seen as more loving. There were no differences between parents on ratings of punishing behavior. The data were also analyzed separately by group. Within the Adjusted, in contrast to the Disturbed group, sex differences were more clear-cut. Adjusted group mothers were seen as significantly more demanding and punishing, while fathers were judged significantly more loving. In the Disturbed group fathers were rated more loving than mothers, but there were no significant differences between parents on the other two behavior dimensions.

There were differences between groups in the reported use of planned parenthood for the control of family size and spacing of births. More parents of well-adjusted children claimed to have planned the birth of the child included in the sample than parents of disturbed children. The proportion of parents who stated that they had used planned parenthood for any of their children was higher in the Adjusted (8 out of 15) than in the Disturbed (3 out of 15) group.

Correlations between comparable scales of the questionnaire and projective measures of parental motivation were generally low. Results show more consistency in parental motivation as tapped by the two instruments in the Adjusted than in the Disturbed group.

The following section of this chapter deals with confirmed parts of hypotheses and with the additional findings as outlined above. Next, predictions which were not confirmed

are discussed. The final section offers suggestions for future research.

Confirmed Hypotheses and Additional Findings

Parental Motivation

The results of this study do indicate that parents of well-adjusted children are concerned with meeting the needs of the child more than are parents of disturbed children. The fact that differences between groups were found only with the questionnaire and not with the projective instrument may have special implications. There is a real possibility, of course, that on an unconscious level as well the parents of disturbed and well-adjusted children do actually differ with respect to child-need focused motivations. The projective instrument may simply not have been sensitive to such differences. On the other hand, the results obtained indicate that a conscious awareness on the part of the parent of his satisfaction in meeting the child's needs has positive implications for the child's emotional adjustment. Nurturant and Child-Centered motivations connote a real focus by the parent on the needs of another--his child. Perhaps an individual must have reached a mature and healthy level of personality development himself in order to spare energy for a deep concern with the welfare of someone else (Erikson, 1950).

One of the most interesting findings regarding differences between groups on the child-need focused motivations

is that while mothers of the two groups did not significantly differ from one another, fathers did. The results suggest that it is critical to the eventual adjustment of the boy that his father be concerned that the child's emotional needs are satisfied. Curiously, therefore, the data indicate that the father's concern may even be more crucial to the child's well-being than the mother's. In accord with this conclusion, recent clinical literature emphasizes the importance of the father's impact on the emotional health of his children (Lidz, et. al., 1965a; Mishler, 1966).

Major, in her 1967 study, found the same sort of focus upon the child's welfare in the parents of well-adjusted children and a similar lack of child-need oriented motivation in the Disturbed group parents. Although Major called her child-need focused category "Altruistic", inspection of items in the measurement techniques she used shows the Altruistic category to be very similar to the Child-Centered and Nurturant motivational classifications used in this research.

Sex Differences in Parental Motivation

No significant sex differences in parental motivation were found with the questionnaire. The lack of significant differences may be related to the puzzling fact that females tended to score higher than males on all motivations with the Family Opinion Survey. Possibly, females tend to be more "agreeable" when a questionnaire is of the agree-disagree

continuum type. On the other hand the items used were of the third-person variety (as, "People want children because . . .") and it could be that women simply have more sensitivity to their own motives or empathy with the motivations of others than men. Either of these explanations is consistent with the fact that Major did find sex differences on the Child Study Inventory questionnaire when she used a forced-choice answer format. A forced-choice method of responding would eliminate possible effects of the tendency to agree (acquiescence set) and would control for quantitative variations from subject to subject in sensitivity to motives of self and others.

The Picture Story Free Response Test, in contrast to the opinion survey, did isolate sex differences in parental motivation. Females gave significantly more Nurturant, and males significantly more Instrumental responses. The results here are consistent with Major's finding that, although sex differences appeared with both her objective and projective measures, the projective device was more sensitive to them. The results of both studies would suggest that males and females differ most from one another on the more unconscious levels of motivation. Further, the sex differences found in the present investigation are consistent with Major's conclusion that females show more Altruistic and Fatalistic, and males more Instrumental and Narcissistic motivation. In the present study, however, the PSFRT did not show significant differences on the Fatalistic or Narcissistic categories.

Perceived Parental Behavior

As predicted, results indicate that there were real differences between well-adjusted and disturbed children in the way they perceived their parents' behavior toward them. Since disturbed children did rate their parents as more punishing and demanding, the postulated relationship between disturbed emotional adjustment and perceived parent behavior was confirmed.

When the Adjusted and Disturbed groups are compared with respect to the ranges of raw scores assigned parents on both Punishing and Demanding scales, the Disturbed group shows a wider spread of scores. The spread of scores as well as the distribution, with Disturbed Group parents more often scoring at the extreme ends of both ranges, suggests that there may be a curvilinear relationship between Punishing behavior, and Demanding behavior of parents and child adjustment. In other words, although their mean scores were higher overall, the parents of disturbed children were both more and less punishing and demanding than parents of well-adjusted boys. The question then arises as to what amounts of punishing and demanding behavior are critical for healthy child adjustment. Data here tend to indicate that a low to moderate amount of punishing and demanding behavior on the part of parents, as in the Adjusted group, is predictive of good child adjustment.

The present study is, in the writer's knowledge, the first research investigation using the BPBQ to compare responses

of normal to those of disturbed children. The results here are in accord with material cited earlier to the effect that parents of disturbed children are hostile or rejecting and controlling since Siegelman (1965) concluded, on the basis of his factor analysis of the Bronfenbrenner Parent Behavior Questionnaire, that the Punishment scale of the measure carries strong connotations of rejection.

There is no clear evidence for confirmation of the theoretical position that parental behavior stems from motivation for parenthood. It does seem that there is a more direct and positive, as predicted, relationship between motivation for parenthood and behavior for the Adjusted than for the Disturbed group. Many of the correlations between parent-need oriented motivation and ratings of punishing and demanding behavior, and child-need oriented motivation and ratings of loving behavior were positive for the Adjusted group. A thorough consideration of the puzzling aspects of these relationships for both Adjusted and Disturbed Groups will follow in a later section of this chapter.

Sex Differences in Perceived Parental Behavior

When the parental behavior ratings of well-adjusted and disturbed boys were combined, there were significant differences in the way the boys saw their mothers and fathers. Mothers were judged to show more demanding behavior and fathers were rated as more loving. There were no sex differences in ratings of punishing behavior. The results may,

in part, be explained by the fact that most of the mothers in both groups did not have jobs but were full-time housewives. It is possible, then, the boy sees mother as the requiring, demanding parent since she is in charge of the house during the day. He may see her as something of a damper on his fun and find her expectations of him troublesome. On the other hand, father probably comes home from work at the end of the day and spends some time playing with his son. It is likely that both parents share the task of disciplining the boy but that father, in contrast to mother, may not require too much of him. Consequently, boys in the 8-11 year old range could have a more thoroughly pleasant relationship with their fathers than their mothers. It is also possible that the BPBQ is tapping a boy's identification with his father in this age group. By this time a boy probably has allied himself with his father against the womenfolk and the behavior of his mother, at least in contrast to his father, may have taken on rather distasteful connotations. It would be interesting to see whether girls in the 8-11 year old range view their mothers more favorably than did the boys in this sample.

When ratings of parental behavior were examined for the groups separately, there were larger differences in the perceived behavior of mothers and fathers in the Adjusted than the Disturbed group. The data may suggest that well-adjusted boys can more clearly discriminate between the behavior of their parents. Another, not inconsistent,

possibility is that parents of well-adjusted boys show clearer distinctions in sex role behavior to their sons than do parents of boys who become disturbed.

The Adjusted group boys viewed their mothers as significantly more punishing and demanding than their fathers, while disturbed boys saw their mothers as only somewhat more demanding and punishing. Although both groups rated their fathers as more loving, the distinction on loving behavior between mothers and fathers was stronger (a larger t) for the Adjusted group. In line with the explanation above, it is indeed possible that the BPBQ is measuring something akin to identification with the father and that well-adjusted boys have a stronger identification with their fathers at this age than do disturbed boys. A conclusion relating to the normal emotional development of boys can be made from comparing the responses of the two groups to the Bronfenbrenner measure. The data indicate that, at least by ages 8-11, boys who are emotionally healthy will tend to ally themselves with their fathers and against their mothers, thereby endorsing male and rejecting female role behavior.

The fact that well-adjusted boys rated their mothers as more punishing and demanding than their fathers while disturbed boys did not may have still further implications. Perhaps this finding underscores an inability on the part of mothers of disturbed boys to set clear limits for acceptable behavior. Mothers of well-adjusted boys may take more responsibility for disciplining than do mothers of disturbed

boys. It is, of course, a frequent clinical observation that mothers of children referred for help with emotional problems have difficulty in establishing and enforcing limits.

Planned Parenthood

As reported previously, parents of well-adjusted boys claimed to have planned the birth of the child included in the sample more often (5 couples in the Adjusted group; 2 couples in the Disturbed group) than did parents of disturbed boys. Furthermore, a tally of the answers of parents in each group to a question about whether they had planned the time of the births of their children showed that parents in the Adjusted group planned the births of their children more often (8 couples in the Adjusted group; 3 couples in the Disturbed group). There would seem to be a suggestion here of some sort of a relationship between the use of planned parenthood and the emotional health of their children. A review of recent literature revealed no research studies on the issue but clinicians often observe that disturbed children were often "unwanted", i.e., not planned, an unwelcome surprise.

Relationship between FOS and PSFRT

The general low correlations between scores on the motivational categories with the two tests suggest: (1) the two measures were sensitive to qualitative differences in

motivation and/or; (2) different levels of motivation were tapped.

The opinion survey appears to have been sensitive to the adjustment-disturbance dimension since it discriminated between groups on four out of the eight motivational categories. The projective device could discriminate between Adjusted and Disturbed Groups on only two of the eight possible parental motivations. In contrast to the FOS, however, it was sensitive to differences in motivation between males and females.

As has been reported, there were more consistently positive correlations between scores on the two measures in the Adjusted than in the Disturbed group. The consistency of the Adjusted group lends support to Allport's (1953) notion that non-neurotic persons have more motivational components available to conscious awareness. Admittedly for this study to support Allport's position, the assumption must be made that the parents of the Adjusted group here either were not neurotic or that they were at least less neurotic than parents of the Disturbed group. Such an assumption seems reasonable but could be disputed. Finally, Major (1957) reasoning from Allport's position predicted that there would be larger differences in parental motivation scores between objective and projective measures for the Disturbed than for the Adjusted group. Although Major's results did not confirm the hypothesis, the findings of this study tend to support her original prediction. The reason

that this and not Major's own study found the Adjusted group to be more consistent is probably that the PSFRT is "more projective" than Major's original multiple-choice projective test. Consequently, the levels of motivation for parenthood tapped in this study were more disparate than they were in the prior investigation.

Unconfirmed Hypotheses

Generally, three predictions of the study were not confirmed by the results: (1) that parents of disturbed children would show more parent-need oriented motivation for parenthood than parents of well-adjusted children; (2) that parents of well-adjusted children would be perceived as more loving than parents of disturbed children; (3) that there would be positive relationships between parent-need focused motivation and perceived demanding and punishing behavior, and between child-need focused motivation and perceived loving parental behavior. Three types of factors could have been responsible, all or in part, for the fact that the predictions were not confirmed. Theoretical foundations of the study, instruments used, and subject variables will each be examined in turn so as to determine their respective contributions to unexpected results.

Theoretical Foundations

Parental Motivation

It was the theoretical position of this study that when parental motivation is focused on the satisfaction of the parents' needs, the situation has pathological implications for the emotional adjustment of the child. Parents of disturbed children, consequently, were expected to report more parent-need oriented motivation for parenthood than parents of well-adjusted children. The results show that parents of well-adjusted children have a dual motivational focus--both on their own and the child's needs. Parents of disturbed children, in contrast, showed a motivational focus on neither their own nor the child's needs.

What sorts of conclusions, then, can be drawn about the validity of the theory in relation to the study's outcome? It seems to the writer that three alternative conclusions are possible. First, the theory is inaccurate and should be revised to coincide with results to the effect that parents of well-adjusted children actually do have a dual motivational focus, while parents of disturbed children have neither. Second, the theory is sound but the instruments did not tap the parent-need oriented motivations of the Disturbed group because parents of disturbed children have less conscious and unconscious awareness of their own and the motives of others than do parents of well-adjusted children. Third, the theory is inaccurate in its assertion

that motivation for parenthood itself affects level of child adjustment and it is, rather, some variable related to parental motivation that has an impact on adjustment.

The first option is to take the results at face value and revise the theory about parental motivation in accord with the study's outcome. The suggestion to revise the theory is particularly tenable since no research study has actually proven that parents of disturbed children have overriding parent-need focused motivations. Although Major (1967) found a trend for parents of disturbed children to show more Narcissistic and Instrumental motivation than parents of adjusted children, the results were not statistically significant. Conceptually, there are four possible types of motivational need focus:

- (a) Child but not parent-need orientation
- (b) Parent but not child-need orientation
- (c) Dual parent and child-need orientation
- (d) Neither parent nor child-need orientation

Major (1967) found (a) for the Adjusted group and trends toward (b) for the Disturbed group, while this writer found (c) for the Adjusted and (d) for the Disturbed. If either the parental motivation instruments used here were more sensitive than those of the previous study or if the Adjusted and Disturbed groups here represented more extreme ends of the adjustment-disturbance continuum, then the actual state of affairs may be more clearly shown by the results here than by Major's study and the theory should be revised. There is,

further, some reason to believe that the FOS may be more sensitive than the shorter and more transparent Child Study Inventory used by Major as well as that the PSFRT with its free response endings is "more projective" than Major's multiple-choice projective instrument. In addition, it is quite probable that this study included a more severely disturbed clinical population than the previous work. Although they had been referred to a child guidance clinic for help with emotional problems, Major's Disturbed Group children were (in the writer's knowledge) able to attend school in regular classrooms. Thirteen of the fifteen disturbed children in this sample were so emotionally upset that they had to be removed from the regular classroom and placed in a special school setting. In addition, the emotional disorders of the children in the present sample were of a long standing nature while the problems of the children in Major's Disturbed Group had appeared only shortly before testing. There are, then, several arguments in favor of accepting the results at face value and altering the theory about the impact of different types of motivation on child adjustment.

If the results are an accurate reflection of the state of things, what sort of theoretical explanations can be offered? It is quite reasonable to assume that in order for a family to produce an emotionally healthy child, parent-child relations must be mutually satisfying. Possibly parents of children who become disturbed are not obtaining

the satisfactions that they might from parenthood and, consequently, view their child as a burden and responsibility. On the one hand it may not be rewarding to them to meet the child's needs for nurturance and, on the other, they may have no expectation that the child will help to meet their own needs. The child in such families would be emotionally "superfluous" and probably ignored. In contrast, parents of well-adjusted children may not only expect to enjoy nurturing the child, but also anticipate that the child will give them something in return. The results here indicate that Adjusted Group parents are aware of their own expectations of their children and can report ways in which having children fulfills some of their own emotional needs. In a like manner, the higher overall means of the Adjusted group and females on both instruments can be interpreted to mean that parents of well-adjusted children and mothers are freer to become involved with and more concerned for having and raising children than parents of disturbed children or males, i.e., more overall motivation for parenthood. A likely interpretation of the results, then is that there are more pathological implications in a parent's ignoring the child (i.e., hoping to satisfy neither child nor parent emotional needs within the context of the parent-child relationship) than in his expecting to gain some emotional satisfactions from the child.

The second possible interpretation of the fact that the results did not confirm some of the predictions is that

the theory is sound. The most likely explanation here is that parents of well-adjusted children simply have more awareness of their own motivations, and more empathy for the motives of others.

In accordance with the second interpretation, perhaps neither device actually measured parental motivation but, rather, a variable related to it such as awareness of or sensitivity to motives. A high sensitivity on the part of a subject to his own feelings and motivations concerning parenthood would enable him to identify with the adults pictured in the PSFRT and lead to fairly high category scores. On the other hand, since the questionnaire is of a third-person format (for example, "People want children because they help strengthen the family"), a high score in any category reflects the subject's ability to recognize or empathize with the motives of others.

Possibly parents of well-adjusted children can admit to themselves less pleasant or "desirable" motivations toward their children and are, in this sense, more self-accepting. The results could indicate that, in contrast, parents of disturbed children deny that they look to their children for satisfaction of any of their own emotional needs. Further, awareness of their strong, pervasive motivations for having children on the part of Adjusted Group parents might account for the finding of differences between them and parents of disturbed children on the By-Product and Humanitarian motivational scales of the PSFRT. Sensitivity to one's own

motivations would likely have more impact on projective than questionnaire test scores.

If indeed parents of well-adjusted children are more sensitive to their own motivations, they may also be more readily able to empathize with the motives of others--an ability which the FOS format requires. The writer's observation of the subjects as they took the tests would support this notion. Parents in the Disturbed group, while responding to the FOS, often made comments to the effect that "Nobody could feel that way." One father, for example, insisted "There's only one reason for having children." He was referring to a sort of obligation to the natural, "God-given", order of things. In contrast, parents in the Adjusted group often commented, "Well, I don't feel that way but I see how some people could."

The "differential sensitivity to motives" explanation would clarify at least two puzzling findings in regard to motivational scores of the Disturbed group. First, it would explain why the parents of the two best adjusted children in the Disturbed group (those attending regular classes and not placed in a special school) scored higher on most motivational categories of both instruments than the mean for their group, i.e., appeared more like the Adjusted group in their answers. The Disturbed group showed, secondly, a consistently larger variance on the motivational categories of the FOS than the Adjusted group. It seems Adjusted Group parents had a higher, and more limited, range of sensitivity

to the motives of others. If Disturbed Group parents had an unusually low level of sensitivity for the motivations of others, they would have a wider range for variability in scores from parent to parent and, consequently, the observed larger variance would result.

The "differential sensitivity" explanation since it does not require revision of the original theory, is also consistent with the assumption that if a parent's personality development is incomplete or distorted, then unconscious motivations for parenthood become important. The results of this study show that if the motivations postulated for the Disturbed group were actually present, the subjects were too defensive to acknowledge them. With the PSFRT the Disturbed group did, however, appear more parent-need oriented in relation to the Adjusted group than it did on the FOS. While the Adjusted group scored higher on the questionnaire scales of Instrumental and Parent-Centered motivation, there were no differences between groups here on the projective device. The possibility is, then, that an instrument even less structured than the PSFRT, if such a measure were available, might have uncovered a real parent-need focus in the Disturbed group.

Finally, the writer in her interaction with Disturbed group parents made several observations which support the theory as originally proposed and suggest that the data may not represent the true motivational state of things. It was supposed that those parents most likely to have disturbed

children are immature, dependent individuals who expect the child to meet their needs. The writer's observation was that Disturbed Group fathers, particularly, seemed childlike and dependent. During her visit to the home, several of these men singled the disturbed child out from their other children and asked that he wait on them or take care of a younger sibling. One of these Disturbed Group fathers stands out from the others as remarkably immature, inadequate, and dependent. At the beginning of the testing session, Mr. C. insisted that he could not read or write and would, therefore, be unable to do the job asked of him. When the writer told Mr. C. that if he wished she would be happy to read the material out loud and write down his responses for him, he set grudgingly to work. Soon, thereafter, he commented that if he had known how much trouble the tests were going to be he would not have been at home when the appointment time came. Slowly and with many lapses in concentration Mr. C. filled out the testing materials. He stopped his work completely several times, once in order to listen to a transistor radio. After about two hours had passed Mrs. C., who had long since finished her tasks, threatened her husband with, "If you don't hurry up and finish I won't make you any dinner." As he, finally, handed the writer his protocols Mr. C. sang to her, "Goodbye to you. . . . goodbye to you. . . ."

Mr. C. can certainly be described as emotionally infantile.

Two alternative explanations for the fact that the results did not substantiate the motivational theory on which the study was based have been explored. Essentially,

they were: (1) that the results do accurately reflect reality, and that the theory should be revised; (2) that the theory is sound but differential sensitivity to motives between groups affected scores on questionnaire and projective instruments, and influenced results. There is a final possible explanation. Parental motivation taken alone may have no implications for child adjustment. It could be that there is another unknown variable which intervenes between motivation for parenthood and its impact. The unknown factor might, for example, be how the parental motives are communicated to and perceived by the child. Possibly parents of well-adjusted children are able to communicate their ambivalent, both parent and child-need motivations, clearly to the child. On the other hand, the data show that parents of disturbed children have little awareness of their own motivations and they may, as a consequence, communicate them to the child in an unclear or confusing fashion. The fact that correlations between parental motivations and perceived parental behavior were more generally positive in the Adjusted than the Disturbed group supports the intervening variable notion.

Perceived Parental Behavior

The only prediction of differences in perceived parental behavior between groups not confirmed was the hypothesis that parents of well-adjusted children would be perceived as more loving. There were no differences between Adjusted and Disturbed Groups in ratings of loving behavior.

The disturbed boys see their mothers and fathers as behaving toward them in rejecting (i.e., high scores on Punishment scale of BPBQ) and loving ways, at the same time. Quite possibly this finding reflects the ambivalent feelings of Disturbed Group parents toward their sons. Parental ambivalence is frequently mentioned in clinical literature as having pathological implications for the emotional health of children. Probably neither the parental love nor the hate is damaging in itself, but the two feelings mixed together in a combination that confuses the child may be pathogenic. Winder and Rau (1962), for example, found that "parental ambivalence" is antecedent to deviancy in preadolescent boys. In their study and consistent with the present results, parents of deviant boys scored high on affection and rejection. The authors saw affection as a compensatory overlay developed to conceal or defend against the parents' feelings of rejection.

Finally, Siegelman (1965) does point to the fact that the BPBQ is sensitive to recognition on the part of child subjects that their parents do have ambivalent feelings toward them. Loving and Punishing are independent factors and the questionnaire was constructed so that they have neither a negative nor a positive statistical relationship to one another.

Parental Motivation and Perceived Parental Behavior

It was proposed that parental behavior, as it is perceived by the child, is the critical variable intervening between parental motivation and child adjustment. In general, the hypotheses of positive correlations between the two sets of variables predicted the relationship more accurately for the Adjusted than for the Disturbed group. Even though the relationship was more straightforward for Adjusted Group subjects, there still does not seem to be a simple 1:1 correspondence between motives and perceived behavior. The data suggest that the directness of the conceptualized relationship is influenced by at least three types of factors.

- (1) Sex of the parent appears to influence the direction of correlations.
- (2) Sex of the child is a likely factor but cannot be substantiated here because all child subjects were boys.
- (3) Clinical status of the family (i.e., membership in the Adjusted or Disturbed group) was shown to be a factor. It is unclear as to whether the results are due to the pathogenic impact of the parent, or to the disturbed child's misperception of his parents' behavior, or to both.

When their patterns of correlations between motives and behavior are compared, it is clear that differences between groups do exist. The same parental motivation in both Disturbed and Adjusted groups was often related to a different perceived parental behavior. Sex of the parent, particularly in the Disturbed group, seems to have affected the direction of these correlations. In the Disturbed but not the Adjusted group, for example, mothers with high

Narcissistic and Parent-Centered motivation (PSFRT) were seen as demanding while fathers with the same high motivations were not. Apparently, mothers and fathers of disturbed children act upon their motivations differently from one another. Possibly a Disturbed Group father who scores high on Narcissism finds satisfactions for himself outside the home. The mother of the same boy, on the other hand, since she spends the bulk of her time at home, may have to interact with him and so she becomes demanding. In any case the same relationships, those between Narcissistic and Parent-Centered motivations and demanding behavior, operate differently within the Adjusted group. Here mothers and fathers of well-adjusted boys report on their motivations for parenthood and are seen as behaving in similar, rather than opposite, fashions. Neither Adjusted Group mothers nor fathers who score high on Narcissism is demanding, while both mothers and fathers who score high on Parent-Centered motivation are perceived as demanding.

There were general negative correlations between parent-need oriented motivations on the FOS scales and demanding and punishing behavior. It could be that conscious awareness by a parent of his own expectations of satisfying emotional needs through the child acts as a sort of control on the parent's behavior. Thus, he may refrain from treating his child in punitive and demanding ways. When the parent-need oriented motivations are unconscious as measured by the PSFRT, however, the Adjusted group shows a more positive

relationship between them and punishing and demanding behavior. The degree of awareness the parent has for his own motives, then, seems to have consequences for the child's perception of his parents' behavior as well as for the child's adjustment.

Measurement Techniques

One particularly striking fact about the data is that Adjusted Group parents and females consistently scored higher on motivation for parenthood than did Disturbed Group parents or males. The Adjusted group and females received higher mean scores on all motivational scales of the FOS. Adjusted subjects scored higher on all but one, and females on all but two, of the PSFRT motivational scales. The high scores of Adjusted subjects surely did have a bearing on the fact that some hypotheses were not confirmed, and the reasons for them will be explored in the sections on the FOS and PSFRT which follow.

FOS

The questionnaire appears to have been quite sensitive to the adjustment-disturbance dimension since there were significant differences between Adjusted and Disturbed groups on four of the eight motivational scales. Because the parents of well-adjusted boys scored consistently higher, however, the possibility must be considered that Adjusted-Disturbed group differences resulted from some factor other than real differences in parental motivation. In other

words, the FOS may have tapped a variable related to the adjustment-disturbance continuum not motivation itself. What sort of "phantom variable", then, could have influenced results? Acquiescence response set or a social desirability factor are the most likely suspects.

The agree-disagree format of the questionnaire could have elicited an "acquiescence set", that is a predisposition to agree, from the Adjusted group. Equally logically, the format may have elicited a predisposition on the part of Disturbed group subjects to disagree with item content. A survey of recent literature showed no study in which measures of acquiescence response set were administered to adjusted and disturbed groups. There is, unfortunately, then, no way to know whether the results here could have been anticipated on the basis of set to agree or disagree alone. The literature does, nevertheless, offer some information relevant to the question.

Acquiescence set was first studied after it was observed, in connection with research on the authoritarian personality, that persons who tend to agree score high on the "F" scale (Megawee, 1960). When the item content of the F scale was reversed, the same subjects still tended to agree but this time they endorsed the opposite of their original responses. The notion was, then, that tendency to agree might be more important than item content. A number of studies of acquiescence set were carried out in the early 1960's--with fairly uniform negative results. Attempts were

made to relate the tendency to agree to observed behavior, with no success (McGee, 1962b; McGee, 1962c). Attempts were made to isolate the effect of acquiescence set on scores of objective tests (Rorer, 1965; McGee, 1962a; Dickens, 1963). The consistent conclusion of researchers was that response set had little or no impact upon the various instruments they studied.

Couch and Keniston (1960) postulated that acquiescence set is a personality variable and that there is an agreeing personality syndrome. They used a 7-point agree-disagree continuum scale, much like the FOS format, to isolate those individuals who tend to endorse and reject large numbers of items. The two groups of subjects, called "yeasayers" and "naysayers", were studied by means of psychological tests and clinical interviews. The authors describe yeasayers as individuals with weak egos who respond easily to external stimuli and internal impulses. They are thought to have id-dominated personalities and to indulge freely in gratifying impulses. Central to the dynamics of the yeasayer's personality is his failure to have internalized parental controls. On the other hand naysayers, persons who show a set to disagree, are described as super-ego dominated individuals. They are thought to have active, guiding egos, and strong internalizations of parental controls. Naysayers are reputed to suppress impulses since strong feelings threaten their personal equilibrium.

If the present study did measure response set, it likely was of the naysayer variety. Parents of the well-adjusted children, who did tend to agree more frequently with items, simply do not resemble Couch and Keniston's impulsive yeasayer personality type. Parents of the disturbed children do bear some similarity to the naysayer type personality in the sense that they probably suppress affect and impulses, and control hostile feelings. If anything, then, response set might appear because of a set to disagree among Disturbed Group subjects. If some of the parents of disturbed children did in fact have a set to disagree due to overcontrol of affect and so on, the conclusion can simply be drawn as it was above, that parents of disturbed children are not very aware of own or of others' feelings and motivations.

By far the most persuasive argument against reasoning that the results were influenced by a set of the acquiescence-disagreement type lies within the study itself. On the projective instrument, where response set could not have made an impact since subjects completed stories with their own open-ended comments, Adjusted Group subjects still scored higher than Disturbed Group subjects on seven of the eight motivational scales.

The response set issue has again raised the question as to whether parents of well-adjusted children have more awareness of motives or some like quality. If so, the questionnaire would certainly seem to have been sensitive

to such differences between groups. One way to eliminate the effects of the Adjusted group's, and maybe the females', ability to empathize would be to put the FOS in a forced-choice format. The experimenter could then compare groups regarding, for example, the proportion of Nurturant to Instrumental motivation of which the subjects are consciously aware, without concern for the absolute scores of conscious motivation in either. Since this method would control for quantitative awareness of motivation, it might more clearly bring out the subtle motivational differences between groups. Perhaps one of the reasons that the results of this study differ in some respects from Major's findings is that she did employ a direct measure with a forced-choice method of response.

Still another suggestion is that higher motivational scores of Adjusted Group subjects and women are due to another type of response set--the tendency to give socially desirable answers. SD is not an adequate explanation for the results here, however, since Adjusted Group subjects and females scored higher on all motivational categories whether they reflected favorably on the endorser or not.

There is one final difficulty with the form of the FOS used in this study. Again and again parents in both groups asked the writer whether to respond in accord with their own feelings or with their notions about the motives of others. They consistently indicated that it would be much easier and clearer to answer for themselves (in the

first-person) than to speculate about "people in general" as the third-person format requires. The writer's impression is that since the questionnaire is moderately transparent in its intent anyway, whatever disguise values there is in the third-person form might easily be sacrificed for the greater clarity of a first-person format.

PSFRT

Parents of both groups can be described as surprised by, unprepared for, and frightened of the request that they look at pictures and write story endings. Some of the subjects, probably because of their anxiety about the task, actually did not write material very relevant to the pictures and story beginnings. Parents of the disturbed children, in particular, balked at the job and had to be encouraged and reassured. The writer's impression is that some of the subjects purposefully did not answer the questions asked ("Why do the people in the pictures want children" and "What will they expect from their children"). Probably parents, especially in the Disturbed group, were suspicious about what would be done with their answers. They were aware that the writer had contact with the personnel of Lincoln School and were asked to sign release of information slips (at the end of testing) so that material collected in the study could be given to their social workers if it should prove helpful to the school's work with the families.

Presentation of the projective instrument elicited expressions about inadequacy ("I wasn't very good in school",

"I'm not very creative") from both groups. Most of the subjects also seemed motivated to "do a good job". It was the general impression of the writer that the task was mildly to severely threatening and that the subjects' defensiveness may have somehow dampened their responses.

Relationship between FOS and PSFRT

Since correlations between the FOS and PSFRT were low, group differences were not computed on the basis of the sum of motivational category scores across measures. To have summed the scores as originally planned would not have given the maximal information about overt and covert levels of motivation. On the contrary, such a procedure would simply have confused and diluted the results from both tests.

Major (1967) has suggested that research studies in the motivation for parenthood area be designed so that there are large differences between levels of awareness tapped by direct and projective measures. It would seem that the present study actually did measure more distinctly different levels of motivation than have been tapped previously. At least, correlations were lower here between the FOS and the PSFRT than they were between Major's direct and projective instruments.

Subject Variables

There is the possibility that subject variables, not controlled or accounted for, affected the data so that some predictions were not confirmed. Variations in test-taking

attitudes, imperfect matching, or proximity or overlapping of the groups on the adjustment-disturbance continuum were potential sources of error.

It was the writer's observation that there were clear differences between groups in the way the subjects approached both her, and the tasks. Adjusted group parents were fairly relaxed, mildly curious about the study, but matter-of-fact in their attitude toward the tests. They set to work in a business-like fashion, made few comments about content of test items, and seemed to finish faster than Disturbed group parents. Often they asked about the purpose of the study, the writer's involvement with it, and why they had been chosen to participate. Their attitude toward the writer was polite, interested, and mildly distant.

In contrast to Adjusted Group parents, mothers and fathers of the disturbed children were apprehensive about the tasks and often hostile toward the writer. After a few sessions with Disturbed Group families, the writer came to expect from them a general climate of punishing her for bringing such a miserable job to do. Frequently the subjects expressed hostility indirectly by making critical observations of FOS test items, reading them aloud to one another in a sarcastic, ridiculing manner, etc. Sometimes the subjects made even more direct, pointed remarks to the effect that such studies are really useless. After the testing was completed and the writer was about to leave, one father commented to her that if she would only read a particular

chapter of the Bible it would answer all the troublesome questions she had asked. The Bible passage proved to assert that everything including having children, should proceed according to God's law and the natural order of things and that all book learning and the like should be cast aside (Ecclesiastes, Chapter I).

Disturbed Group couples appeared different from parents of well-adjusted children in a further interesting way. Unlike Adjusted Group parents where there seemed to be a fairly equal marital "balance of power", in the Disturbed group often one spouse or the other appeared to have more than his share of the control. To simplify, it often seemed that either one or the other of two pictures was presented: (1) strong husband and inadequate wife, or; (2) inadequate husband and competent, mothering wife. In the second type of husband-wife relationship, the husband usually asked his wife for encouragement on the tests, what to do, how to spell, etc. These inadequate-seeming, dependent men also asked their children (frequently the disturbed child included in the sample) to bring them food, beer, milk for younger children, and so on.

Most of the children in the Adjusted group could read the BPBQ for themselves but acted bored with the job and were clear with the writer that they did not much enjoy doing it. In spite of their boredom they did what was required of them fairly conscientiously, and quickly went off to play when they finished. The writer actually had more

contact with the Disturbed group boys than with the others. First of all, few of the disturbed children could read the BPBQ for themselves and they needed to have items read to them. Secondly, they seemed to expect and want more from the writer's interaction with them than the other children. Often they tried to give her something by showing their toys and drawings, asked if she would come again. They worked with painfully serious concentration and appeared very eager to please. One 11 year old boy was particularly graphic in his way of asking for something. On the back of the mother form of the questionnaire he drew a large, distorted, monster-like female figure. Growing on a jagged platform from the large figure's head was a tiny shape which had extra long arms and huge hands. Printed unmistakably above the tiny shape's head in cartoon fashion, was the word "Help."

The differences between groups in test-taking attitudes seem to reflect and lend validity to their classification as Disturbed or Adjusted. It may be, of course, that the sharp contrast in attitudes somehow affected the study's results but if so such affects would probably be consistent with clinical status of the groups and would not introduce extraneous variables.

In order to obtain valid differences between groups relevant only to the variables studied, Adjusted and Disturbed families were matched as to age of child, religion, and socio-economic level. It was necessary to sort through

the records of all boys 8-11 years old in six Lansing area schools before families of well-adjusted children which appropriately matched the Disturbed group on the criteria were found. Appendix C indicates that twelve of the fifteen Disturbed Group families were perfectly matched according to the three criteria. The remaining three Adjusted-Disturbed matches were exact with regard to two of the control criteria, but only approximate for the third. In one case ages of children differed by one year, and in the other two cases the socio-economic levels were a single step removed (i.e., Middle vs. High; Low vs. Middle). Since religious beliefs can influence motivation for parenthood, care was taken to insure that religion was matched exactly in all cases.

It was the writer's impression that, although socio-economic levels were matched according to criteria perfectly in 13 cases, they were qualitatively higher in the Adjusted group. The families were classified into levels according to education of the father in the following manner:

- (1) Low -- less than high school graduation
- (2) Middle -- high school graduation with or without trade school training
- (3) High -- some college and beyond

Actual occupations and educational levels of the fathers are shown in Appendix C. As the table indicates, often fathers of well-adjusted boys seem to have more actual years of education and jobs of higher status than fathers of the Disturbed boys.

It is puzzling as to the way in which qualitative differences in groups' socio-economic levels may have affected results. A general conclusion is that Adjusted Group parents had some reason to be less defensive and threatened by the testing than Disturbed Group parents. Parents of well-adjusted boys were aware before testing that their child was judged to show good emotional adjustment. They were not aware, however, that their responses would be compared to those of parents of disturbed children. It could also be that the somewhat higher socio-economic level of the Adjusted group caused them to be more sophisticated about psychological tests and, consequently, less apprehensive.

Indications were that the two groups represented extreme positions on the adjustment-disturbance continuum. Adjusted group boys were rated by their teachers as showing average or better emotional health. Most of the well-adjusted subjects were actually judged to have outstandingly good adjustment compared to their classmates. In contrast, thirteen of the fifteen Disturbed Group boys were so emotionally upset that they had been removed from regular classrooms and placed in Lincoln School for special treatment. The diagnostic evaluations of these youngsters showed two basic types of pathology. Most boys were described as having severe behavior disorders as evidenced by their hyperactivity, poor impulse controls, and violent attacks on other children. A second type of pathology often mentioned was of a withdrawal nature. A few of the boys in the Disturbed sample daydreamed

excessively, were fearful and had bizarre fantasies. The two disturbed children still attending regular school classes had been referred to a psychological clinic for help with emotional problems. In each case, the emotional disorder was severe enough to warrant a recommendation for psychotherapy.

Suggestions for Further Research

The conceptualized relationships between motivation for parenthood and child adjustment and between motivation for parenthood and perceived parental behavior are not so simple as it was assumed. In contrast, the associations between perceived parental behavior and level of child adjustment seem quite straightforward. A fruitful approach for future research would be to break the critical variables down into smaller units for study. The present investigation was global in orientation and, consequently, raised more questions than it answered. For example, how important is it for parents to gain need satisfaction from their children and, what is the critical amount of parent-need motivation conducive to good child adjustment? In all likelihood, satisfaction of some parent needs is desirable but at what point or under what conditions might a parent-need focus become pathogenic?

The study also raised questions regarding parental behavior. It can be assumed that demanding and punishing by parents in moderate quantities, as in the Adjusted group,

represents setting limits and is as such conducive to good child adjustment. On the other hand, parents of disturbed children show an excess of these behaviors. Too much punishing and demanding likely leads to childhood behavior disorders and neurotic conditions. There is the third possibility that failure of parents to set limits (punish and demand) results in defective character structure or delinquency. What then are the amounts of demanding and punishing behavior critical for good child adjustment?

This study supports the contention that it is more fruitful to investigate parental behavior as the child perceives it than to ask parents to report on their behavior and attitudes. Results here clearly tie perceived parental behavior to the Adjusted or Disturbed group status while research on actual parental attitudes and behavior have reported negative findings. A similar sort of principle could be used to study motives of parents. The impact of motivation for parenthood on child adjustment might be clarified if Adjusted and Disturbed Group children were asked to answer a questionnaire, like the FOS, as they feel their parents would.

The results of the present study also raised an issue about the importance of a parent's awareness of his own motives for having children. One way to interpret the data is that parents of well-adjusted children have more awareness of their own, and sensitivity to the motives of others. How and why, then, might lack of such awareness

adversely affect the emotional health of a child?

The present study has some additional implications for further research in the motivation for parenthood area. Both the questionnaire and the picture measures used here might be more effective if their form were modified. With the FOS, accurate measurement of motivation could have been hindered by two factors: (1) differential sensitivity of Adjusted and Disturbed Group subjects to the motives of others; (2) a tendency to agree or disagree with item content. The questionnaire might be written in the first-person so that it is clear to the subject that his own motives are being inquired about. In addition, the same FOS items used in this study could be placed in a forced-choice format of the Edwards variety wherein each item of a set is equated with its partner for social desirability. If the FOS were revised in the suggested way subjects would receive the same overall score but would differ from one another qualitatively, that is would show a different profile of motivations. Such a questionnaire format, without changing basic item content, would control for variability in total level of motivation and degree of sensitivity to motives so that the more qualitative differences could be isolated.

One of the purposes of this study was to develop a direct measure that would be more sensitive to motivation for parenthood than the only questionnaire device that previously existed in the area, the Child Study Inventory. The aim of developing a more effective direct research tool seems

to have been accomplished since the FOS has more items with a wider range of item content, and eight internally consistent categories rather than the four previously used classifications of motives. Further, the FOS did prove to be sensitive to some of the motivational differences between Adjusted and Disturbed Groups. The FOS, revised as suggested above has promise as a tool for future research.

The PSFRT proved much more sensitive to sex differences in motivations for parenthood than to differences between Adjusted and Disturbed Groups. It does not seem feasible to use a measure more projective than the story completion device to study motivation for parenthood variables. A less structured instrument would likely be so ambiguous that the critical motives would not be elicited. Subjects might very well tell imaginative stories to pictures of parents and children but it is doubtful that they would include reasons for the parents' wanting the children. The major difficulty here with the PSFRT seemed to be in tapping motives of parents of disturbed children. An open-ended response task was quite threatening to them and responses to picture and story beginnings were not always appropriate. Pictures with story beginnings and multiple-choice type endings, similar to those used by Major (1967) would probably be most effective when comparing motives of an Adjusted and a Disturbed group.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of the present investigation was to explore motivations for parenthood as they relate to child perceptions of parental behavior, and as they relate to the mental health of children. Since an adequate direct measure of motivation for parenthood was not available, the present study included the development of a questionnaire for this purpose.

Two groups of subjects were selected for the study. The Disturbed group consisted of 15 boys who were diagnosed as having emotional problems, and their parents. The Adjusted group consisted of 15 boys whose teachers rated them as well-adjusted, and their parents. Groups were matched with respect to age of child, religion, and socio-economic level.

Three instruments were used to explore parental motivation and behavior in both groups. The Family Opinion Survey (FOS), a questionnaire measure of motivation for parenthood developed in the context of the present research, consisted of 86 third-person statements. In conjunction with the questionnaire, a projective instrument was also used to study motives of parents for having children. The Picture Story Free Response Test, adapted from Major's (1967) Picture-Story Completion Technique, consisted of four pictures

with story beginnings for which subjects were required to write story endings. Responses to both direct and projective measures of motivation for parenthood were classified as parent-need oriented (Narcissistic, Instrumental, Parent-Centered), child-need oriented (Nurturant, Child-Centered), or non-need oriented (Humanitarian, Fatalistic, By-Product). Perceived parental behavior was measured by the 45 item Bronfenbrenner Parent Behavior Questionnaire from which child ratings of parental behavior can be assessed along three dimensions: Demanding, Punishing, and Loving.

Results of the study pertaining to motivation for parenthood can be summarized as follows:

- I. Adjusted Group parents showed more parent-need oriented motivation for parenthood (FOS) than Disturbed Group parents, contrary to the prediction.
- II. Adjusted Group parents showed more child-need oriented motivation for parenthood (FOS) than Disturbed Group parents, in accord with the prediction.
- III. Adjusted Group parents showed more Humanitarian and By-Product motivation for parenthood (PSFRT). The prediction that there would be no differences between groups on the non-need oriented motivations was not substantiated, but the hypothesis was basically confirmed because there were actually few differences between groups.

Results of the group comparisons on perceived parental behavior are summarized below:

IV. Disturbed Group parents were rated as more Demanding and more Punishing than Adjusted Group parents, in accord with the prediction. The expectation of a positive association between parent-need oriented motivations and demanding and punishing behavior was not confirmed, but there were trends in the predicted direction for the Adjusted group.

V. There were no differences between group ratings on Loving and the prediction that parents of the Adjusted group would be judged as more Loving was not confirmed. The expectation of a positive association between child-need oriented motivation for parenthood and loving behavior was not confirmed, but there were trends in the predicted direction for the Adjusted group.

Results also showed sex differences in motivation for parenthood (PSFRT) and perceived parental behavior. Females showed more Nurturant and males more Instrumental motivation for parenthood, while mothers were perceived as more Demanding and fathers more Loving in behavior. Finally, although low correlations between motivational categories on the questionnaire and projective instrument indicated that the two measures were tapping different levels of awareness of motives, Adjusted Group parents showed more consistency between tests.

It was concluded that motivation for parenthood and perceived parental behavior variables bear complex relationships to one another as well as to child level of adjustment.

The present paper raised a series of puzzling questions. Suggestions, which should prove helpful to future investigations, were made for modifications of existing measurement techniques.

REFERENCES

- Abbe, Alice E. Maternal attitudes toward children and their relationship to the diagnostic category of a child. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1958, 92, 167-173.
- Ackerman, N. The psychodynamics of family life. New York: Basic Books, 1958.
- Allport, A. W. The trend in motivational theory. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1953, 23, 107-119.
- Ausubel, D. P., Balthazer, E. E., Rosenthal, Irene, Blackman, L. S., Sanpoont, S. H., and Welkowitz, Joan. Perceived parent attitudes as determinants of children's ego structure. Child Development, 1954, 25, 173-184.
- Beach, F. A. Hormones and behavior. New York: Paul B. Hoeber, Inc., 1948.
- Becker, W. C., Peterson, D. R., Hellmer, L. A., Shoemaker, D. J., and Quay, H. C. Factors in parental behavior and personality as related to problem behavior in children. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1959, 23, 107-118.
- Bell, R. Marriage and family interaction. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, Inc., 1963.
- Benedek, Therese. Psychosexual functions in women. Studies in psychosomatic medicine. Vol. II. New York: Ronald Press, 1952.
- Benedek, Therese. Parenthood as a developmental phase. Journal of American Psychoanalytic Association, 1959, 7, 389-417.
- Bernstein, Rose, and Cyr, Florence C. A study of interviews with husbands in a parental and child health program. Social Casework, 1957, 38, 473-480.
- Bibring, Crete L. Some considerations of the psychological processes in pregnancy. Psychoanalytic Studies of the Child, 1959, 14, 113-121.

- Bibring, Grete L., Dwyer, T. F., Huntington, Dorothy S., and Valenstein, A. F. A study of the psychological processes in pregnancy and of the earliest mother-child relationship. Psychoanalytic Studies of the Child, 1961, 16, 9-72.
- Bowan, H. Marriage for moderns. New York: Witthesey House (McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.), 1942.
- Bressler, B., Nyhus, P., and Magnussen, F. Pregnancy fantasies in psychosomatic illness and symptoms formation: A clinical study. Psychosomatic Medicine, 1958, 20, 187-202.
- Brody, Grace F. A study of the relationship between maternal attitudes and mother-child interaction. Dissertation Abstracts, 1963, 24 (4), 1728.
- Burchinal, L. G. Parents' attitudes and adjustment of children. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1958, 92, 69-79.
- Campbell, A. "Design and scope of the 1960 study of growth of American families," In Kiser, C (Ed.), Research in Family Planning. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1962.
- Cavan, Ruth S. The family. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1942.
- Cavan, Ruth S. American marriage. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1959.
- Chesire, Leone, Saffir, M., Thurstone, L. L. "Computing diagrams for the tetrachoric correlation coefficient." Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1933.
- Couch, A., and Keniston, K. Yeasayers and naysayers: agreeing response set as a personality variable. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 4, 1960, 60, 151-174.
- Davids, A. and Pildner, H. Comparison of direct and projective methods of personality assessment under different conditions of motivation. Psychological Monographs, 1958, 72, 1-30 (Whole No. 464).
- Dennison, C. P. Parenthood attitudes of college men. Journal of Heredity, Vol. 31, December, 1940, 527-31.
- Deutch, Helene. The psychology of women. Vol. II. Grune and Stratton, New York, 1944.

- Dicken, C. Good impressions, social desirability, and acquiescence as suppression variables. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1963, 23, 699-720.
- Edwards, A. L. The assessment of human motives by means of personality scales. In Levine, D. (Ed.), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1964, 135-162.
- Epstein, S. Some theoretical considerations on the nature of ambiguity and the use of stimulus dimensions in projective techniques. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1966, 30, No. 3, 183-192.
- Epstein, S., and Smith, R. Thematic apperception as a measure of the hunger drive. Journal of Projective Techniques, 1956, 20, 372-384.
- Erikson, E. H. Childhood and society. New York: Norton 1950.
- Fodor, N. Motives in psychological sterility. Psychoanalysis, 1958, 6, 59-73.
- Forer, B. R., Rabin, A. I., Goldstein, F. J., and Lesser, G. S. Custom-built projective methods: A symposium. Journal of Projective Technology, 1961, 25, 3-31.
- Freeman, R., and Grayson, H. Maternal attitudes in schyzophrenia. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1953, 50, 45-52.
- Freeman, T. Pregnancy as a precipitant of mental illness in men. British Journal of Medical Psychology, 24:49-54, 1951.
- Getzels, J. W., and Walsh, J. J. The method of paired direct and projective questionnaires in the study of attitude structure and socialization. Psychological Monographs, 1958, 72, 1-26 (Whole No. 454).
- Gildea, Margaret C. L., Glidewell, J. C., and Kantor, Mildred B. Maternal attitudes and general adjustment in school children. In J. C. Glidewell (Ed.), Parental attitudes and child behavior. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1961, 42-89.
- Ginsparg, Sylvia L. Post-partum psychosis. Dissertation Abstracts, 1957, 17, 1124.
- Goodsell, Willystine. A history of the family as a social and educational institution. New York: Macmillan Co., 1926.

- Greenberg, N. H., Loesch, J., and Larkin, M. Life situations associated with the onset of pregnancy. Psychosomatic Medicine, 21:296-310, 1959.
- Groves, E. and Groves, Gladys H. The contemporary American family. New York: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1947.
- Guilford, J. P. Fundamental statistics in psychology and education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1965.
- Hereford, C. F. Changing parental attitudes through group discussion. University of Texas Press, Austin, Texas, 1963.
- Hoffman, Lois W., and Wyatt, F. Social change and motivation for having larger families: some theoretical considerations. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1960, 6, 235-244.
- Humphrey, M. and Ounsted, Christopher. Adaptive families referred for psychiatric advice: II. The parents. British Journal of Psychiatry, 1964, 110 (467), 549-555.
- Jenkins, W. L. An improved method for tetrachoric r. Psychometrika, Vol. 20, No. 3, September, 1955, 253-258.
- Jersild, A. L., Woodyard, C. S., and Del Solar, C. Joys and problems of child rearing, New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1949, 235.
- Kagan, J. The stability of TAT fantasy and stimulus ambiguity. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1959, 23, 266-271.
- Kenny, D. L. Transcendence indices, extent of personality factors in fantasy responses, and the ambiguity of TAT cards. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1954, 18, 345-348.
- Kenny, D. T. and Byou, S. W. Ambiguity of pictures and extent of personality factors in fantasy response. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1953, 17, 283-288.
- Krug, Ronald S. Attitudinal and behavioral differences in child rearing practices between parents of clinic and nonclinic children: A questionnaire assessment. Dissertation Abstracts, 1965, 26(5), 2869-2870.
- Lantz, H. and Snyder, Eloise. Marriage. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1962.

- Levy, D. M. Maternal overprotection. New York: Columbia University Press, 1943.
- Lidz, T., Cornelison, Alice R., Fleck, S., and Terry, Dorothy. The fathers. In T. Lidz, S. Fleck, and Alice R. Cornelison (Eds.), Schizophrenia and the family. New York: International Universities Press, Inc., 1965a, 97-118.
- Little, K. B. Problems in the validation of projective techniques. Journal of Projective Techniques, 1959, 23, 287-290.
- Loesch, J. G., and Greenberg, N. H. Some specific areas of conflicts observed during pregnancy: A comparative study of married and unmarried pregnant women. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1962, 32(4), 624-636.
- Loevinger, J. and Sweet, Blanche. Construction of a test of mothers' attitudes. In J. G. Glidewell (Ed.), Parental attitudes and child behavior. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1961, 110-123.
- Lomas, P. The husband-wife relationship in cases of puerperal breakdown. British Journal of Medical Psychology, 1959, 32, 117-123.
- McClelland, D. C. Toward a theory of motive acquisition. American Psychologist, 1965, 20, 321-333.
- Mace, D. and Mace, Vera. The Soviet Family. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1963.
- Madoff, J. M. The attitudes of mothers of juvenile delinquents toward child rearing. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1959 (Dec.), 23, 518-520.
- Major, Marilyn. Assessment of motivation for parenthood in parents of disturbed and normal children. Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing 1967.
- McGee, R. The relationship between response style and personality variables: I. The measurement of response acquiescence. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1962a, 64, 229-233.
- McGee, R. The relationship between response style and personality variables: II. The prediction of independent conformity behavior. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1962b, 65, 347-351.

- McGee, R. Response style as a personality variable: by what criteria? American Psychologist, 1962c, Vol. 59, 284-295.
- Medinnus, G. R. The relation between inter-parent agreement and several child measures. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1963, 102 (1), 139-144.
- Megangee, E. I. Research in Clinical Assessment. London and New York: Harper & Row, 1966.
- Miller, D., and Swanson, A. Inner conflict and defense. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1960.
- Mishler, E. Families and schizophrenia: An experimental study. Mental Hygiene, 1966, 50, 552-556.
- Peterson, D. R., Becker, W. C. Hellner, L. A., Shoemaker, D. J. and Quay, H. C. Parental attitudes and child adjustment, Child Development, 1959 (March), 30, 119-130.
- Purcell, K. Some shortcomings in projective test validation. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1958, 57, 115-118.
- Rabin, A. I. Kiblenitz mothers view "collective education". American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1964, 34, 140-142.
- Rabin, A. I., and Greene, R. J. "Exploring motivation for parenthood." Michigan State University, 1966. (Unpublished manuscript.)
- Radke, Marian J. Relation of parental authority to children's behavior and attitudes. University of Minnesota Institute of Child Welfare Monograph, 1946, No. 22.
- Rapport, D. On the psychoanalytic theory of motivation. In M. R. Jones (Ed.), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 1960. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1960.
- Roe, Anne and Siegelman, M. A parent-child relationship questionnaire. Child Development, 1963, 34(2), 355-369.
- Rorer, L. G., and Goldberg, L. R. Acquiescence in the MMPI? Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1965, 25, 801-817.
- Rosberg, J., and Karon, B. P. A direct analytic contribution to the understanding of post-partum psychosis. Psychiatric Quarterly, 1959 (April), 33, 296-304.
- Ross, Adelaide and Anderson, A. S. An examination of motivation of adoptive parents. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1965, 35, 375-377.

- Ross, Aileen. The Hindu family in its urban setting. Canada: University of Toronto Press, 1961.
- Sait, U. B. New horizons for the family. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1938.
- Scahefer, E. S. A circumplex model for maternal behavior. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1959, 59, 226-235.
- Sachefer, E. S. Converging conceptual models for maternal behavior and for child behavior. In J. C. Glidewell (Ed.), Parental attitudes and child behavior. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1961, 124-146.
- Scahefer, E. S., and Bell, R. O. Development of a parental attitude research instrument. Child Development, 1958, 29, 339-361.
- Sherwood, J. J. Self-respect and projective measures of achievement and affiliation. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1966, 30(4), 329-337.
- Shoben, E. J. The assessment of parental attitudes in relation to child adjustment. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1949, 39, 101-148.
- Siegelman, M. Evaluation of Bronfenbrenner's questionnaire for children concerning parental behavior. Child Development, 1965, 36, 163-174.
- Stogdill, R. The measurement of attitudes toward parental control and the social adjustment of children. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1936, 20, 359-377.
- Tauch, Ruth J. Interpersonal perceptions of fathers and mothers. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1955, 87, 59-65.
- Taylor, Katherine W. In Becker, H. and Hill, R. Family, marriage and parenthood. Boston: D. C. Heath and Co., 1955.
- Thurstone, L. L. The measurement of attitude. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1936.
- Towne, R. D. and Afterman, J. Psychosis in males related to parenthood, Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic, 1955, 19.
- Trethowan, W. H. and Conlon, M. F. The couvade syndrome. British Journal of Psychiatry, 1965, 111 (470), 57-66.

- Truxal, A. and Merrill, F. Marriage and the family in American culture. New York: Prentic-Hall, Inc., 1953.
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1961, 82 Annual Edition, 54.
- Veiga, M. The wanted child: motivations of foster and adoptive parents for seeking care of children. Paper delivered at the 1965 convention of the American Orthopsychiatric Association, New York City.
- Wasserman, Marta B. On post-partum neurosis. Psychoanalysis, 1958, 6, 45-58.
- Weil, R. J. and Tupper, C. Personality, life situation and communication: A study of habitual abortion Psychosomatic Medicine, 1960, 22, 448-455.
- Wesskopf, Edith. An experimental study of the effects of brightness and ambiguity on projection in the Thematic Apperception Test. Journal of Psychology, 1950, 29, 407-416.
- Williams, W. W. The PALS Tests: a technique for children to evaluate both parents. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1957, 54, 229-249.
- Winch, R. F. The modern family. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1964.
- Winder, C. L. and Rau, Lucy. Parental attitudes associated with social deviance in preadolescent boys. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1962, 64(6), 418-424.
- Woods, Sister Frances J. The American family system. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959.
- Zilboorg, G. Depressive reactions related to parenthood. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1931, 10, 927-962.
- Zuckerman, M., Barrett, Beatrice, H. and Bragiel, R. M. The parental attitudes of parents of child guidance cases: I. Comparisons with normals, investigations of socioeconomic and family constellation factors, and relations to parents' reactions to the clinics. Child Development, 1960, 31, 401-417.
- Zuckerman, M., Oltean, Mary and Monashkin, I. The parental attitudes of mothers of schizophrenics. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1958, 22, 307-310.

- Zuckerman, M., Ribback, Beatrice B., Monashkin, I., and Norton, J. A., Jr., Normative data and factor analysis on the Parental Attitude Research Instrument. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1958, 22, 165-171.
- Zunich, M. Relationship between maternal behavior and attitudes toward children. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1962, 100, 155-165.
- Zunich, M. Child behavior and parental attitudes. Journal of Psychology, 1966, 62(1), 41-46.

APPENDIX A

SUGGESTED CRITERIA FOR TEACHER SELECTION OF WELL-ADJUSTED CHILDREN

(Hereford, 1963)

Factors to consider in evaluating child adjustment may be:

1. The child's relationship with you, the teacher.
2. How well he is accepted by the other children.
3. His reaction to rules and regulations.
4. His attitude and cooperativeness.
5. His general emotional maturity.

APPENDIX B

ADJUSTED-DISTURBED PAIRS MATCHED ON CONTROL CRITERIA

<u>Pair No.</u>	<u>Age</u>	<u>Religion</u>	<u>S-E Level</u>	<u>Education</u>	<u>Occupation</u>
1. Disturbed	9	P	H	Attended College	Real Estate Appraiser
Adjusted	9	P	H	Completed College	Highway Engineer
2. Disturbed	11	C	H	Completed College	Engineer
Adjusted	11	C	H	Attended College	Office Manager
3. Disturbed	10	C	H	Attended College	Field Engineer
Adjusted	9	C	H	Post-Graduate Work	Executive, Community Chest
4. Disturbed	9	P	H	Attended College	Inspector
Adjusted	9	P	H	Post-Graduate Work	Teacher
5. Disturbed	10	P	M	High School Graduate	Brick-Layer
Adjusted	10	P	M	High School Graduate	Mold-Maker
6. Disturbed	9	C	M	High School Graduate Trade School	Plumber
Adjusted	9	C	H	College Graduate	Salesman
7. Disturbed	9	P	H	Attended College	Production Manager
Adjusted	9	P	H	College Graduate	Civil Engineer
8. Disturbed	11	P	L	Completed Jr. High	Machine Operator
Adjusted	11	P	M	High School Graduate	Builder

<u>Pair No.</u>	<u>Age</u>	<u>Religion</u>	<u>S-E Level</u>	<u>Education</u>	<u>Occupation</u>
9. Disturbed	11	P	L	Completed Jr. High	Finish Painter
Adjusted	11	P	L	Completed 8th Grade	Carpenter
10. Disturbed	10	P	M	High School Graduate	Factory worker
Adjusted	10	P	M	High School Graduate	Supply Builder
11. Disturbed	11	P	H	Attended College	Foreman
Adjusted	11	P	H	College Graduate	High School Teacher
12. Disturbed	9	P	M	High School Graduate	Draftsman
Adjusted	9	P	M	High School Graduate	Buyer
13. Disturbed	8	P	H	Post- Graduate Work	Assistant Professor
Adjusted	8	P	H	Post- Graduate Work	College Admissions Officer
14. Disturbed	11	P	H	Attended College	Interstate Commerce Clerk
Adjusted	11	P	H	Attended College	Farmer
15. Disturbed	8	C	M	High School Graduate	Program Specialist
Adjusted	8	C	M	High School Graduate	Retail Sales

APPENDIX C

PICTURE-STORY FREE RESPONSE TEST

(1) SCORING MANUAL

1-Point Responses - Statements which cannot be interpreted as indicating any of the eight types of parental motivations defined

There is no danger from the population explosion now.

She's thinking of her son's future.

Jason is afraid of marriage.

Nurturant Motivation

2-Point Responses

References to the fact that it's enjoyable or satisfying to have children. Mild, lukewarm, vague statements about the fact that having children is nice. Responses about parents liking or enjoying children. Comments about what the pictured parents might have to give a child.

They will enjoy having a child.

3-Point Responses

Responses of moderate intensity about loving children, wanting to teach them things and watch them develop, giving them things (as, love, patience).

John is thinking that "if I had a child of my own I could hold it as often as I would like to beside coming home to him and seeing him develop."

4-Point Responses

Strong statements about satisfaction in watching and helping a child develop. Comments about wanting to share living with children. Intense statements about loving and wanting to care for children (enjoying being nurturant). Wanting children to grow up into independent, happy, healthy adults who find satisfaction in life.

To love, care for and guide into worthwhile, happy, healthy beings

Humanitarian Motivation

2-Point Responses

Mild, vague references to notion that having children is the right, adult, proper thing to do. May be implication here about how having children is a duty and will benefit society as a whole. Comments about satisfactions to be found in creating a new life and producing a child of "good character" (who is kind to others, etc.).

Creating a new life

3-Point Responses

Moderately strong references to the value of family relationships, contribution of children to mankind. Moderately intense expectations as to good qualities a child should have in order to benefit others.

She expects him to be loving, considerate, likeable, hard-working, a good provider, honest, fair.

4-Point Responses

Strong, sweeping statements about the importance of a child's contribution to society through his good qualities. Rather peculiar, idealized, unrealistic expectations appear here.

Asset to society in general.

Fatalistic Motivation

2-Point Responses

Mild, vague references to idea that having children is nature's way, natural, etc.

A child is a miracle (of nature).

3-Point Responses

Moderate statements about naturalness of having children. Implicit here is the idea that little more needs be said about having children than that being a parent is natural -- that's the way things are.

It is nature.

4-Point Responses

Strong comments about the natural order of things. God's laws may be invoked here.

God ordained that we have large families.

Narcissistic Motivation

2-Point Responses

Mild statements indicating that children are part of the parents, that children belong to parents, and are to

be "enjoyed". Vague fantasies about what the child may grow up to be like and hopes that he may, in some ways, be like the parents. General, mild, or vague comments indicating that the parents expect the child to behave toward him in ways so as to enhance the parent.

He likes sports and he would like his son to be in sports.

3-Point Responses

Moderately intense statements indicating ownership of a child and identification with him. Fairly clear references to the possibility that a child will be enhancing to a parent -- as, fulfill a parent's life, give him incentive for his work, behave in ways that help the parent to feel somewhat better about himself.

Expect a child to respect and obey me and act in a way that pleases me.

4-Point Responses

Strong indications that the parent feels the child belongs to him and intense expression of identification with the child. Expectations that the child behave in a way to glorify the parent. Comments implying that the parent is incomplete or unfulfilled as a person without producing children. Vicarious living through the child.

Hopes he will have more and do more than she has ever done. All the things she had hoped for herself.

Instrumental Motivation

2-Point Responses

Weak statements to the effect that children can do something for the parent. Mild comments about what the children might accomplish or what they might give to or do for the parents.

Expect fellowship from children.

3-Point Responses

Moderate statements about the function of children within a family or a marriage. Statements implying that life would be lonely, boring, empty, unrewarding (usually unexplained) without children.

People who don't have children miss out on life.

4-Point Responses

Responses strongly indicating the function of children in a family or marriage. Implication is that the parents use the children for fairly tangible gains - security in old age, love and companionship, etc.

Only advantage is a tax deduction.

Parent-Centered Motivation

2-Point Responses

Statements mildly and/or vaguely mentioning that children can meet parental needs. They can meet parental needs either through enhancing the parent's picture of himself or performing a function or role in the family.

In any case, responses classified here will be only vague, general, or watered down statements about what the parent might gain (in terms of his own need satisfaction) from having a child.

Children give a common interest in a family.

3-Point Responses

Moderate statements about the ways children help to meet parental needs.

They want children for their own happiness and satisfaction.

4-Point Responses

Strong statements about the ways in which children can meet the needs of their parents. Often these responses are quite specific in content and may sound "way out" (unrealistic), malevolent, exploitive.

He would like to prove he could father a child.

Child-Centered Motivation

2-Point Responses

Mild statements about how having children around is enjoyable and satisfying. General, rather vague reference as to what a parent might give a child. Indications that the parent wishes good things for the child in the future. Mild, general concern for the welfare of the child.

These people enjoy children and being parents.

3-Point Responses

Moderate references to caring for children, wanting to give them things, and concern for their welfare.

He thinks of how much he could give a child-- security, money, love, a good home.

4-Point Responses

Strong concern with the welfare of the child and clear indications that the parent finds satisfaction in helping the child develop in a way that is appropriate for him. Encouragement of the child as an independent person in his own right. Sharing experiences with the child.

" . . . to have them each day and see how they grow and feel their need and love for you"

By-Product Motivation

2-Point Responses

Vague statements about the "naturalness or rightness" of having children. General references to natural (or God's) law and to duty to society (or God) as reasons for having children are classified here.

A child is a miracle.

3-Point Responses

Statements of moderate intensity about creating life, the value of human life, and contributing to society through raising a child of "good character". Also moderately strong references to the natural order of things are included here.

Child may contribute to mankind.

4-Point Responses

Strong references to nature, God's law, etc. as reasons for having children. Clear and strong statements about the value of families and the contribution of children to society are included here.

Having children is fulfilling the God given privilege of a man and a woman.

APPENDIX C

(2) INTERJUDGE RELIABILITIES BY MOTIVATIONAL CATEGORY

	<u>Pearson r*</u>	<u>Spearman-Brown**</u>
Nurturant	.59	.85
Humanitarian	.64	.88
Fatalistic	.91	.98
Narcissistic	.38	.71
Instrumental	.75	.92
Parent-Centered	.44	.76
Child-Centered	.64	.88
By-Product	.75	.92

*Based on correlations between ratings of judges
for responses of 15 subjects.

**Estimate of correlations between judges for ratings
of all 60 subjects' responses.

APPENDIX C

(3) PROJECTIVE STORY STEMS

- Card I. John Thompson is completing his year of internship in an obstetrics specialty. He is married, but because of the expense of medical school, he and his wife Jane have put off having children. While re-examining his first delivery, John is wondering about the advantages of having a child of his own.
- Card II. Janice Collier is holding her small son Alan while she is daydreaming about his future. Many things run through her mind but she is able to come up with three or four especially important things that she expects of him.
- Card III. Fred and Alice Smith have no children as yet. They are looking at this poster which illustrates the dangers of population explosion and are asking themselves why they should have children.
- Card IV. Jason has been regularly seeing a girl named Sandra whom he likes very much. He is, in fact, seriously considering asking Sandra to marry him when he receives a promotion next month. Recently Jason learned that Sandra is unable to have children. He is now thinking about the reasons he would like to have children of his own.

APPENDIX D

FAMILY OPINION SURVEY

1. Subscale reliabilities

<u>Sub-scale</u>	$T_1 - T_2$ correlation
Nurturant	.72
Humanitarian	.64
Fatalistic	.72
Narcissistic	.72
Instrumental	.79
Parent-centered	.79
Child-centered	.72
By-product	.69

2. Subscale correlations

	<u>Humani- tarian</u>	<u>Fatal- istic</u>	<u>Narcissis- tic</u>	<u>Instru- mental</u>
Nurturant	.11	.27	.55	.23
Humanitarian		.67	.34	.47
Fatalistic			.31	.40
Narcissistic				.54
	<u>Child-centered</u>		<u>By-product</u>	
Parent-centered	.44		.51	
Child-centered			.27	

3. Items by motivational category.

A. Group A: Five subscales, 71 items

Nurturant

N=12

People have children because it is a joy to care for someone who depends upon you.

Men want children because they just like them.

People want children because they would like to help someone grow and develop.

Men want children because they would like to care and provide for someone.

Men want children so they can teach them things.

Women want children because they would like to care and provide for someone.

Women want daughters so they can teach them things.

People have children because they enjoy helping someone develop.

Women want children because they just like them.

People want children because they would like to help someone on the road to a happy and satisfying life.

Men want sons so they can teach them things.

Men want children so they can play with them.

Humanitarian

N=11

People have children because they believe in the value of human life.

Having children is a social obligation.

People have children because that is their Christian duty.

Having children is a duty to society.

It is only right and proper for couples to have children after they get married.

Married couples have children because that is the right thing for them to do.

People want children because having children is part of being a mature adult.

Married couples have children because that is the right thing for them to do.

Having children is the duty of all couples as citizens.

Couples have second and third children so that they have a chance to correct the mistakes they made with the first.

Men and women want to have children because that is part of their rightful task in life.

Fatalistic

N=8

Men want children because that is what nature intended.

There is an inborn, natural instinct to be a parent.

Becoming a mother is just a natural step for girls after they grow up and get married.

Men want children because it is a natural instinct.

Couples want children because that is what nature intended.

Becoming a father is just a natural step for boys after they grow up and get married.

Women want children because it is a natural instinct.

Women want children because that is what nature intended.

Narcissistic

N=19

What parents want most from their children is respect.

People have kids because they are curious as to what a child of their will look like.

People have children because they want to give somebody the things they missed out on in childhood.

People want children so that they can make someone else's childhood better than their own was.

Couples want children because that is the way to a woman's greatest fulfillment.

People have children because that is one way to get some of their own childhood back.

Mother expects her daughter to be everything she never was.

People want children because they like to know that a part of themselves will carry on after death.

Men want children because they want to be respected and loved by somebody.

Parents expect their children to follow in their footsteps.

People have children so that there will be someone to carry on the family line.

Mothers hope that their children will be a credit to them.

Women want children because they enjoy having someone look up to them.

Men want children because children are a reflection of themselves.

Father expects his son to be like himself.

People have children because kids keep you young.

Parents expect their children to be good-looking.

People have children because they get a kick out of seeing their children do things that an adult just can't get away with.

Father expects his son to be everything he never was.

Instrumental

N=21

Men want children because having a family raises a man's position in the eyes of the community.

Couples have children because if they didn't others might think there was something wrong with them.

People want children because they help you to make friends in the community.

Women have children because that is one of the few ways they can make something out of their lives.

Women want children because that is one way to show others just how hard their lot in life is.

Married couples have children so that they can have an ideal family life.

Couples have children to keep their marriage off the rocks.

People have children because a childless marriage leads to a boring home life.

People expect their children to keep them company.

Women have children because it is a sure way to keep their husbands.

People want children because childlessness is frowned upon today.

People have children because that is what is expected of mature, married couples.

People have children when they feel they are in a rut in the hopes that their children will rise in the world.

People want children in order to help with family chores and projects.

People want children to help hold their marriages together.

Women have children because they feel that's better than sitting around the house with time on their hands.

People want children because all their friends are having them.

Women want children because having a family raises a woman's position in the eyes of the community.

Women have children because it's embarrassing to be a housewife and not a mother.

Husbands and wives hope that having a child will help them to settle their differences.

Couples have children because a childless marriage is empty.

B. Group B: Three subscales, 76 items

Parent-centered N=42

People have children in the hopes that their children will go farther in the world than they did.

Father expects his son to be everything he never was.

People want children so that they can have the joy of presenting their own parents with grandchildren.

Men want children because having a family raises a man's position in the eyes of the community.

Couples have children because if they didn't others might think there was something wrong with them.

People want children because they help you make friends in the community.

Women have children because that is one of the few ways they can make something out of their lives.

Men want children so they can be a "big man" to somebody.

People have kids because they are curious as to what a child of theirs will look like.

Women want children because that is one way to show others just how hard their lot in life is.

Married couples have children so that they can have an ideal family life.

Couples have children to keep their marriage off the rocks.

Couples want children so that there will be more of a common ground between them.

People have children because a childless marriage leads to a boring home life.

People want children because becoming parents is one way to keep life interesting.

People expect their children to keep them company.

Couples want children because that is the way to a woman's greatest fulfillment.

Married couples have children in the hopes that there will be someone around to care for them in their old age.

Women have children because it is a sure way to keep their husbands.

People want children because childlessness is frowned upon today.

People have children because that is one way to get some of their own childhood back.

People have children because that is what is expected of mature, married couples.

Mother expects her daughter to be everything she never was.

People want children because they like to know that a part of themselves will carry on after they are gone.

People want children because they help strengthen the family.

Parents expect their children to follow in their footsteps.

People have children so that there will be someone to carry on the family line.

Women want children because they enjoy having someone look up to them.

People want children because they feel that children will give them companionship and affection as they grow older.

People have children when they feel that they are in a rut in the hopes that their children will rise in the world.

Men want children because children are a reflection of themselves.

People want children in order to help hold their marriages together.

People want children in order to help with family chores and projects.

Women have children because they feel that's better than sitting around the house with time on their hands.

People want children because all their friends are having them.

Women want children because having a family raises a woman's position in the eyes of the community.

Women have children because it's embarrassing to be a housewife and not a mother.

Parents expect their children to be good-looking.

Women have children because being a mother is an art and very much looked up to.

People have children because they get a kick out of seeing their children do things that an adult just can't get away with.

Husbands and wives hope that having a child will help them settle their differences.

A child is living proof of his father's manliness.

Child-centered

N=14

People have children because they believe in the value of human life.

Men have children so they can teach them how to avoid their own failures.

People have children because it is a joy to care for someone who depends upon you.

Men want children because they just like them.

People want children because they would like to help someone grow and develop.

Men want children because they would like to care and provide for someone.

Men want children so they can teach them things.

Women want children because they would like to care and provide for someone.

Women want daughters so they can teach them things.

People have children because they enjoy helping someone develop.

Women want children because they would like to help someone on the road to a happy and satisfying life.

Men want sons so they can teach them things.

Men want children so they can play with them.

People want children because they would like to help someone on the road to a happy and satisfying life.

By-product

N=20

Men want children because that is what nature intended.

People have children because that is their Christian duty.

Having children is a duty to society.

It is only right and proper for couples to have children after they get married.

People want children because they see parenthood as the duty of a mature adult.

Married couples have a duty to bring children into the world.

There is an inborn, natural instinct to be a parent.

People want children because having children is part of being a mature adult.

Women want children because being mothers is their purpose in life.

Becoming a mother is just a natural step for girls after they grow up and get married.

Married couples become parents because that is the normal thing for them to do.

Men want children because it is a natural instinct.

Couples want children because that is human nature.

People have children so that they can help make the future world a better place.

Women want children because that is what nature intended.

Having children is a duty of all couples as citizens.

Becoming a father is a natural step for boys after they grow up and get married.

Men and women want to have children because that is part of their rightful task in life.

Women want children because it is a natural instinct.

Married couples have children because that is the right thing for them to do.

APPENDIX E

BRONFENBRENNER PARENT BEHAVIOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Child subjects are asked to respond in one of two ways for each item: either the options for responding are "always, most of the time, sometimes, hardly ever, never"; or they are "almost every day, about once a week, about once a month, only once or twice a year, never".

Father form:

1. I can talk to him about everything.
2. When I go someplace for the first time, he comes with me to make sure that everything goes well.
3. He says that I have to have his permission first when I want to go to the movies or play with my friends.
4. He makes me work hard on everything I do.
5. I can talk him in to most anything.
6. He is fair when he punishes me.
7. He seems to be upset and unhappy when I do not behave myself.
8. He is happy to be with me.
9. He makes me feel good and helps me when I have troubles.
10. He worries and is afraid I cannot take care of myself.
11. He wants to know exactly how I spend my money when I want to buy some little thing for myself.
12. He tells me that I have to do better than other children.
13. He lets me off easy when I am bad.
14. When I have to do something for him he explains why.
15. He makes me feel ashamed when I am bad.
16. He says nice things about me to other people.
17. I feel that he is there for me when I need him.
18. He does not let me roam or wander around because something might happen to me.
19. He tells me exactly when I should come home.
20. He tells me that I must have very good grades in school.
21. He finds it hard to punish me.
22. When he punishes me he explains why.
23. He tells me, "I don't want to have anything more to do with you", when I don't behave myself.
24. My father is very good to me.
25. He says nice things to me when I do something good.
26. He punishes me by sending me out of the room.
27. He teaches me things that I want to learn.
28. He tells me that other children behave better than I do.
29. He slaps me.
30. He punishes me by making me do extra work.

31. He goes on pleasant walks and trips with me.
32. He wants me to run errands and do favors for him.
33. He punishes me by not letting me play with other children.
34. He helps me with my hobbies or things I like to do.
35. He pesters me and keeps telling me to do things.
36. He spansks me.
37. He punishes me by not letting me do things I really enjoy.
38. He enjoys talking with me.
39. He wants me to keep my own things in good order.
40. He punishes me by sending me to bed early.
41. He helps me with my school work when I do not understand something.
42. He tells me that I am bad and yells at me.
43. He says he will spank me if I am bad.
44. He punishes me by taking my favorite things away.
45. He wants me to help around the house.

APPENDIX F

LETTER FROM LINCOLN SCHOOL

Dear Mr. and Mrs. :

In the next few days, Mrs. Ross Carter from Michigan State University will be contacting you in regard to a study she is doing in cooperation with us. She is interested in the attitudes and opinions that parents have toward the family.

Mrs. Carter will ask for an appointment with you in your home to complete the attitude survey. Your attitudes and opinions will be kept strictly confidential.

We would be most appreciative of any cooperation that you can give Mrs. Carter since her work may help us better understand the family and family relations and to provide better services to you and your child.

Sincerely,

Pedro A. Ojeda
Child Psychiatrist

Robert L. Little
Administrative Director

Gilbert A. Hansen
Principal

APPENDIX G

ADDITIONAL FINDINGS

Table 15. Means, standard deviations, and between-sex
t values of scores on the Family Opinion Survey.

Motivation	Mean	SD	Sex Differences t
Nurturant			
Females	46.40	10.11	
Males	44.43	9.92	0.709 N.S.
Humanitarian			
Females	31.53	7.57	
Males	30.97	7.34	0.320 N.S.
Fatalistic			
Females	33.23	7.18	
Males	31.07	8.83	1.309 N.S.
Narcissistic			
Females	65.23	13.53	
Males	61.07	13.02	1.382 N.S.
Instrumental			
Females	53.70	14.68	
Males	52.33	11.81	0.413 N.S.
Parent-Centered			
Females	121.03	27.47	
Males	118.10	27.02	0.455 N.S.
Child-Centered			
Females	53.60	10.96	
Males	50.70	11.30	1.174 N.S.
By-Product			
Females	70.40	13.87	
Males	66.60	14.12	1.357 N.S.

N = 30 in each group.

Table 16. Means, standard deviations, and between-sex
t values of scores on the Picture-Story Free
Response test.

Motivation	Mean	SD	Sex-Difference t
Nurturant			
Females	8.23	2.73	
Males	6.80	2.17	2.423*
Humanitarian			
Females	5.83	1.91	
Males	5.60	1.65	0.561 N.S.
Fatalistic			
Females	4.53	.94	
Males	4.43	1.00	0.303 N.S.
Narcissistic			
Females	7.03	2.08	
Males	6.83	2.07	0.408 N.S.
Instrumental			
Females	5.83	1.82	
Males	6.90	2.40	-2.058*
Parent-Centered			
Females	8.63	1.92	
Males	8.62	2.60	0.555 N.S.
Child-Centered			
Females	7.87	2.40	
Males	7.03	1.96	1.556 N.S.
By-Product			
Females	6.27	1.72	
Males	6.50	2.53	-0.451 N.S.

N = 30 in each group.

* = Sig. .05 level.

Table 17. Means, standard deviations, and between-sex *t* values of scores on the BPBQ.

Parental Behavior	Mean	SD	Between-sex <i>t</i>
Demanding			
Females	42.77	7.18	
Males	39.83	7.91	3.127***
Punishing			
Females	29.23	8.87	
Males	29.03	9.22	0.183 N.S.
Loving			
Females	46.53	5.65	
Males	51.97	6.03	-6.400***

N = 30 in each group.

*** = Sig. .01 level.

Table 18. Means, standard deviations, and between-sex *t* values for Adjusted and Disturbed Groups of scores on the BPBQ.

Parental Behavior	Mean	SD	Between-sex <i>t</i>
Demanding			
Adjusted			
Females	40.33	5.64	
Males	36.40	5.22	4.094 ***
Disturbed			
Females	45.20	7.89	
Males	43.27	8.77	1.191 N.S.
Punishing			
Adjusted			
Females	27.73	5.75	
Males	24.67	5.45	2.593**
Disturbed			
Females	33.73	9.30	
Males	33.40	10.27	0.172 N.S.
Loving			
Adjusted			
Females	44.93	5.40	
Males	52.20	6.18	-7.198 ***
Disturbed			
Females	47.13	6.01	
Males	51.73	6.09	-3.286 ***

N = 15 in each group.

** = Sig. .02 level.

*** = Sig. .01 level.

Table 19. Intercorrelations of the Family Opinion Survey and Picture-Story Free Response Test for the Adjusted and Disturbed Groups.

I. Adjusted Group

	FOS							
	Nur	Hum	Fat	Nar	Inst	P-C	C-C	B-P
Nur	.18							
Hum		-.44						
PSFRT								
Fat			.03					
Nar				.14				
Inst					.40			
P-C						.43		
C-C							.07	
B-P								.22

II. Disturbed Group

	FOS							
	Nur	Hum	Fat	Nar	Inst	P-C	C-C	B-P
Nur	.36							
Hum		-.24						
Fat			.16					
Nar				.01				
PSFRT								
Inst					-.34			
P-C						-.10		
C-C							.30	
B-P								-.27

N = 15 couples in each group.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293100300965