

ROOM USE ONLY



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.

281 m 8/11/10 5/18/10 10/13/10		
---	--	--

role t
with p
by Par
quiry
effect
cent s
parent

ure an
demand
sion,
ment.
sion,
tion.
design
role c
Attitu
Questi
sons w
parcei

ABSTRACT

A STUDY OF THE INTERACTION BETWEEN PARENTAL ROLE AND PARENTAL ATTITUDE AND ITS RELATIONSHIP WITH BEHAVIOR MANIFESTATIONS IN PREADOLESCENT SONS

by Burton A. Deming

This study is oriented around the application of role theory toward the analysis of parent-son relationships with particular reference to the role concept as developed by Parsons' theory of action. Within this context, an inquiry was directed toward the notion that the differential effect of parental attitudes on the behavior of preadolescent sons is a function of the differential roles taken by parents.

The variables for parents consisted of a role measure and eight attitude scales: rejection, ambivalence, demands for aggression, parental aggression, general aggression, self-esteem, husband-wife relationship, and adjustment. The four dependent measures for sons included aggression, dependency, withdrawal, and perceived parental rejection. Role was measured by a story completion technique designed to operationalize the expressive and instrumental role concepts as defined by the Parsonian theory of action. Attitudes were assessed by the Stanford Parent Attitude Questionnaire. Aggression, dependency, and withdrawal in sons were measured by the Peer Nomination Inventory and perceived rejection by the Parent Authority-Love Scale.

47 fa

eral

by pa

icant

depen

titud

were

to ea

varia

son s

attit

eight

inter

ative

the a

roles

pred.

for e

tica

sion

that

for t

finne

respe

The samples, predominantly middle class, included 47 father-son pairs and 56 mother-son pairs. In its general form, the hypothesis stated that negative attitudes by parents who take expressive roles will be more significantly related to disturbance in sons in terms of the four dependent variables than will be the case for negative attitudes of parents who take instrumental roles. Hypotheses were derived separately for fathers and mothers with respect to each of the attitude variables and each of the dependent variables. This amounted to 32 predictions for the father-son sample and 32 for the mother-son sample.

To test the hypotheses, each parent's score on the attitude and role scales were multiplied together to yield eight interactional variables. High scores on each of the interactional scales indicated the association between negative attitude traits and expressive roles and low scores the association between negative attitudes and instrumental roles. Regression coefficients and their significance in predicting each of the dependent variables were obtained for each of the eight interactional measures. The statistical analysis was a test of the hypothesis that the regression coefficients are zero against an alternative hypothesis that they are greater than zero.

The results indicated that, of the 32 predictions for the father-son sample, five of the hypotheses were confirmed in relation to aggression in sons and three with respect to dependency. None of the hypotheses for the

mother

demand

aggres

to be

the sa

taking

intera

rejec

fathe

indic

alter

instr

relat

paren

This

is ti

intro

samp

indi

fami

the

on t

of p

ency

itiv

depe

mother-son sample were supported. Rejection, ambivalence, demands for aggression, parental aggression, and general aggression by fathers who take expressive roles were shown to be more significantly related to aggression in sons than the same attitudes in conjunction with instrumental role taking by fathers. For dependency in sons, significant interactions in the predicted direction were revealed for rejection, parental aggression, and general aggression by fathers. The findings for the mothers' parental aggression indicated that the hypotheses were rejected in favor of alternative ones. Parental aggression by mothers who take instrumental roles was indicated to be more significantly related to aggression and perceived rejection in sons than parental aggression by mothers who take expressive roles. This tends to be opposite to the findings for fathers and is the reverse of that predicted for mothers.

The nature of the sample employed in this study introduces caution in generalizing the findings to other samples and to the general population. In general, the indications are that the samples included the more disturbed families. The sons of mothers, and to a lesser extent, of the fathers, who participated in the study scored higher on the aggression and dependency variables than the sons of parents who did not take part. Since there was a tendency for high scores on the attitude variables to be positively associated with high scores on the aggression and dependency scales, it was considered likely that the

partici

titude

Burton A. Deming

participating parents were also more negative in their attitudes toward sons.

Approved _____
Committee Chairman

Date _____

**A STUDY OF THE INTERACTION BETWEEN PARENTAL ROLE
AND PARENTAL ATTITUDE AND ITS RELATIONSHIP WITH
BEHAVIOR MANIFESTATIONS IN PREADOLESCENT SONS**

By
Burton A. Deming

A THESIS

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Psychology

1964

to Elinor

the
ma
fa
th
cor
as
dev
the
is
at
abo
Inv

fre
age
dis
Kar
des
dat

Jam
ana
ass
the
Mai
Hea
the
enco
an
Scho
Elex
fami

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to acknowledge most gratefully the assistance of the following people who contributed in many ways to the progress of the dissertation. Of the faculty, Dr. Berton Karon and Dr. Alfred Dietze served on the dissertation committee throughout the planning and completion of the dissertation. Dr. John Hurley served as committee chairman through the entire course of thesis development. Dr. Rabin was particularly helpful during the early stages of the research. A special note of thanks is due Dr. Winder for graciously substituting for Dr. Rabin at the last moment and for his informative conversations about the Stanford Attitude Scale and the Peer Nomination Inventory.

I am especially grateful to Dr. Hurley who gave freely of his time, energy, patience, ability, and encouragement throughout the initiation and conclusion of the dissertation. I wish also to express appreciation to Dr. Karon particularly for his assistance on the statistical design and help in clarifying problems in analysis of the data.

Of my colleagues, I am particularly grateful to James Clark and Clyde Crego for help with the computer analysis. This was particularly noteworthy since their assistance was given at a time when they were busy with their own research. To Dr. Ray Bodwin and Dr. Leon Maizlish and the other staff members of the Flint Mental Health Clinic, special thanks are due for their help in the completion of the research. They provided time and encouragement during my association with the clinic as an intern and staff member. Finally, the Flint Public Schools, particularly the staffs of the Merrill and Selby Elementary Schools, provided facilities and contacts with families which made possible the completion of the research.

CHAP

I

II

III

IV

V

V

REF

APP

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Prospectus	1
Conceptual Analysis of Role.	1
Theoretical Frame of Reference	4
Review of Studies on Parental Roles.	13
Review of Research on Parent-Child Relation- ships.	16
General Summary and Conclusions.	25
II. PROBLEM AND HYPOTHESES	28
Statement of the Problem	28
Statement of Hypotheses.	28
III. METHOD	31
Instruments.	31
Procedure.	49
Sample	51
Statistical Analysis	53
IV. RESULTS.	57
Father-Son Sample.	57
Mother-Son Sample.	64
V. DISCUSSION	70
Father-Son Sample.	70
Mother-Son Sample.	77
Correlations between the Mother and Father Variables.	79
Implications for Research in Parent-Child Relations.	81
VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.	85
REFERENCES.	88
APPENDICES.	92

2A3

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	Page
1. SCT scoring categories and scoring weights assigned to each criterion or combination of criteria.	39
2. Intercorrelations for specific SCT stories and between each story and the total SCT score. . . .	39
3. Mean SCT scores for the pilot sample comparing fathers (F) and mothers (M)	41
4. Mean SCT scores for the present sample comparing fathers (F), non-working mothers (NWM) and working mothers (WM).	41
5. Mean ages and mean years of education for the mothers and fathers who participated in the study, and the distribution of boys by grade for each parent sample.	52
6. Intercorrelations between the attitude and role variables for the fathers	54
7. Intercorrelations between the attitude and role variables for the mothers	55
8. Aggression in Sons: Regression coefficients for the fathers' attitude, role, and interactional variables	58
9. Dependency in Sons: Regression coefficients for the fathers' attitude, role, and interactional variables	60
10. Withdrawal in Sons: Regression coefficients for the fathers' attitude, role, and interactional variables	62
11. Perceived Rejection of Fathers by Sons: Regression coefficients for the fathers' attitude, role, and interactional variables	63
12. Aggression in Sons: Regression coefficients for the mothers' attitude, role, and interactional variables	65

TABLE

13.

14.

15.

16.

17.

LIST OF TABLES--Continued

TABLE	Page
13. Dependency in Sons: Regression coefficients for the mothers' attitude, role, and interactional variables	66
14. Withdrawal in Sons: Regression coefficients for the mothers' attitude, role, and interactional variables	67
15. Perceived Rejection of Mothers by Sons: Regression coefficients for the mothers' attitude, role, and interactional variables.	68
16. Intercorrelations between the dependent variables for the father-son sample.	73
17. Correlations of the fathers' attitude and role variables with the attitude and role variables for the mothers based on scores for 41 marital-pairs.	80

APPENDIX

A.

B.

C.

D.

E.

F.

G.

H.

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX	Page
A. SCT Instructions and Stories.	92
B. Scoring Manual for the SCT.	95
C. Mother Form of the Stanford Parent Questionnaire.	107
D. Father Form of the Stanford Parent Questionnaire.	119
E. Items for each scale of the Stanford Parent Questionnaire.	131
F. Mean scores for the dependent variables in relation to role taking by fathers and mothers.	133
G. Raw Scores for the Mother-Son Sample.	134
H. Raw Scores for the Father-Son Sample.	139

PROSPEC

around

of fam

the as

dition

this g

notion

parent

differ

cussio

of rol

a revi

resear

child

CONCEP

sociol

years

standi

of thi

Brim,

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

PROSPECTUS

The organization of the following pages is oriented around the application of role theory toward an analysis of family relationships. At issue is the extent to which the association between parental and child behavior is conditional to the kind of role taken by the parent. Within this general context, an inquiry is directed toward the notion that the differential effect of the attitudes of parents on the behavior of their sons is a function of the differential roles taken in relation to the sons. The discussion in this chapter takes up in order the definition of role, the theoretical frame of reference for this study, a review of research on parental roles, and a review of research on parental attitudes and their bearing on parent-child relations.

CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS OF ROLE

The concept of role has been used extensively in sociological and psychological theory. Moreover, in recent years there has been a concerted effort to further understanding of family relationships through the application of this concept (Parsons, 1955a, 1955b; Ackerman, 1958; Brim, 1957; Farber, 1959, 1960; Strodbeck, 1954). This

app
tem
uai
gro

tive
is c

it i
and
this
If e
and t
tatic
will
follo

to de
when
of A,
situa

approach characterizes the family as a unitary social system or psychological group in which the actions of individuals have significance for each other and for the total group.

Role is advanced as a relationship variable descriptive of and critical to the interactive group process. It is defined by Parsons (1951a) as follows:

Role is that organized sector of an actor's orientation which constitutes and defines his participation in an interactive process. It involves a set of complementary expectations concerning his own actions and those of others with whom he interacts. Both the actor and those with whom he interacts possess these expectations. Roles are institutionalized when they are fully congruous with the prevailing culture patterns and are organized around expectations of conformity with morally sanctioned patterns of value orientations shared by members of a collectivity in which the role functions (p. 23).

Parsons stresses five attributes of role. First, it is relational in scope. Ego's role has implications for and is evolved from his relationship with alter.¹ Second, this relationship is complementary and reciprocal in nature. If ego, as an example, takes a dominant role with alter, and the process is stabilized, this necessitates an expectation on the part of both ego and alter that the former will be dominant and the latter submissive. This notion follows closely with those of Sarbin (1954) and Brim (1957).

¹The terms "ego" and "alter" are used by Parsons to denote two persons, say A and B, interacting together. When their relationship is discussed from the standpoint of A, then ego refers to A and alter to B. In the converse situation, ego pertains to B and alter to A.

Third, is the matter of role expectations. Essentially, these are the reciprocal expectations of ego and alter about each other's actions and attitudes. Fourth, is the social aspect of role. This highlights role as the point of articulation between the personality system of the actor and the social system of which he is a part. Vogel (1958) and Ackerman (1958) also stress this aspect of role.

Finally, there is the quality of institutionalization which is essentially a function of the extent to which there is agreement between group members as to their respective roles. This bears closely on the formal and informal categories of Vogel (1958). Formal roles are those which are officially prescribed by the group and are concerned primarily with duties and rules regarding specific tasks. Informal roles are less explicit, less likely to be directly communicated between group members, and deal more with the social and emotional elements of group behavior.

The foregoing discussion has dealt principally with structural aspects of role. Correlating with this are the manifest and latent role functions postulated by Merton (1957).

Manifest functions are those objective consequences contributing to the adjustment or adaptation of the system which are intended and recognized by participants in the system. Latent functions, correlatively, being those which are neither intended or recognized . . . although they may integrate a group as well as disrupt it (p. 51).

A corollary relationship apparently exists between the

function

above.

by manif

THEORETIC

role and

sented in

action (

1953).

mental a

scheme f

active p

systems.

nections

in terms

system i

organize

than the

tural sy

norms, a

the indi

Essential

ality of

the rules

interpers

functional and structural attributes of roles as described above. Formal roles would seem to be constituted mainly by manifest functions and informal roles by latent functions.

THEORETICAL FRAME OF REFERENCE

The theoretical and operational formulations about role and its bearing on parent-child relationships, as presented in this study, are taken from Parsons' theory of action (Parsons, 1951a, 1951b, 1951c; Parsons and Bales, 1953). Of particular relevance are the concepts of instrumental and expressive role orientations.

The theory of action is represented as a conceptual scheme for the analysis of human behavior. It is the interactive product of the personality, social, and cultural systems. The first is one which pertains to the interconnections of the actions of an individual which are organized in terms of the structure of his need dispositions. A social system is one which involves a plurality of persons and is organized on the basis of the interactive process rather than the action system of the individual. Finally, a cultural system is a pattern of culture from which values, norms, and symbols which guide and direct the action of the individual and his interactions with others are derived. Essentially, the theory of action encompasses the personality of the individual, his interactions with others, and the rules and norms which make possible orderly and stable interpersonal relationships.

The description of a system of action must employ the categories of motivational orientation: cognition, cathexis, and evaluation. Likewise the description of an action system must deal with the properties of the system of interaction of two or more individuals or collective actors--this is the social aspect--and it must note the conditions which interaction imposes on the participating actors. It must also take into account the cultural tradition as an object of orientation as well as culture patterns as internalized patterns of cognitive expectations and of cathectic-evaluative selection among possible orientations that are of crucial significance in the personality system and in the social system (Parsons, 1951a, p. 7).

Role was defined above as the point of articulation between the personality system of the individual and the social system of which he is a part. Following from this, Parsons takes role as the conceptual unit of analysis of the social system, applies it as a frame of reference within which relations between ego and alter take place, and interprets it as being one of the major determinants of this relationship (Parsons, 1951c).

The two primary roles considered to be characteristic of interpersonal behavior are designated by Parsons as instrumental and expressive. Consequently, the nature of role's determination of the relationship between ego and alter is dependent upon which role orientation is the predominant one. These two are in turn indicated to be constituted by five strictly limited and defined pattern variables or value dimensions which are presented as choice points giving direction to one orientation or the other (Parsons, 1951c, p. 67).

1. Affectivity vs. Affective Neutrality.

Discussi

versalis

ship bet

the achi

tern var

ego respo

grative

social s

The assu

be conti

on it by

discipli

seek imm

delay gr

diate gr

be chara

typical

attitude

that exp

high ind

2. Self-Orientation vs. Collectivity-Orientation.
3. Universalism vs. Particularism.
4. Achievement vs. Ascription.
5. Specificity vs. Diffuseness.

Discussion

The affectivity-affective neutrality and the universalism-particularism dimensions focus on the relationship between ego and alter from the standpoint of ego while the achievement-ascription and specificity-diffuseness pattern variables pertain to the properties of alter to which ego responds. The self-collectivity orientation is integrative in nature and designates the principal referent social system or group for ego's relationship with alter. The assumption is that ego's interaction with alter will be contingent upon and integrated with the demands placed on it by a larger relational system.

The first pattern variable raises a gratification-discipline dilemma. The decision here is whether ego will seek immediate gratification for his affective needs or delay gratification in his relationship with alter. Immediate gratification of affective needs is considered to be characteristic of expressive roles while delay is more typical of instrumental roles. Himmelstrand (1960), using attitude as his conceptual frame of reference, indicates that expressive manifestations occur under conditions of high independence of affective loading of verbal attitudes

from
condi
featu
vario
ing)
ary i
catic
objec
ents

indi
to t
ion
spec
abou
more
this
the
refe
ogou
tiat

per
Exp
spo
of
the

from their attitudinal referents and instrumental ones under conditions of low independence or dependence. The critical feature of the first is "the allocation of energy among various symbolic acts which are gratifying (tension reducing) in themselves, the referents signified being of secondary importance (p. 48)," and of the second is "the signification, description, and evaluation of selected referent objects, gratification being attained only as these referents are reached (p. 48)."

These comments by Himmelstrand seem to suggest that individuals taking expressive roles will show a tendency to treat their relationships with others in a symbolic fashion while obtaining gratification more by reflecting and speculating on their personal ideas, thoughts, and feelings about an interpersonal situation rather than by dealing more directly with its cognitive demands. In contrast to this, instrumentally oriented individuals respond more to the cognitive aspects of their relationships with particular reference to alter's behavior. This distinction is analogous to the immediate vs. delayed gratification differentiation noted above.

Himmelstrand also addresses himself to the time perspective aspect of expressive and instrumental roles. Expressive actions are conceptualized as consummatory responses located at a proximal goal, and the performance of one such act is drive reducing which in effect lowers the probability of continued action in the same direction.

Consequ

repetiti

proximal

rise to

as mainl

and the

drive re

continue

strument

goals be

of previ

and disc

usually

further

roles fo

mental

ity dime

cate tha

alter, r

needs an

within

ego wil

position

of alter

and cont

Consequently, expressive goal attainment is a "static or repetitive process, the goals of expressive action being proximal goals of symbolic gratification which do not give rise to new goals as they are attained (p. 51)."

By contrast, instrumental actions are designated as mainly responses located at some distance from the goals, and the performance of any one such act is not in itself drive reducing which tends to increase the probability of continued action in the same direction. As a result, instrumental goal attainment is a "dynamic process, new distal goals being established over and over again on the basis of previous attainment, since the barriers met and the errors and discoveries made in the flow in instrumental action usually present new problems projecting the goals of action further into the future (p. 51)." In short, expressive roles focus more on the present time perspective and instrumental roles more on the future time perspective.

With respect to the affectivity-affective neutrality dimension, the views of Parsons and Himmelstrand indicate that in expressive roles ego, in his relationship with alter, will be internally oriented toward his affective needs and will seek immediate gratification of these needs within the present time perspective. In instrumental roles ego will assume a more affectively-neutral and cognitive position and will be externally oriented toward the behavior of alter. Gratification of affective needs will be delayed and contingent upon the future consequences of his relationship

with
the
on h
pred
role

able
era
or
they
siv
the
to
to
cla
aff
rel
to

to
alt
e.
ac
si
or
or
to

with alter. Theoretically at least, it seems clear that the internal dynamics of ego will have a greater impact on his relationship with alter when the expressive role predominates than would be the case for the instrumental role.

The issue for the universalism-particularism variable is whether ego will respond to alter in terms of generalized norms characteristic of others in the same class or in terms of the particular relational system in which they are involved. Particularism is associated with expressive roles and universalism with instrumental roles. In the first instance, ego will respond to attributes peculiar to alter, and in the second, he will relate with respect to characteristics held in common with others of the same class. This follows from the above discussion in that an affective orientation is more conducive to particularistic relationships while a cognitive approach is more pertinent to generalized, universalistic relationships.

The achievement-ascription dimension is relevant to ego's focusing on the overt, performance aspects of alter's behavior or on the intrinsic properties of alter, e.g., feelings and personality traits. The former is characteristic of instrumental roles and the latter of expressive roles. In expressive roles ego is not only affectively oriented to himself but also to alter. In instrumental orientations ego is cognitively oriented both with respect to himself and to alter.

quest

ego a

to pa

a mul

tive

role.

in b

two

fies

ment

syst

conc

he w

inst

to s

ship

modi

to t

ins

not

tio

ori

pha

pro

The specificity-diffuseness variable bears on the question of how involved will be the relationship between ego and alter. In the first, the relationship is limited to particular needs and demands. In the second, there is a multiplicity of needs and demands. Specificity is descriptive of instrumental roles and diffuseness of expressive roles.

The self-collectivity orientation is represented in both types of roles. The differentiation between the two is in terms of the referent social system which modifies ego's relationship with alter. In expressive involvements ego's integrative reference is the immediate social system in which his relationship with alter occurs. His concern is facilitating solidarity within this group, and he will respond to alter in terms of achieving this. In instrumental involvements ego's integrative reference is to social systems external to the one in which his relationship with alter occurs, and his responses to alter will be modified in terms of the adaptation of the immediate group to those external to it.

Two additional considerations about expressive and instrumental roles need to be examined. First, they are not mutually exclusive. An individual's action and relationship patterns must of necessity include both kinds of orientations. However, the assessment of the relative emphasis given to one role versus the other is a legitimate procedure. Second, role as defined by Parsons is primarily

a struc
uted to
out that
tional r
focus mo
on the m
structur
apparent
qualitie
But role
tent of

refe
it i
alte
sign
to s
of t
than
tura
than
sons

The aff
as an e
or abse
tive or
to bear

Summary

product
interact

a structural variable. There are certain functions attributed to the two roles. Thebalt and Kelley (1959) point out that expressive roles deal more with the social-emotional relations within the group while instrumental roles focus more on the task or problem solving demands imposed on the members of the group. In addition, in terms of the structural-functional context described above it is also apparent that expressive roles take on informal, latent qualities and instrumental roles formal, manifest aspects. But role is structural in that it extends across the content of specific interactional situations.

To develop a systematic scheme of points of reference for the analysis of orientations in roles it is then essential first to analyze these basic alternatives of selection which are particularly significant in defining the character of relations to such a social object, and which are constitutive of the character of the relationship itself rather than of its "content" in interest terms, its cultural or motivational aspects in any sense other than as constitutive of relational patterns (Parsons, 1951c, pp. 58-59).

The affectivity-affective neutrality relational pattern, as an example, does not necessarily indicate the presence or absence of affective needs, nor whether they are negative or positive, but only the mode by which they are brought to bear on a relationship.

Summary

The theory of action is presented as the interactive product of the personality structure of the individual, his interactions with others, and the values and norms which

f

t

t

t

o

t

o

t

t

t

i

a

t

t

r

t

t

t

t

facilitate the stabilization of these interactions. From this, expressive and instrumental roles are derived as structural variables, defined by an expressive-instrumental continuum, and taken as the unit for the conceptual analysis of interpersonal relationships. Within this general context, the following attributes are presented as definitional of expressive roles.

1. Primacy is given to affective modes of orientation with the focus of the relationship being directed more toward the internal dynamics of ego than toward the properties of alter.

2. The gratification process for ego is immediate, is evolved from a particularistic relationship with alter, and tends not to extend beyond the immediate time perspective. In any given interaction ego will attempt to complete the gratification cycle without delay by eliciting appropriate responses from alter.

3. Ego's attachment to alter is diffuse in that there is a complex of needs and demands expressed in relation to his more covert feelings and attitudes, rather than to alter's overt, performance behavior.

4. They are structured along informal lines being indeterminate, implicit, and emphasizing latent role functions.

5. Integrative functions occur to the extent that ego responds to alter in ways which promote solidarity among the members of the group in which the relationship between ego and alter occur.

In contrast to the above, the following attributes are presented as definitional of instrumental roles.

1. Primacy is given to cognitive modes of orientation with the focus of the relationship being directed more toward the properties of alter than toward the internal dynamics of ego.

2. The gratification process for ego is delayed, is evolved from a universalistic relationship with alter, and takes into account a future time perspective. Ego will attempt to modify alter's performance behavior with the

expecta
cations
is cont

restric
of his

determ

gree t
of the
extern
ner wh

REVIE

have

of sm

1950;

incom

of fa

soci

muni

of c

tion

corr

func

macy

them

expl

bear

expectation that the latter will incorporate these modifications into future problem solving behavior. Ego's reward is contingent upon alter's fulfilling this expectation.

3. Ego's attachment to alter is specific, being restricted to overt, performance, task-oriented aspects of his behavior.

4. They are structured along formal lines being determinate, explicit, and stressing manifest functions.

5. Integrative functions are involved to the degree that ego views his relationship with alter in terms of the latter's adaptation and adjustment to social systems external to the immediate one and responds to him in a manner which will bring this about.

REVIEW OF STUDIES ON PARENTAL ROLES

The concepts of instrumental and expressive roles have been found to be descriptive of the primary functions of small group interaction (Thebalt and Kelley, 1959; Bales, 1950; Bales and Slater, 1955). Parsons (1955b) has further incorporated these concepts into a theoretical formulation of familial roles. The family is described as a primary social system having meaningful ties with the larger community with respect to the socialization and integration of children into society membership and to the stabilization of adult personalities which make up society. These correspond generally with instrumental and expressive role functions respectively.

Parsons postulates that husbands and sons give primacy to instrumental tasks and wives and daughters concern themselves largely with expressive considerations. Two explanations are offered. Biologically the mother's early bearing and nursing experience predisposes her toward

social-

emption

the oc

instru

of occ

(1960)

his s

large

into

1955

for

mari

aske

both

ter

by

wit

siv

rol

use

ch

th

wa

de

in

social-emotional relationships. The father's relative exemption from these biological demands and his position as the occupational leader of the family orient him toward instrumental and task-oriented aspects. The importance of occupational setting is underscored by Aberle and Naegele (1960) in asserting that the father's relationship with his son, particularly in middle class families, is mediated largely in terms of the latter's eventual incorporation into an appropriate occupation.

Several studies (Kenkel, 1961a, 1961b; Huntington, 1955; Ovade, 1955) have tested the Parsonian hypothesis for husband-wife interactional patterns. In each case, marital pairs were presented with problem situations and asked to work out a solution to the mutual satisfaction to both. Their interactions were recorded and analyzed in terms of instrumental and expressive categories as defined by Bales (1950). Significant differences were obtained with husbands taking instrumental roles and wives expressive ones.

Another series of studies have investigated parental roles within a parent-child context. Emmerich (1959, 1961) used a modified paired comparison procedure based on the child's perceptions of his parents. The extent to which the parent was viewed as facilitating the acts of the child was operationally defined as an expressive role and the degree to which the parent was seen as interfering as the instrumental role. Pre-school children were found to ascribe

express

However

Hosken

tions

parent

were t

of num

father

expre

inves

multi

a mea

and v

above

poth

amin

Disc

focu

text

rela

the

husb

test

expressive roles to mothers and instrumental roles to fathers. However, this differentiation did not hold for older children.

Kagan and Lemkin (1960), Kagan (1956), and Kagan, Hosken, and Watson (1961) also utilized children's perceptions of their parents in their analyses. Perceptions of parents as punitive, threatening, dominating, and competent were taken to indicate an instrumental role and qualities of nurturance and support as an expressive role. Again, fathers were found to be instrumentally oriented and mothers expressively inclined in their relationships with children.

A final study to be discussed is a cross-cultural investigation reported by Zelditch (1955). He employed multiple criteria such as "warmth" and "conciliation" as a measure of the expressive role and "emotional restraint" and "boss" to indicate the instrumental role. As in the above studies, the findings tended to confirm Parsons' hypothesis about parental roles for each of the cultures examined.

Discussion

With exception of the one by Zelditch, these studies focus largely on middle-class samples, and within this context, indicate that wives and husbands have reciprocal role relationships with the former taking expressive roles and the latter instrumental roles. The reported research on husband-wife interactional patterns appears to be a valid test of Parsons' theory in that definition of the two roles

in ter
sons'
are de
orien
tivel
behav.

child
indic
press
instr
follo
previ
press
tiona
neutr

Summa

conce
sive
of me
ental
tiate
as to

REVIE

in terms of the Bales' categories is consistent with Parsons' formulations as given above. Instrumental categories are defined as affectively neutral and pertaining to task-oriented functions, and the expressive categories as affectively oriented and dealing with social-emotional areas of behavior.

The findings as to parental roles in relation to children are less conclusive. In the main, these studies indicate positive emotional qualities as indicative of expressive roles and negative qualities as definitional of instrumental roles. These definitions do not appear to follow very closely with Parsons' conceptualizations. As previously discussed, the affective orientation of the expressive role may include negative as well as positive emotional qualities while the instrumental role is affectively neutral and cognitive in its orientation.

Summary

As far as their interactions with each other are concerned, the results show that wives tend toward expressive roles and husbands toward instrumental roles. Because of methodological questions, the results dealing with parental roles in relation to children only partially substantiate Parsons' theory. Questions may be raised particularly as to fathers taking instrumental roles.

REVIEW OF RESEARCH ON PARENT-CHILD RELATIONSHIPS

In the previous section, the indications were that

mother
relati
making
feren
child
wheth
etc.,
is gi
and t
asses

et al
popul
Fels
were
famil
guida
ical
of co
as in

point
and p
of ch
to be
the m
great

mothers and fathers tend toward different roles in family relationships. Following from this, in this section studies making comparisons between mothers and fathers and the differential effect of their attitudes on the behavior of their children are reviewed. Of interest are questions as to whether the mother's or the father's rejection, aggression, etc., has the greater impact on the child. Further emphasis is given to research focusing on sons more than daughters and that which is based on methodologically independent assessment of the mother, father, and son variables.

Three investigations (Becker et al., 1959; Peterson et al., 1961; Peterson et al., 1959) pertained to clinic populations and utilized essentially the same design. The Fels Parent Behavior Scales (1945) and other instruments were administered to fathers and mothers of two groups of families, one with a child requiring services of a child guidance clinic and one without children involved in clinical contacts. The child's behavior was evaluated in terms of conduct and personality problems with parents serving as informants.

The Becker et al. and Peterson et al. (1961) studies pointed up possible differences in the way that maternal and paternal behavior is structured in relation to problems of children. Both parents of conduct problem children tended to be maladjusted and dictatorial with the child. However, the model suggested was one in which the mother has the greater impact on the child. She is active in thwarting

and
sive
sona
whic
moth

pare
demo
and
ment
tions
for f

Rau,
has e
of at
proce
above
as pa
havior
condu
the m
the f
of the
tiatic
the bo

and controlling the child whereas the father is more passive and ineffective in disciplinary matters. For the personality variable the situation was somewhat reversed in which the father's maladjustment was more relevant than the mother's.

The Peterson et al. (1959) study suggested that parents of nonclinic populations tended to be higher in democratic guidance, parent-child harmony, sociability, and adjustment than clinic parents. The sociability-adjustment variable was indicated to be crucial for differentiations between mothers and the passivity-activity dimension for fathers.

Other research (Becker et al., 1962; Winder and Rau, 1962) has dealt more with nonclinic populations and has employed omnibus type procedures involving a variety of attitudinal variables. Becker et al. used measurement procedures similar to those for the clinic studies, discussed above, the principal exception being that teachers as well as parents were used to obtain ratings of the child's behavior. On the basis of teacher ratings, aggression and conduct problems in boys were positively correlated with the mother's physical punishment, negative perception of the father, self-esteem, anxiety, and adjustment. None of the father variables were related. A similar differentiation was reported with respect to parental ratings of the boys' behavior.

Winder and Rau compared attitudes of parents with

socia
sesse
and s
(1959
on pe
ency,

the m
behav
and P
as ag
the .
high
sion,
with
only
ambiv

(1963
and p
role
the f
perce
carry
itive
a coc
betwe

social deviancy in preadolescent sons. Attitudes were assessed by the Stanford Parent Attitude Questionnaire (SPAQ) and social deviancy by the Peer Nomination Inventory (PNI) (1959). The PNI is a modified "guess who" technique based on peer ratings and yields measures of aggression, dependency, withdrawal, and depression.

Overall, their findings indicated a tendency for the mothers' attitudes to be more influential of the sons' behavior than the fathers'. Comparisons between the SPAQ and PNI variables showed 35 scores on the mothers' scales as against 22 of the fathers' scores to be significant at the .05 level or better. For the mothers low self-esteem, high ambivalence, high consistency, high demands for aggression, and high aggression and punitiveness were associated with three or four of the deviancy variables. For the fathers only high punitiveness and physical punishment and high ambivalence were so related.

Investigations by Farber (1962) and Adams and Sarason (1963) focused more specifically on marital role tension and parental anxiety. Farber concluded tentatively that role conflict by the mother, in comparison with that of the father, is more significantly related to the child's perception of acceptance by either parent. Implied is a carryover of the marital relation, whether negative or positive, by the mother to the mother-child relationship, and a coordinating role for the mother in which she mediates between the father and the children. Adams and Sarason

showed

with a

class

has yi

parent

popula

The mo

signifi

turbar

more c

of lov

boys a

overco

to be

The r

issue

of ag

ticip

etc.)

for th

Discus

studie

a more

showed that the mother's anxiety was more highly correlated with anxiety in boys than was the father's anxiety.

The studies reviewed so far have focused on middle class samples. However, research on lower class families has yielded similar findings. Eron et al. (1961) compared parental attitudes and peer ratings of their children on popularity, rejection, aggression, and aggression anxiety. The mothers' rejection and parental disharmony was more significantly related than the fathers' to behavioral disturbances in the child while punishment by the fathers was more crucial than that by the mothers.

McCord, McCord, and Howard (1961), in their study of lower class families, used aggression in early adolescent boys as their dependent variable. Punitiveness, rejection, overcontrol, and inconsistency by the mothers were found to be significantly associated with the boys' aggression. The relevancy of the father was restricted largely to the issue of his adequacy as an identification model. The fathers of aggressive boys tended to be passive, ineffectual, participating in immature deviant forms of behavior (alcoholism, etc.), and deficient in providing a model of inner control for their sons.

Discussion

Two general trends seem to be indicated by these studies. First, mothers, in comparison with fathers, have a more pervasive and significant impact on their sons' behavior.

Both the covert factors of inconsistency, anxiety, self-esteem, marital disturbance, and adjustment and the more overt attitudes of aggression, rejection, control, and domination on the part of the mother tend to be critically related to behavior disturbances in boys.

Significant attitudinal patterns for the father are more unidimensional in that they pertain largely to modeling functions. Deviant behavior on the part of the son is related to the father's failure to provide the boy with norms for inner and outer controls and an adequate model for identification. This distinction between fathers and mothers follows closely with that suggested by Winder and Rau (1962).

It would seem that deviant social behavior in boys of this age develops in a setting of punitiveness, restrictiveness, and ambivalence on the part of both parents. Within this general context of disturbed parent-child interactions, we are tempted to speculate on somewhat different roles played by mothers and fathers in shaping their sons' deviant behavior. The father seems to be an important influence to the extent that he is actively involved with the child and presents either an assertive and perhaps exaggeratedly masculine or a somewhat unassertive, inadequate model. The mother's impact on the son, on the other hand, seems to be a somewhat more complicated function of her internal dynamics and relationships with other family members, particularly the father. She may react toward the child with hostile rejection or anxious overconcern and restrictiveness at least in part because of her own security and self esteem are impaired. And this, in turn, may be a reflection of a disturbed or unsatisfying marital relationship (p. 423).

The second conclusion, following closely from the first, is that the husband-wife-son relationship pattern

may co
sugge
action
group
terms
decis
tween

As in
son
than
on t
senc
moth
hush
into

shi
Bec
and
rel
eve
we
in
fo
as
re

may conform in part to the three-person interactional model suggested by Mills (1953, 1954). He contends that interaction is not equally distributed throughout the three-person group structure. A mutually reinforcing relationship in terms of support solicited, approval given, power relations, decision making, and general participation accumulates between two members with the third being isolated.

This would be modified somewhat for the family triad. As indicated above, the mother is more influential in parent-son relationships than the father. But the latter, rather than being strictly isolated, may exert an indirect effect on the son through the husband-wife relationship. In essence, it is postulated that the mother-child dyad is the mother's principal domain within the family and that the husband-wife dyad is the father's principal point of entry into family relationships.

Some support for this is indicated by the relationships between maternal and paternal attitudes reported by Becker et al. (1962). Hostility, strictness, sex anxiety, and physical punishment by fathers were each significantly related to several behavioral variables for mothers. However, from the standpoint of the mothers, these attitudes were associated only with their corresponding counterparts in the fathers. Hostility by fathers, for example, was found to correlate significantly with mothers' hostility as well as their negative perception of the father, child rearing anxiety, and tendency toward physical punishment.

In con

with

but t

more

for t

more

He re

asser

nurs

corr

the

not

corr

the

dis

ove

clu

tha

and

is

ma

po

of

fe

In contrast to this, the mothers' hostility correlated only with the fathers' hostility.

Becker et al. do not interpret these correlations, but their findings do suggest that the father tends to be more determinant of the mother's behavior than is the case for the converse of this. Hoffman (1960) has commented more directly on this postulated model of family interaction. He related power assertion or domination by parents to power assertiveness, hostility, and resistance to influence in nursery school children. The results showed high positive correlations between the mothers' power assertiveness and the child variables. The fathers' power assertiveness was not related to the child's behavior but was significantly correlated with the mothers'.

He concluded that dictatorial fathers tend to direct their authoritarianism toward their wives, who in turn, displace their resentment onto the child in the form of overly dominating attitudes. A corollary to Hoffman's conclusion would be one indicating that wives are less likely than their husbands to openly verbalize marital tensions and conflicts to their marital partners. Support for this is reported by Quade (1955) in his study of the effect of marital adjustment on husband-wife interaction.

These conclusions about parental attitudes and the postulated model of family interaction patterns tend to offer further support for the expressive-instrumental differentiation between parents. The complexity of the mother's

relati
in rol
dicate
roles.
child
ily an
point
interp
sive a

Summar

contex
First,
to the
mother
tern i
In con
more u
on his

in whi
and th
for fa
that t
of the
is mor

relationship with the son is more suggestive of diffuseness in role orientation than of specificity, and as such, indicates that mothers take expressive more than instrumental roles. The family interactional model presented the mother-child dyad as the mother's principal domain within the family and the husband-wife dyad as the father's principal point of entry into family relationships. Farber (1957) interprets this distinction as being indicative of expressive and instrumental roles respectively.

Summary

The discussion of parental attitudes within the context of parent-child relationships yields two conclusions. First, the attitudes of mothers are more crucially related to the behavior of sons than those of the fathers. The mother's impact on the son appears to follow a complex pattern involving both covert and overt attitudinal dimensions. In contrast to this, the father's influence seems to be more unidimensional in nature and focuses more specifically on his adequacy or inadequacy in modeling functions.

Second, a model of family interaction was suggested in which the mother-son relationship is pertinent for mothers and the husband-wife relationship is the most relevant one for fathers. Following from this, the indications were that the mother's behavior has a direct bearing on that of the son while the father's effect on the boy's behavior is more indirect being mediated through the mother. Both

o

t

a

G

t

b

t

g

a

h

f

f

a

r

s

a

w

e.

b

e.

to

to

p2

be

of these conclusions were interpreted as further confirmation of the contention that mothers tend toward expressive and fathers toward instrumental roles.

GENERAL SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In the theoretical discussion role, as defined by the expressive-instrumental continuum, was interpreted as being one of the major determinants of interpersonal relationships. The review of research revealed that mothers generally take expressive and fathers instrumental roles, and that their attitudes have a greater effect on the behavior of sons than those of the fathers. These parallel findings give support for this interpretation and offer further elaboration as to the probable direction of role's association with attitude.

In general, negative parental attitudes such as rejection and anxious overconcern would appear to be more significantly related to the behavior of sons when they are associated with expressive roles than when they occur within an instrumental role context. The definition of expressive and instrumental roles offer some theoretical basis for this postulated relationship. As discussed above, expressive roles tend to be affectively oriented, directed toward the immediate gratification of affective needs, and to focus more on the internal dynamics of ego than on the properties of alter. Moreover, the tendency for ego will be away from problem solving behavior in his relationship

W

f

h

S

a

C

v

e

with alter with greater emphasis given to the latter's covert feelings and attitudes than to his overt, performance behavior. Finally, an expressive orientation is generally structured along informal lines being indeterminant, implicit, and focused on latent role functions.

Instrumental roles, on the other hand, are more cognitively oriented, directed toward delay in gratification of affective needs, and inclined more toward the properties of alter than the internal dynamics of ego. The relationship between ego and alter is determinant, explicit, pointed toward manifest role functions, structured along formal lines, and within this frame of reference, directed toward problem solving in terms of alter's performance behavior.

In the view of the writer, one condition which would seem to follow from the nature of expressive and instrumental roles is that in the former communication and understanding between ego and alter as to the demands and conditions for reward would be at a minimum. In the case of the latter, the tendency would be for maximum communication and understanding. Thus, when the behavior of a son arouses the negative attitudes of rejection and anxiety in an expressively oriented parent the latter will be inclined to seek immediate gratification of the needs associated with these attitudes without, at the same time, focusing very much on changing or rectifying the behavior of the boy. Consequently, the son will be relatively unclear as to which of

his b
tituc
rewar

role
orien
behav
tive
chang
relat
viewe
alter

pear
sive
effec
may h
strun
pect
in as
to th
ity,
on ma

his behavioral characteristics elicited these negative attitudes and as to which changes would facilitate a more rewarding position with the parent.

In contrast to this, a parent taking an instrumental role will be more cognitively and task or problem solving oriented. Attention will be given to modifying undesirable behavior patterns in the son while gratification of affective needs will be delayed and contingent upon the boy's change in behavior. Following from this, the son will be relatively clear as to which aspects of his behavior are viewed as wrong by the parent and as to how they may be altered to insure a more positive reaction.

In essence, then, the instrumental role would appear to facilitate adaptation by the son while the expressive role may have somewhat of an opposite effect. The effect of even strongly negative attitudes toward a boy may be offset in part by being channeled through the instrumental role toward the adaptive, reality-oriented aspects of the son's behavior. Negative parental attitudes in association with an expressive role are communicated to the son in an atmosphere conditioned by lack of specificity, vagueness, and diffuseness which would seem to bring on maladjustment more than adaptation.

STATE

of pa

behav

sion

the

to a

its

rese

att.

to

the

for

tu

pa

ba

fo

w.

S

f

CHAPTER II

PROBLEM AND HYPOTHESES

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

This study is an investigation of the interaction of parental attitude and parental role and its effect on behavior manifestations in preadolescent sons. The discussion in CHAPTER I indicated that predictions would follow the general theme that the more a negative attitude tends to associate with the expressive role the greater will be its impact on the behavior of the son. Current theory and research does not, however, clarify very much as to which attitudinal and dependent variables would be more sensitive to the manifestations of role than others. Consequently, the design includes a complex of several such factors.

For each parent taking part measures were obtained for the role variable and for each of the following attitudes: ambivalence, rejection, demands for aggression, parental aggression, general aggression, self-esteem, husband-wife relationship, and adjustment. Dependent measures for each son participating included aggression, dependency, withdrawal, and perceived parental rejection.

STATEMENT OF HYPOTHESES

Hypotheses were derived separately for mothers and fathers and for each of the eight attitude measures and

each

32

32

hyp

Hyp

ica

pen

ent

rol

Hyp

ica

pen

ent

rol

Hyp

more

of

pre

ins

Hyp

icar

pend

enta

role

Hypo

sign

the

each of the four dependent variables. This amounted to 32 hypotheses being tested for the mother-son sample and 32 for the father-son sample. In their general form, the hypotheses are as follows:

Hypothesis I. Ambivalence in parents will be more significantly related to disturbance in sons in terms of the dependent variable when it is associated with expressive parental roles than when it is associated with instrumental roles.

Hypothesis II. Rejection by parents will be more significantly related to disturbance in sons in terms of the dependent variable when it is associated with expressive parental roles than when it is associated with instrumental roles.

Hypothesis III. Demands for aggression by parents will be more significantly related to disturbance in sons in terms of the dependent variable when it is associated with expressive parental roles than when it is associated with instrumental roles.

Hypothesis IV. Aggression by parents will be more significantly related to disturbance in sons in terms of the dependent variable when it is associated with expressive parental roles than when it is associated with instrumental roles.

Hypothesis V. General aggression in parents will be more significantly related to disturbance in sons in terms of the dependent variable when it is associated with expressive

parental roles than when it is associated with instrumental roles.

Hypothesis VI. Low self-esteem in parents will be more significantly related to disturbance in sons in terms of the dependent variable when it is associated with expressive parental roles than when it is associated with instrumental roles.

Hypothesis VII. Negative husband-wife relationships in parents will be more significantly related to disturbance in sons in terms of the dependent variable when it is associated with expressive parental roles than when it is associated with instrumental roles.

Hypothesis VIII. General maladjustment in parents will be more significantly related to disturbance in sons in terms of the dependent variable when it is associated with expressive roles than when it is associated with instrumental roles.

INS

Par

ati

tin

In

eac

a s

sto

int

rem

shi

dea

and

Fin

as

For

tin

ins

as

one

CHAPTER III

METHOD

INSTRUMENTS

Parental Role

A story completion test (SCT) was designed to operationalize the concept of the expressive-instrumental continuum within the context of Parsonian theory of action. In its preliminary form the SCT consisted of 12 stories each describing a problem situation involving parents and a son indicated to be 10 to 12 years of age. Six of the stories were dyadic in nature in that they presented an interpersonal situation between a parent and a son. The remainder stressed triadic or three-person group relationships between both parents and a son. The content of stories dealt with such problems as bed-wetting, school achievement, and stealing.

Construction of the SCT followed two principles. First behavioral sequences were described as objectively as possible in order to avoid emotionally-loaded labels. For example, "stealing" was referred to as "Danny has at times taken things that don't belong to him." Second, the instructions for the stories were worded so as to eliminate, as much as possible, any biasing of the individual toward one aspect of the story situation as opposed to another.

In particular, an attempt was made to avoid giving subjects the impression that they were necessarily required to respond to the task oriented aspects of the stories and to provide satisfactory solutions to the problems presented.

The intent was to give each subject the freedom to respond in a manner typical of that characterizing relationships with his own son and spouse. The complete instructions for the SCT are given in Appendix A. Briefly, the instructions ask the respondent to indicate how he would feel about the situation, what he would think about it, and how he would act if he were faced with the situation described.

The preliminary form of the SCT was administered to 23 mothers and 16 fathers. One mother failed to respond to one of the stories, and she was omitted, leaving a pilot sample of 38. Most of the respondents were taken from groups of parents participating in a nursery school program. In two instances, the marital pairs were part of a group of parents receiving group therapy. The sample was largely middle class and varied as to the number, sex, and age of the children. In most cases the forms were completed at home and mailed to the writer. The parents were instructed to complete them independently, and inspection of the responses did not reveal any gross instances of collusion.

The primary purpose for collecting this data was to develop a procedure for coding the responses. It was considered particularly crucial to utilize scoring categories

whi
exp
was
and
be
abo

amo
the
gro
ano
set
aff
tas
II,
its
ore
sio

ind
ati
Thi
"I
aff

lar
exp
obt
thr
foc

which could be logically derived from the theory regarding expressive and instrumental roles. A secondary concern was ascertaining whether discrimination between the mothers and fathers on the basis of the selected categories would be consistent with theoretical and empirical expectations about parental roles.

Several categories were considered and selection among them was based on their frequency, the extent to which they discriminated between subjects within the two parental groups, the degree to which they could be communicated to another scorer, and their relevance to theory. The final set of categories for the six dyad stories consisted of affectivity, expressive symbolism, affective interaction, task-oriented: general, task-oriented: I, task-oriented: II, and task-oriented: III. A brief description of each, its scoring characteristics, and its relevance to the theoretical definition of the expressive-instrumental dimensions described above¹ is given below.

A. Affectivity. This was scored when the response indicated negative or positive reaction to the story situation, including anger, anxiety, guilt, sympathy, etc. This was usually indicated directly by "I'd be angry" or "I would feel sorry for him." This category bears on the affectivity-affectively-neutral dimension.

B. Expressive Symbolism. This variable is particularly pertinent to Himmelstrand's (1960) comments. He views expressive orientations as those in which the individual obtains his gratification from interactional situations through emphasis on their symbolic aspects rather than by focusing on their overt, problem-solving demands. It was

¹See pp. 12-13.

scor
at
cat
sto

to
sit
con
to
par
va
is
an
to
in
to
dy
te

an
si
te
is
d
ti
a
l
i
b
I
E
O
W
S
e
n
H
e

E
t
e
t
s
t
K
O
s

scored for comments that were not classified under A, and at the same time, did not suggest involvement or communication with the boy or his behavior as described in the story.

Essentially this suggests a tendency for parents to react to the general or abstract meanings of problem situations with their sons rather than to the immediate, concrete aspects. Sometimes respondents were stimulated to expound on their viewpoint in life, notions about how parents should act, general value systems, and other private concerns. Representative are such comments as "this is a case of sibling rivalry," "stealing needs attention," and "I would wonder what was going on." Himmelstrand refers to such a tendency as a verbalism factor, and its presence in the responses was considered to indicate that reactions to the problems of sons were directed more by the internal dynamics of the parent than by the specific behavior pattern of the boy.

C. Affective Interaction. The A and B categories are considered to represent approaches to interpersonal situations with sons which focus largely on affective, internalized needs of the parents. Affective interaction is indicative of a shift away from this and toward more direct interaction with the boy. Category C differs from the four given below in that it pertained exclusively to affective considerations rather than to attempts at problem solving solutions. It was scored for statements revealing communication of positive or negative feelings to the boy described in the story such as "I would let him know I was angry," "I would tell him it was okay," and "I would find out what was wrong." As suggested above, the presence of this characteristic in a parent's response to the stories was interpreted as a tendency for him to react to problem situations involving his son by giving positive support or expressing negative considerations, rather than focusing more specifically on possible solutions to the problems presented. This category has reference to the affectivity-affectively-neutral and ascriptive-performance dimensions.

D. Task-Oriented: General. This category and E, F, and G given below illustrate a further shift in orientation away from affective aspects and toward cognitive and concrete problem considerations. Consequently, they are interpreted as indicating a tendency for parents to take a cognitive, problem-solving approach to interpersonal situations with their sons and bear closely on the ascriptive-performance dimensions given above. The distinction between D and the other task-oriented variables is based on the degree of specificity characteristic of the problem-solving approach. Category D was scored for statements

which
genera
import
steal
ticula

are ea
cific,
betwee
involv
gory E
commit
future
drink
task-o
affect
involv

ments
for E
amples
would

ered to
three
ments
present
boy.
done w
ized ap
the cas
clarify
categor
back to
make hi
and "I
a G sco

of the
are giv
behavio
and the
about t

which stressed a normative, moralistic, or otherwise very general orientation, such as "I talked with him about the importance of sharing," and "I told him it was wrong to steal." Thus, the specificity-diffuseness variable is particularly relevant here.

E. Task-Oriented: I. The E, F, and G categories are each interpreted as representing tendencies toward specific, problem-solving orientations. The differentiation between the three pertains to the degree to which the parent involves himself in a son's problem-solving behavior. Category E was scored for any statement indicating an explicit commitment on the part of the parent, either present or future. This would be illustrated by "I would not let him drink water before going to bed." Definition of the three task-oriented categories is pertinent to the affectivity-affectively-neutral dimension since a high degree of self involvement would suggest affective concern.

F. Task-Oriented: II. This was scored for statements which suggested less involvement than was the case for E and in which the commitment was more implicit. Examples of this include "I would make him do it," and "I would see that he did it."

G. Task-Oriented: III. This category was considered to be the most affectively-neutral approach of the three task-oriented categories. It was scored for statements indicating that attempts to deal with the problem presented are restricted to verbal interaction with the boy. The assumption is that telling a boy what was to be done without any qualifying phrases which are not verbalized approaches more of a neutral position that would be the case for E and F. A comparative illustration will help clarify the scoring procedure for the three task-oriented categories. The statement "I would take him and the toy back to the store" would be scored under E, while "I would make him give the toy back" would be classified under F, and "I would tell him to give the toy back" would indicate a G score.

Scoring Procedure for the SCT. The final version of the SCT consisted of five of the six dyad stories. These are given in Appendix A. The triad stories described a behavioral interaction between a son and a mother or father, and the respondent was asked to indicate how he would feel about the situation and how he would act. Mothers were

pre

mot

mor

sc

in

otl

fi

in

in

ne

In

in

re

sc

co

wh

re

be

on

th

an

sc

pr

1.

presented with father-son interactions and fathers with mother-son situations. The triad stories seemed to elicit more defensiveness from the pilot sample of parents, and scoring categories based on their responses did not discriminate between subjects as clearly as was the case for the other stories. Consequently, they were omitted from the final version of the SCT.

The complete scoring manual for the SCT is given in Appendix B. The procedure is considered to be structural in nature since it disregards the negativeness or positiveness or appropriateness or inappropriateness of the responses. In practice the story response of each subject is divided into statements, and these, rather than the total story response, are scored according to the seven categories described above.

The complexity of this scoring procedure is reduced considerably by several rules. First, the frequency with which a particular category occurred within a given story response is not considered. For example, although A might be represented by several statements, it is scored only once. Second, the C and D categories are scored only if there are no statements which could be classified under any other category. Third, a given story response may be scored under one of the task-oriented categories, if appropriate, but never more than one.

The scoring weights for the SCT are shown in table 1. The assignment of these weights is largely in terms of

the
res
sto
whi
fiv
A a
with
inst
ing
with
inst

reli
The
scor
stud
insu
pend
one
the
ing
scor

obta
rela
ister

the combination of scoring categories for a given story response. In short, a subject's complete response to a story receives a score from one to eighteen depending on which categories are represented. The sum total for all five stories represents his SCT score. Table 1 shows that A and B, which most reflect expressive roles, are associated with high scores and that E, F, and G, which most define instrumental roles, are given low scores. Thus, the scoring procedure for the SCT yields a continuous range of scores with high scores indicating expressive roles and low scores instrumental roles.

Psychometric Properties of the SCT. Inter-scorer reliability of the SCT is based on two separate estimates. The story responses of the pilot sample of 38 parents were scored independently by the writer and an advanced Ph.D. student in clinical psychology. An attempt was made to insure that each of the five stories would be scored independently of one another. All the parent responses to story one were scored first, and with these results hidden from the view of the scorer, attention was then given to scoring story two responses. The three remaining stories were scored in the same fashion.

A comparison of SCT scores for the pilot sample obtained by the two scorers revealed a product-moment correlation of .78. For the present study the SCT was administered to 103 parents including 47 fathers and 56 mothers.

Th
in
ra
pr
re
Th

sco
the
the
How
sco
Thu
to
dif
nea
deg

non-
van
were
Tab
the
end
extr

that

The writer and a third scorer, also an advanced Ph.D. student in clinical psychology, scored the responses of 17 parents randomly selected from the sample of 103. The same scoring procedure as that described above was followed, and the results again indicated a high inter-scorer reliability. This comparison of SCT scores yielded a correlation of .97.

Table 2 shows the intercorrelations for specific scores and between each story and the SCT score, which is the sum total of all five. Most of the correlations between the five stories are significant but all tend to be low. However, the correlations between each story and the SCT score are considerably higher and approximately the same. Thus, table 2 indicates that each of the five stories seems to measure the expressive-instrumental continuum somewhat differently from the others. But with respect to the SCT measure utilized in this study, there is apparently a high degree of consistency of measurement for all stories.

Mean comparisons were made between fathers, mothers, non-working mothers, and working mothers which have relevance for the validity of the SCT scale. Complete responses were obtained for 16 father-mother pairs of the pilot sample. Table 3 shows a highly significant mean difference between the two groups with mothers tending toward the expressive end of the continuum and fathers toward the instrumental extreme.

This finding might be questioned on the grounds that deriving scoring criteria from the same sample used

Tab

Tab

*A c
.05

Table 1. SCT scoring categories and scoring weights assigned to each criterion or combination of criteria

Category	Weight	Category	Weight
A	18	BE	9
AB	17	BF	8
B	16	BG	7
AE	15	C	6
AF	14	CD	5
AG	13	D	4
ABE	12	E	3
ABF	11	F	2
ABG	10	G	1

Table 2. Intercorrelations* for specific SCT stories and between each story and the total SCT score

Story	2	3	4	5	SCT
1	.294	.152	.316	.232	.639
2		.177	.181	.242	.589
3			.317	.038	.571
4				.270	.665
5					.595

*A correlation of .164 is required for significance at the .05 level using a one-tailed test.

to t
Howe
resp
Of t
both
grou
not
for
moth
agai
dire

outs
orie
sequ
by t
the
give
the
icar
and
a s
fati

sign
The

to test differences could have introduced a spurious factor. However, the same categories were used to score the SCT responses of the present study with very similar findings. Of the sample of 103 parents, there were 41 cases in which both parents from the same family participated. Of this group there were 26 marital pairs in which the mother was not employed outside the home and it was the first marriage for both. Table 4 shows the mean difference between the mothers and fathers from this sample of 26, and the results again indicate a significant difference in the expected direction.

Parsons (1955a) has indicated that employment outside the home is one of the more important factors in orienting an individual toward an instrumental role. Consequently, the validity of the SCT is further indicated by the mean difference between mothers employed outside the home (WM) and those not so employed (NWM). Table 4 gives the comparison between 13 WM and 26 NWM taken from the group of 41 marital pairs. The results show a significant difference with NWM tending toward expressive roles and WM toward instrumental roles. Table 4 also indicates a slightly higher mean score for WM in comparison with fathers which is not significant.

Summary. A story completion test (SCT) was designed to measure the instrumental-expressive role variable. The preliminary form of the SCT, consisting of 12 stories,

Tabl

Grou

F

M

*One

Tabl

Grou

F

NW

WM

NW

F

WM

*One

Table 3. Mean SCT scores for the pilot sample comparing fathers (F) and mothers (M)

Group	N	Mean	SD	M. Diff.	t*	df	P
F	16	30.68	14.22				
				19.19	3.24	30	.005
M	16	49.87	19.63				

*One-tailed test.

Table 4. Mean SCT scores for the present sample comparing fathers (F), non-working mothers (NWM), and working mothers (WM)

Group	N	Mean	SD	M. Diff.	t*	df	P
F	26	45.19	19.87				
				10.77	2.19	50	.025
NWM	26	55.96	15.42				
WM	13	46.38	12.69				
				9.58	1.98	37	.05
NWM	26	55.96	15.42				
F	26	45.19	19.87				
				1.19	.02	37	ns.
WM	13	46.38	12.69				

*One-tailed test.

wa
an
ba
def

gro
was
par
the
the
mate
of .

and
stor
equal
of co
sons
and n
were
and N
to be
regar

Parent

alence

was administered to a pilot sample of mothers and fathers, and from their responses, a scoring procedure was developed based on criteria which were consistent with the theoretical definition of instrumental and expressive roles.

Five stories were selected from the preliminary group of 12 to serve as the final version of the SCT which was utilized in this study. The SCT measure for each parent participating in the study was determined by adding together the scores for the five stories. A high reliability for the SCT scoring procedure was indicated. Two separate estimates of inter-scorer reliability revealed correlations of .78 and .97 respectively.

Results were discussed pertaining to the reliability and validity of the SCT. Correlations between each of the stories and the total SCT score were high and approximately equal. This was interpreted as indicating a high degree of consistency of measurement for each story. Mean comparisons were made between fathers (F), working mothers (WM), and non-working mothers (NWM). Significant differences were found revealing that F and WM take instrumental roles and NWM expressive roles. These findings were indicated to be consistent with theoretical and empirical expectations regarding parental roles.

Parental Attitudes

The attitude variables included rejection, ambivalence, demands for aggression, parental aggression, general

aggre

ment.

tude

The S

inclu

For t

iden

tude

One

in t

the

man

and

sca

Amb

dem

by

par

on

rel

and

use

ti

en

on

aggression, self-esteem, husband-wife relation, and adjustment. Measurement was based on the Stanford Parent Attitude Questionnaire (SPAQ) developed by Winder and Rau (1962). The SPAQ consists of a form for mothers and one for fathers including, in its entirety, 27 and 28 scales respectively. For the most part, however, the items of the two forms are identical.

Only the SPAQ scales pertaining to the eight attitude variables given above were utilized in this study. One additional scale, sex role expectations, was included in the format given to the parents but the responses to the items of this scale were not analyzed. Rejection, demands for aggression, parental aggression, self-esteem, and husband-wife relation are each measured by individual scales. The other three are assessed by summary measures. Ambivalence is the sum total of rejection and affection demonstrated, the general aggression scale was obtained by adding together scores for demands for aggression and parental aggression, while parental adjustment was based on the summation of scores for self-esteem and husband-wife relationship. The arrangement of the items for the mothers' and fathers' forms was randomly determined. The SPAQ forms used in the study are given in Appendices C and D.

The SPAQ was constructed with reference to a particular set of constructs about parental attitudes and parent-child interactions. Choice of variables was based partly on previous studies of parental correlates of personality

deve

Item

scal

uate

iten

ents

as b

mous

ing

outl

subj

is c

four

Stro

fere

to i

assi

and

ered

assi

husb

sion

high

and R

development in children and partly on clinical experience. Items were selected on an a priori basis and assigned to scales on the basis of judgment of the authors and a graduate student in clinical psychology. The main source of items was verbatim transcriptions of interviews with parents which sampled actions toward self and others as well as beliefs about family roles and relationships.

The original version of the SPAQ included a dichotomous scoring system. However, the administration and scoring of the instrument for this study followed the procedure outlined by Winder and Rau¹ in their revised version. The subject is asked to indicate the extent to which each item is characteristic of his own attitude by selecting one of four alternatives: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree. The four alternatives are assigned different weights. If agreement with the item is considered to indicate presence of the characteristic, then three is assigned to Strongly Agree, two to Agree, one to Disagree, and zero to Strongly Disagree. If disagreement is considered to indicate presence of the characteristic, then the assignment of weights is reversed.

This was modified somewhat for the self-esteem, husband-wife relation, and adjustment. In the revised version the items for these three scales are weighted so that high scores are in the positive direction. For this

¹Unpublished material received from Drs. Winder and Rau.

investigation the assignment of weights was made so that high scores indicated negative characteristics. This was necessary because the statistical analysis required scores for all the scales to run in the same direction.

The SPAQ was considered appropriate for several reasons. First, reported reliabilities for the scales pertaining to this study are in the 60's and 70's. Second, the revised version includes only items which correlate at least .30 with the scale score which should increase the reliability. This was done by an item analysis on the basis of dichotomous scores. The use of weighted scores increases the power of discrimination for each item, and this permitted the writer to further reduce the number of items for some of the scales. In most cases any reduction was limited to one or two items and in no instance was an item eliminated unless it appeared to be a duplicate of another. Third, responses to the SPAQ have been found to relate significantly to social deviancy in preadolescent boys (Winder and Rau, 1962). Fourth, many of the items are phrased in the language actually used by parents. Fifth, where relevant, parents are instructed to respond in terms of particular persons, namely spouse and son. These last two points should add to the instrument's validity.

Dependent Variables

Aggression, Dependency and Withdrawal. Scores for the boys taking part in the study on these three scales

were obtained by the Peer Nomination Inventory (PNI), developed by Wiggins and Winder (1961) and considered to be a measure of social deviancy. The format, administration, and scoring procedure followed that given by the writers. The PNI, as applied to this study, consisted of 48 items including 12 for each of the three variables, four filler items, and eight rational likeability items. With the exception of four filler items at the beginning and two likeability items at the end, the order was determined by means of random numbers.

The format for the PNI listed all the items down the left-hand side of the page while the names of all the boys in the class were written in at the top of the page. The boys were first instructed to draw a line through the column in which their name appeared, since they were not required to rate themselves. Following this, the writer read each item aloud and gave the class a brief time to put check marks under the names of the boys they considered to act in the way described.

Scores were determined by adding the percentage of boys from a given class who nominated each boy for each item of the aggression, dependency, and withdrawal scales. This yielded a total score for each of the three variables. Since there are 12 items for each scale, the possible range of scores varies from 000 to 1200.

Wiggins and Winder give two estimates of reliability. Correlation between odd-even items showed coefficients of

.852

draw

year

for

on c

ind.

mea.

to

by

is

inc.

son

int.

or

act

ina

iza

sty

is

und

the

ing

Hig

(LA.

.851, .838, and .876 for aggression, dependency, and withdrawal respectively. Test-retest procedures covering a year's time yielded correlations of .519, .437, and .521 for the three scales. Their estimate of validity was based on comparisons with responses of teachers to the PNI. These indicated correlations of .54, .64, and .63 for the three measures. The reliability and validity findings pertain to responses of 4th, 5th, and 6th grade boys.

Perceived Parental Rejection. This was assessed by means of the Parent Authority-Love Scale (PALS) which is a projective device developed by Williams (1958). It includes eight blank-faced line drawings depicting mother-son interactions and a duplicate number showing father-son interactions. In each case a boy is portrayed in a problem or need situation which calls for the parent to take some action. The eight need situations are food, sleep, elimination, overt affection, independence, aggression, socialization, and succorance. Each picture shows, in cartoon style, the boy saying something to the parent. The subject is asked to select one of the four alternatives printed underneath the picture which he thinks best represents what the mother or father would say.

Each of the four alternatives are prejudged according to two dimensions: High Authority-High Love (HA-HL); High Authority-Low Love (HA-LL); Low Authority-High Love (LA-HL); Low Authority-Low Love (LA-LL). Williams used a

dic
as
ere
A c
wei
HA-
the
rej
ica
of
and
mot

dis
out
mot
in
sch
tox
In
sca
sid

ce
hi
be
fir

dichotomous scoring system. Parents who were described as being in the HA-LL and/or LA-LL categories were considered rejecting and the converse of this as non-rejecting. A continuous scoring system was used for this study with weights being assigned to the four categories as follows: HA-LL 6; LA-LL 4; LA-HL 3; HA-HL 1. High scores approach the rejecting end of the continuum and low scores the non-rejecting end. The assignment of weights was done empirically on the basis of responses to PALS by a pilot sample of 17 fifth grade boys. Comparisons between the dichotomous and weighted scores indicated a correlation of .86 for the mother form and .88 for the father form.

Williams reported findings showing that the PALS discriminated between preadolescent and adolescent acting-out boys and a control group with the former perceiving mothers and fathers as more rejecting. To obtain further information on the applicability of this test to normal school population, the PALS and the Peer Nomination Inventory were administered to a group of 17 fifth grade boys. In addition to the aggression, dependency, and withdrawal scales, as indicated above, the PNI also includes a depression measure.

The assumption behind this was that boys who perceive their parents as rejecting would very likely be rated high on the social deviancy variables. As such, this would be an indication of a type of validity for the PALS. The findings pertaining to perception of mothers showed

corr
ency
the
ican
and
reje
vian
is c
impa

PROC

and
numb
all
were
clas

time
1964
the
the
semb
case
begin
write
ance

correlations of .58, .60, and .67 respectively for dependency, withdrawal, and depression which are significant at the .01 level and .26 for aggression which is not significant. The correlations for the fathers were much lower and not significant. These results indicate that perceived rejection of mothers is positively related to socially deviant behavior in boys while that for fathers is not. This is consistent with the notion that mothers have a greater impact than fathers on a boy's behavior.

PROCEDURE

The PALS and PNI were given to the fourth, fifth, and sixth grade boys of two elementary schools. The total number of boys participating was 263 which included almost all the boys enrolled in these three grades. The schools were located in what appeared to be a predominantly middle class, stable section of the community.

The testing of the boys required about six weeks' time and took place between December, 1963, and January, 1964. A group administration procedure was utilized with the PALS given first, since it is the more projective of the two scales. All the boys from a given class were assembled in a room by themselves for this purpose. In most cases no teachers or school officials were present. Before beginning, each group was given a brief explanation by the writer as to why the data was being collected and reassurance that they would not have to sign their names and that

thei

was

part

talk

After

sent

of t

as l

This

tele

ture

and

a su

Pare

the

cili

time

SCT

was

be a

selv

all

fam

sons

their responses would be confidential. Special attention was made to insure a serious involvement, and for the most part, the groups participated with a minimum of extraneous talking.

The 263 boys represented 229 individual families. After the testing of the boys was completed, letters were sent to each of these families requesting the participation of the parents. Considerable effort was made to insure as large a participation among the parents as possible. This entailed sending a second letter, and in some cases, telephone calls. Stress was given to the confidential nature of the study with respect to the individuals involved and to the fact that each participating family would receive a summary of the findings.

The story completion test (SCT) and the Stanford Parent Attitude Questionnaire (SPAQ) were administered by the writer to groups of parents using the meeting room facilities of the schools. This covered about six weeks' time extending from February, 1964, to April, 1964. The SCT was given first and the SPAQ second. Special attention was given to the fact that many of the SPAQ items were to be answered in terms of specific individuals--namely themselves, their spouses, and a particular son. In almost all cases, participating fathers and mothers from the same family attended the same meeting.

The groups were small, usually numbering eight persons or less. This enabled the writer to keep close track

of v
pare
to f
one
one
very
the

SAMP

volv
comp
time
elim
47 f
band
husb
and y
as th
The e
ilie.
of th
fathe
versi

parti
on th

of whether or not instructions were being followed. Five parents omitted a few items but readily complied when asked to finish. The testing of the parents was completed in one session for each group with the average time being about one hour and twenty minutes. Most of the parents worked very attentively at the task and talked very little with the others.

SAMPLE

Of the 229 families contacted, 31% responded, involving one or both parents, and all of these eventually completed test forms. Parents who were divorced at the time of the study and/or those whose spouses had died were eliminated leaving a sample of 56 mothers and a sample of 47 fathers. This consisted of 41 marital pairs, six husbands whose wives did not take part, and 15 wives whose husbands did not take part. Table 5 gives the mean ages and years of education for the mothers and fathers as well as the distribution of boys by class for each parent sample. The educational level of the parents suggests that the families were predominantly middle class. Practically all of the mothers had completed high school while most of the fathers had finished one or more years of college or university work.

An analysis was made to determine if the parents participating in the study differed from those who did not on the basis of the PALS and PNI variables. There were

Table 5

Group

Mothers

Fathers

Table 5. Mean ages and mean years of education for the mothers and fathers who participated in the study, and the distribution of boys by grade for each parent sample

Group	N	Mean Age	Mean Yrs. Educa.	Boys by Grade		
				4	5	6
Mothers	56	37.75	12.53	15	23	18
Fathers	47	39.87	13.57	12	19	16

no signif
whose fat
and depen
ticipate.
significan
nificantly
the other
ating for
direction
in terms of

STATISTICAL

Th
attitude,
variables.
approach to
the instru
that high
actional v
plying each
teractions
of scores
along the

Ta
tudes and
comparison
ship betwe

no significant differences for fathers, although the boys whose fathers took part had higher scores on the aggression and dependency scales than those whose fathers did not participate. However, the boys whose mothers took part were significantly higher on aggression and dependency and significantly lower on perceived rejection of mothers than the others. Thus, there were some selective factors operating for the sample of mothers with the bias being in the direction of obtaining the more disturbed families, at least in terms of social deviancy in boys.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The data for this study included scores on eight attitude, a role, eight interactional, and four dependent variables. The role scale was scored so that high scores approach the expressive end of the continuum and low scores the instrumental extreme. The other scales were scored so that high scores run in the negative direction. The interactional variables are based on scores obtained by multiplying each subject's role and attitude scores. Each interactional scale is essentially a continuous distribution of scores based on the cross-products of corresponding points along the attitude and role dimensions.

Table 6 shows the intercorrelations between attitudes and role for the fathers while table 7 gives the same comparisons for mothers. The tables show little relationship between the attitude and role variables, with the

Tab

Var

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

*A c
a t

Table 6. Intercorrelations* between the attitude and role variables for the fathers

Variables	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Rejection	.76	-.27	.19	-.10	.42	.19	.39	.00
2. Ambivalence		-.14	.00	-.11	.33	.22	.36	.09
3. Demands for Aggression			.14	.84	-.20	.02	.11	-.34
4. Parental Aggression				.64	.30	.08	.24	.08
5. General Aggression					.00	.07	.05	-.24
6. Self-Esteem						.17	.74	-.02
7. Husband-Wife Relation							.78	-.20
8. Parental Adjustment								-.15
9. Parental Role								

*A correlation of .28 is significant at the .05 level using a two-tailed test.

Tabl

Vari

1. Re

2. An

3. De
Ag

4. Pa
Ag

5. Ge
Ag

6. Se

7. Hu
Re

8. Pa
Ad

9. Pa
Ro

*A co
a tw

Table 7. Intercorrelations* between the attitude and role variables for the mothers

Variables	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Rejection	.70	.05	.44	.39	.69	.50	.64	-.25
2. Ambivalence		.02	.22	.19	.57	.33	.47	-.11
3. Demands for Aggression			-.19	.62	-.01	.07	.04	.01
4. Parental Aggression				.64	.31	.32	.35	-.08
5. General Aggression					.23	.31	.31	-.05
6. Self-Esteem						.57	.83	.00
7. Husband-Wife Relation							.93	-.05
8. Parental Adjustment								-.03
9. Parental Role								

*A correlation of .26 is significant at the .05 level using a two-tailed test.

poss

All

inte

acco

tude

tion

scal

lati

all

low

dle,

atti

lowe

to i

and

indi

and

nega

inte

the

regr

nifi

were

The

coef

that

possible exception of the fathers' demand for aggression. All the correlations tend to be low. The nature of the interactional distribution is such that the role variable accounts for much more of its variance than does the attitude variable. For both mothers and fathers, the correlations between the attitude and corresponding interactional scales all tend to be relatively low. However, the correlations between the role and interactional variables are all positive and comparatively much higher.

Consequently, parents who are high, middle, and low on the role scale tend to be correspondingly high, middle, and low on the interactional scale. With respect to attitudes though, the tendency is for the top, middle, and lower levels on each of the interactional distributions to include parents whose scores fall into the top, middle, and lower ranges of the attitude scale. High scores will indicate the association between negative attitude traits and expressive roles and low scores the association between negative attitudes and instrumental roles. As such, the interactional scale provides an adequate basis for testing the hypotheses for this study.

The analysis of the data is based on a multiple regression design. Regression coefficients and their significance in predicting each of the four dependent variables were obtained for each of the eight interactional variables. The analysis is a test of the hypothesis that the regression coefficients are zero against an alternative hypothesis that they are greater than zero.

FAT

Agg

abl

rela

This

samp

coe

ican

fath

the

data

that

tude

half

able

to a

ered

aggr

the

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

FATHER-SON SAMPLE

Aggression in Sons

Hypotheses were derived for the interactional variables pertaining to each of the eight attitude scales in relation to each of the four behavior measures for the sons. This amounted to 32 hypotheses in all for the father-son sample. In each case it was predicted that the regression coefficient for the interactional variable would be significantly related to the dependent variable.

Table 8 gives the regression coefficients for the fathers' attitude, role, and interactional measures and their significance in predicting aggression in sons. The data for the attitude and role scales are given first, and that showing the effect when the interaction between attitude and role is taken into account is listed in the bottom half of the table. The parental aggression and role variables are significantly related in a positive direction to aggression at the .10 level of confidence.

When the role orientation of the fathers is considered the relationship between the fathers' attitudes and aggression in sons is enhanced. The table indicates that the coefficients for each role-attitude interaction than

Table 8. Aggression in sons: Regression coefficients for the fathers' attitude, role, and interactional variables

Variable	N	R. Coeff.	SD	df	t*	P
Rejection	47	.201	.146	45	1.379	ns
Ambivalence	47	.115	.148	45	.779	ns
Demands for Aggression	47	-.060	.148	45	-.408	ns
Parental Aggression	47	.245	.144	45	1.702	.10
General Aggression	47	.087	.148	45	.589	ns
Self-Esteem	47	-.033	.148	45	-.226	ns
Husband-Wife Relation.	47	-.037	.148	45	-.251	ns
Adjustment	47	-.046	.148	45	-.313	ns
Role	47	.261	.143	45	1.816	.10
Rejection x Role	47	.311	.141	45	2.198	.05
Ambivalence x Role	47	.278	.143	45	1.946	.10
Dem. for Agg. x Role	47	.241	.144	45	1.681	.10
Par. Agg. x Role	47	.320	.141	45	2.267	.05
Gen. Agg. x Role	47	.290	.142	45	2.032	.05
Self-Esteem x Role	47	.188	.146	45	1.289	ns
Husband-Wife Rela. x Role	47	.192	.146	45	1.314	ns
Adjustment x Role	47	.201	.146	45	1.318	ns

*Two-tailed test.

those given for the same attitude when considered independently of role. Interactions with rejection, ambivalence, demands for aggression, parental aggression, and general aggression are significantly related in the predicted direction to aggression in sons at the .10 level or better.

Thus, five of the eight hypotheses pertaining to the dependent variable of aggression are supported by the findings. The behavior of fathers insofar as it is related to attitudes of rejection, ambivalence, demands for aggression, parental aggression, and general aggression is more significantly related to aggression in sons when it occurs within an expressive role context than when it is associated with instrumental role taking by fathers.

Dependency in Sons

The results pertaining to dependent behavior in sons are very similar to those for aggression. Table 9 presents the regression coefficients for the fathers' attitude, role, and interactional variables and their significance in predicting dependency in sons. Parental aggression is significantly related in a positive direction to dependency at the .05 level.

Again, when the role of the fathers is taken into account the relevancy of their attitudes as a source of variance for dependent behavior in sons is accentuated. Table 9 shows that the coefficients for each of the interactional variables is greater than that for the same

Table 9. Dependency in sons: Regression coefficients for the fathers' attitude, role, and interactional variables

Variable	N	R. Coeff.	SD	df	t*	P
Rejection	47	.160	.147	45	1.092	ns
Ambivalence	47	.133	.147	45	.906	ns
Demands for Aggression	47	.090	.148	45	.606	ns
Parental Aggression	47	.292	.142	45	2.054	.05
General Aggression	47	.225	.144	45	1.551	ns
Self-Esteem	47	.049	.148	45	.334	ns
Husband-Wife Relation.	47	-.056	.148	45	-.379	ns
Adjustment	47	-.006	.149	45	-.045	ns
Role	47	.207	.145	45	1.425	ns
Rejection x Role	47	.256	.144	45	1.780	.10
Ambivalence x Role	47	.235	.144	45	1.627	ns
Dem. for Agg. x Role	47	.232	.145	45	1.600	ns
Par. Agg. x Role	47	.299	.142	45	2.105	.05
Gen. Agg. x Role	47	.265	.143	45	1.845	.10
Self-Esteem x Role	47	.191	.146	45	1.306	ns
Husband-Wife Rela. x Role	47	.133	.147	45	.901	ns
Adjustment x Role	47	.172	.146	45	1.176	ns

*Two-tailed test.

attitude when taken by itself. The interactions of role with rejection, parental aggression, and general aggression are significant in the predicted direction at the .10 level or better.

For dependency, then, the results supported three of the eight hypotheses. Attitudes of rejection, parental aggression, and general aggression by fathers who take expressive roles are more significantly related to dependent behavior in sons than the same attitudes by fathers who take instrumental roles.

Withdrawal and Perceived Rejection of Fathers by Sons

Table 10 shows the regression coefficients for the fathers' attitude, role, and interactional variables in relation to withdrawal while Table 11 gives the corresponding data with respect to perceived rejection. In marked contrast to the previous findings, the impact of the father's attitudes on the son's behavior in terms of the withdrawal and perceived rejection dimensions is apparently not conditional to whether the father takes an expressive or instrumental role. None of the coefficients for the interactions are significant or even approach this level.

Consequently, none of the 16 hypotheses for these two dependent variables were supported. Demands for aggression is significantly related to withdrawal and parental aggression and general aggression to perceived rejection at the .05 level or better. None of the coefficients for

Tab

Var.

Reje

Amb.

Dema

Aggr

Par

Aggr

Gene

Aggr

Self

Husb

Rela

Adju

Role

Reje

x Ro

Amb

x Ro

Dem.

Agg

Par.

x Ro

Gen.

x Ro

Self

x Ro

Husb

Rela

Adju

x Ro

*Two

Table 10. Withdrawal in sons: Regression coefficients for the fathers' attitude, role, and interactional variables

Variable	N	R. Coeff.	SD	df	t*	P
Rejection	47	-.092	.148	45	-.624	ns
Ambivalence	47	-.026	.149	45	-.177	ns
Demands for Aggression	47	.291	.142	45	2.050	.05
Parental Aggression	47	-.012	.149	45	-.081	ns
General Aggression	47	.179	.146	45	1.224	ns
Self-Esteem	47	-.027	.149	45	-.184	ns
Husband-Wife Relation.	47	-.035	.148	45	-.239	ns
Adjustment	47	-.041	.148	45	-.277	ns
Role	47	-.018	.149	45	-.124	ns
Rejection x Role	47	-.046	.148	45	-.310	ns
Ambivalence x Role	47	-.014	.149	45	-.095	ns
Dem. for Agg. x Role	47	.041	.148	45	.315	ns
Par. Agg. x Role	47	-.060	.148	45	-.409	ns
Gen. Agg. x Role	47	-.018	.149	45	-.124	ns
Self-Esteem x Role	47	-.022	.149	45	-.152	ns
Husband-Wife Rela. x Role	47	-.078	.148	45	-.526	ns
Adjustment x Role	47	-.052	.148	45	-.351	ns

*Two-tailed test.

Table 11. Perceived Rejection of Fathers by Sons: Regression coefficients for the fathers' attitude, role, and interactional variables

Variable	N	R. Coeff.	SD	df	t*	P
Rejection	47	-.037	.148	45	-.254	ns
Ambivalence	47	-.016	.149	45	-.110	ns
Demands for Aggression	47	.181	.146	45	1.240	ns
Parental Aggression	47	.355	.139	45	2.555	.02
General Aggression	47	.341	.140	45	2.437	.02
Self-Esteem	47	.063	.148	45	.423	ns
Husband-Wife Relation.	47	.093	.148	45	.631	ns
Adjustment	47	.102	.148	45	.692	ns
Role	47	-.036	.148	45	-.243	ns
Rejection x Role	47	-.087	.148	45	-.586	ns
Ambivalence x Role	47	-.057	.148	45	-.386	ns
Dem. for Agg. x Role	47	.048	.148	45	.325	ns
Par. Agg. x Role	47	.140	.147	45	.951	ns
Gen. Agg. x Role	47	.098	.148	45	.616	ns
Self-Esteem x Role	47	-.001	.149	45	-.006	ns
Husband-Wife Rela. x Role	47	.045	.148	45	.307	ns
Adjustment x Role	47	-.022	.149	45	-.351	ns

*Two-tailed test.

the role scale are significant.

MOTHER-SON SAMPLE

Aggression and Dependency in Sons

As in the case of the father-son sample, 32 hypotheses were derived for the mothers with the predictions being that the regression coefficients for the interactional variables would be related to the dependent measures. Table 12 presents the coefficients for the mothers' attitude, role, and interactional variables in relation to aggression in sons while table 13 shows the corresponding data for dependency in sons.

None of the 16 hypotheses pertaining to aggression and dependency in sons were supported by the findings. The hypothesis for parental aggression was in fact rejected by the results. The interaction for parental aggression is significantly related to aggression in sons but in a negative direction which is opposite to that predicted. For attitudes alone, ambivalence is related to both dependent variables while rejection is significantly associated with aggression. Neither of the coefficients for the role scale are significant.

Withdrawal and Perceived Rejection of Mothers by Sons

Table 14 gives the data with respect to predicting withdrawal while table 15 shows the corresponding data for perceived rejection. None of the 16 hypotheses for these

Table 12. Aggression in Sons: Regression coefficients for the mothers' attitude, role, and interactional variables

Variable	N	R. Coeff.	SD	df	t*	P
Rejection	56	.268	.131	54	2.057	.05
Ambivalence	56	.246	.131	54	1.870	.10
Demands for Aggression	56	.058	.135	54	.428	ns
Parental Aggression	56	-.129	.134	54	-.960	ns
General Aggression	56	-.057	.135	54	-.421	ns
Self-Esteem	56	.053	.135	54	.390	ns
Husband-Wife Relation.	56	-.141	.134	54	-1.053	ns
Adjustment	56	-.072	.135	54	-.533	ns
Role	56	-.154	.134	54	-1.151	ns
Rejection x Role	56	.039	.135	54	.293	ns
Ambivalence x Role	56	-.055	.135	54	-.407	ns
Dem. for Agg. x Role	56	-.094	.135	54	-.697	ns
Par. Agg. x Role	56	-.231	.132	54	-1.746	.10
Gen. Agg. x Role	56	-.176	.133	54	-1.314	ns
Self-Esteem x Role	56	-.067	.135	54	-.496	ns
Husband-Wife Rela. x Role	56	-.195	.133	54	-1.461	ns
Adjustment x Role	56	-.149	.134	54	-1.112	ns

*Two-tailed test.

Table 13. Dependency in Sons: Regression coefficients for the mothers' attitude, role, and interaction variables

Variable	N	R. Coeff.	SD	df	t*	P
Rejection	56	.213	.132	54	1.604	.10
Ambivalence	56	.230	.132	54	1.743	.05
Demands for Aggression	56	.021	.136	54	.154	ns
Parental Aggression	56	-.025	.136	54	-.188	ns
General Aggression	56	-.003	.136	54	-.028	ns
Self-Esteem	56	.074	.135	54	.549	ns
Husband-Wife Relation.	56	.094	.135	54	.696	ns
Adjustment	56	-.030	.136	54	-.226	ns
Role	56	-.131	.134	54	-.971	ns
Rejection x Role	56	.026	.136	54	.196	ns
Ambivalence x Role	56	-.042	.135	54	-.309	ns
Dem. for Agg. x Role	56	-.093	.135	54	-.689	ns
Par. Agg. x Role	56	-.135	.134	54	-1.006	ns
Gen. Agg. x Role	56	-.127	.134	54	-.944	ns
Self-Esteem x Role	56	-.030	.136	54	-.223	ns
Husband-Wife Rela. x Role	56	-.142	.134	54	-1.060	ns
Adjustment x Role	56	-.100	.135	54	-.740	ns

*Two-tailed test.

Table 14. Withdrawal in Sons: Regression coefficients for the mothers' attitude, role, and interactional variables

Variable	N	R. Coeff.	SD	df	t*	P
Rejection	56	.162	.132	54	1.207	ns
Ambivalence	56	.096	.135	54	.711	ns
Demands for Aggression	56	.025	.136	54	.105	ns
Parental Aggression	56	.042	.135	54	.310	ns
General Aggression	56	.053	.135	54	.390	ns
Self-Esteem	56	.121	.135	54	.897	ns
Husband-Wife Relation.	56	.065	.135	54	.483	ns
Adjustment	56	.098	.135	54	.726	ns
Role	56	-.152	.134	54	-1.131	ns
Rejection x Role	56	.013	.136	54	.095	ns
Ambivalence x Role	56	-.099	.135	54	-.735	ns
Dem. for Agg. x Role	56	-.111	.135	54	-.827	ns
Par. Agg. x Role	56	-.070	.135	54	-.518	ns
Gen. Agg. x Role	56	-.106	.135	54	-.786	ns
Self-Esteem x Role	56	-.034	.136	54	-.256	ns
Husband-Wife Rela. x Role	56	-.014	.136	54	-.104	ns
Adjustment x Role	56	-.025	.136	54	-.188	ns

*Two-tailed test.

Table 15. Perceived Rejection of Mothers by Sons: Regression coefficients for the mothers' attitude, role, and interactional variables

Variable	N	R. Coeff.	SD	df	t*	P
Rejection	56	-.201	.133	54	-1.512	ns
Ambivalence	56	-.296	.129	54	-2.285	.05
Demands for Aggression	56	.183	.133	54	1.374	ns
Parental Aggression	56	-.330	.128	54	-2.890	.01
General Aggression	56	-.118	.135	54	-.874	ns
Self-Esteem	56	.004	.136	54	.036	ns
Husband-Wife Relation.	56	-.016	.136	54	-.124	ns
Adjustment	56	-.009	.136	54	-.068	ns
Role	56	.000	.136	54	.005	ns
Rejection x Role	56	-.120	.135	54	-.894	ns
Ambivalence x Role	56	-.114	.135	54	-.845	ns
Dem. for Agg. x Role	56	.107	.135	54	.798	ns
Par. Agg. x Role	56	-.224	.132	54	-1.695	.10
Gen. Agg. x Role	56	-.044	.135	54	-.326	ns
Self-Esteem x Role	56	-.001	.136	54	-.010	ns
Husband-Wife Rela. x Role	56	.021	.136	54	.159	ns
Adjustment x Role	56	-.013	.136	54	-.100	ns

*Two-tailed test.

two variables were confirmed by the findings. The hypothesis for parental aggression in relation to perceived rejection was again rejected in that the results indicated a significance at the .10 level in a negative direction. Ambivalence and parental aggression by themselves are also negatively related to perceived rejection at the .05 level or better. The coefficients for the role variable are not significant.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

FATHER-SON SAMPLE

This study directs an inquiry toward the proposition that the effect of parental attitudes such as aggression, rejection, etc., on the behavior of preadolescent sons is conditional to the kind of role taken by the parent in his relationship with the son. The general hypothesis indicated that negative attitudes by parents who take expressive roles will be associated with more disturbance in the behavior of sons than will be the case for negative attitudes of parents who take instrumental roles. Predictions were made separately for fathers and mothers and for each of eight attitude scales and each of four dependent measures for sons. To test this hypothesis, each parent's scores on the attitude and role scales were multiplied together to yield eight role-attitude interactional variables. High scores on each of the interactional distributions indicated the association between negative attitude traits and expressive roles and low scores the association between negative traits and instrumental roles. Regression coefficients and their significance in predicting the dependent variables were computed for each of the interactional measures.

The findings for this investigation pertain to a

selected group of parents and sons. In general, the indications are that the more disturbed families took part in the study. The sons whose mothers took part were significantly higher on the aggression and dependency and significantly lower on the perceived rejection scales than the sons whose mothers did not participate. Similar differences were noted for the fathers with respect to aggression and dependency in sons, and while not significant, they were nevertheless rather substantial. Since the findings show a general tendency for high scores on the attitude scales to be associated with high scores on the aggression and dependency variables, it is likely that the mothers and to a lesser extent the fathers who participated were more negative in their attitudes toward sons than the parents who did not take part.

A complex of independent and dependent variables were selected for investigation because theory and previous research have not indicated which attitudes of parents and behavioral dimensions in sons would be most affected by variations in role taking by parents. The findings for the father-son provide some clarification in that the results are significant for a common set of attitudes in the fathers and a particular pattern of behavior in the son. Significant interactions were obtained for the rejection, ambivalence, demands for aggression, parental aggression, and general aggression scales. All five of these attitudes were shown to be critically related in the predicted

direction to aggression in sons and three of the five to dependency in boys. In general, these five scales include items which focus on the father's reactions to the behavior of the son and thus may represent a fairly direct assessment of the father-son relationship. The interactions for self-esteem, husband-wife relationship, and adjustment were not significant. In contrast to the others, these three scales tend to reflect the father's reactions to his self-concept, his spouse, and the marital relationship. As such, they may not be so directly relevant to the father-son relationship as the other attitude scales.

Sons' withdrawal and their perceived rejection of fathers were not significantly related to any of the role-attitude interactions. This suggests that these dimensions tap an area of behavior which is of a different nature than that indicated by aggression and dependency. Intercorrelations between these four variables in relation to the father-son sample, as given in table 16, show that aggression and dependency correlate .84 while the correlations of each with withdrawal and perceived rejection are much lower.

These findings are consistent with factor analytic studies of the Peer Nomination Inventory reported by Wiggins and Winder (1959). They reveal an aggressive-dependency cluster and a withdrawal factor. Hostility is characteristic of both aggression and dependency, but in the case of the latter, the hostile acting out may be directed toward fulfillment of attention getting needs. Withdrawal, by

Table 16. Intercorrelations* between the dependent variables for the father-son sample

Variable	2	3	4
1. Aggression	.84	.05	-.03
2. Dependency		.17	.08
3. Withdrawal			.11
4. Perceived Rejection			

*A coefficient of .28 is significant at the .05 level for a two-tailed test.

contrast, pertains largely to social isolation and rejection by peers. Popularity with peers, for example, influences nomination for the withdrawal dimension more than it does for the aggressive-dependency dimension.

The aggressive-dependency and withdrawal dimensions, then, would appear to lead to characteristically different peer relationships. The former is more likely to result in active involvements with others while the latter will tend toward passivity and withdrawal. Perceived rejection of fathers is not significantly related to any of the other dependent variables. However, the largest correlation occurs in connection with withdrawal which suggests that perceived rejection may be linked in some way with passivity in peer relationships.

Expressive and instrumental parental roles, as defined in this study, differ on two major points. Theoretically, expressive roles characterize parents who are oriented toward their own internal dynamics and consequently tend toward passivity and withdrawal in relationships with the son. The tendency will be toward the immediate gratification of affective needs, and when involvements with the son occur, the focus will be on the underlying emotional aspects of the boy's behavior.

Instrumentally oriented parents, on the other hand, are presumably more actively involved with the son and give more attention to the overt, task-oriented aspects of his behavior. The emphasis will be on modifying the problem-

solving behavior of the boy with the expectation that these modifications will be incorporated into future performance actions. The gratification process for these parents tends to be delayed and contingent upon the son's fulfilling these expectations.

The findings show that negative attitudes by fathers who take expressive roles are associated with disturbances in the sons' behavior. The results do not bear directly on the nature of this relationship in terms of specific father-son interactional patterns but they do provide a basis for speculation. Rejecting, ambivalent, and aggressive fathers who take instrumental roles focus their criticism of the son on the boy's task-oriented behavior with the emphasis being on modifying these overt, performance patterns. This will tend to minimize the negative effect of the father's attitudes. The son will be relatively clear as to which aspects of his behavior is eliciting the unfavorable reactions of the father and as to how they may be modified so as to insure a more favorable reaction. The boy's reality adaptation will be facilitated which will permit him to maintain satisfactory peer relationships.

Rejecting, ambivalent, and aggressive fathers who take expressive roles will be inclined to seek immediate gratification of needs associated with these negative attitudes by focusing on the son's underlying feelings and emotions rather than his cognitive, more overt performance behavior. This will tend to maximize the negative effect

of the father's attitudes. The boy will be aware that the father is critical of him but relatively unclear as to which aspects of his behavior are subject to the father's disapproval and as to what should be done. The son's reality adaptation will be impeded which will affect his peer relationships. He will maintain active involvements with others, rather than withdraw, but will tend to be overly aggressive, overly dependent, or both.

In addition to the interactional variables, significant findings were also indicated for the role scale. Fathers who take expressive roles are more likely to have aggressive sons than fathers who take instrumental roles. Parsons (1955b) indicates that the predominant role for sons is instrumental while that for daughters is expressive. Thus, the findings suggest that task-orientation by fathers helps the son adopt task-oriented relationships for himself and promotes the boy's integration into the instrumental role. This, in turn, permits satisfactory peer relationships. On the other hand, expressive role orientation by fathers interferes with this process and leads to disturbed peer relationships.

The results for the attitude variables indicated that most of the relationships with the dependent variables were not significant. However, the findings did suggest that aggression in fathers is particularly crucial to understanding the father-son relationship. Fathers who scored high on the parental aggression scale tend to have sons

who are aggressive, dependent, and who perceive the fathers as rejecting. Similarly, high scores on demands for aggression is associated with withdrawal in sons while high scores on the general aggression scale is related to high perceived rejection by boys.

MOTHER-SON SAMPLE

None of the hypotheses for the interactional variables were supported by the findings. The interaction for parental aggression was found to be significantly related to aggression and perceived rejection of mothers in a direction opposite to that predicted. These findings reject the hypotheses for parental aggression in favor of an alternative one. The association between parental aggression and instrumental roles may tend to result in more disturbance for the son than when it is in conjunction with expressive role taking by mothers. Thus, instrumental roles tend to maximize the negative effects of parental aggression while expressive roles minimize this effect. This is the reverse of that indicated for the fathers.

A comparison of the effect of the attitude and role variables as indicated in tables 12, 13, 14, and 15 shows that high scores on the attitude scales generally tend to be associated with high scores on the dependent variables while high scores on the role variable tend to be associated with low scores on the dependent scales, with the possible exception of the perceived rejection variable. While most

of these relationships are not significant, the differences may have possibly tended to cancel out any interactional effect between the role and attitude measures.

The results for the attitude variables are generally insignificant but they do suggest that ambivalence, and to a lesser extent rejection and parental aggression, are crucial to the mother-son relationship. Ambivalent mothers tend to have sons who are aggressive and dependent. This is also the case for rejection in mothers in relation to aggression in boys. Ambivalence and parental aggression are also related to perceived rejection but in a negative direction. Mothers who score high on these scales are associated with sons who perceive them as being low on rejection.

As in the case of the interactional variables, the results for the mothers' role, while not significant, suggest that instrumental role taking by mothers may lead to more disturbance in the behavior of sons. The explanation was offered that task-oriented behavior by the father helps the son take a task-oriented approach in his own relationships and promotes the boy's integration into the instrumental role. The findings for the mothers raise the question as to why her task orientation, either alone or in conjunction with attitudinal behavior, may not have the same facilitating effect. Aside from the effect parental role has on the son's reality adaptation, it may also influence the boy's identification with his father. Instrumental

role taking by fathers may promote this process while the same role by mothers may interfere with it.

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN THE MOTHER AND FATHER VARIABLES

The findings for this investigation raise the question as to what kinds of interactions go on between mothers and fathers and how they affect the behavior of the sons. Table 17 shows the correlations of the fathers' attitude and role measures with those for the mothers, based on scores for 41 marital-pairs. The most marked is a positive relationship between the mother's attitudes and the father's role. Significance at the .01 level is indicated for five of the eight attitude scales with the correlations for demands for aggression, ambivalence, parental aggression, and general aggression being, in fact, quite high.

These findings suggest a pattern of interactions between the mother, father, and son which will tend to produce disturbances in the father-son relationship. The father's relationship with the boy is apparently a function of not only his attitudes and role but also the attitudes of the mother. The more ambivalent and aggressive she is, the more likely the father is to take expressive roles, which in turn increases the probability of adjustment problems for the son.

The correlations between the attitudes of fathers and role of mothers are generally lower and not significant. Consequently, at least for the samples utilized in this

Table 17. Correlations* of the fathers' attitude and role variables with the attitude and role variables for the mothers based on scores of 41 marital-pairs

Fathers	Mothers								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Rejection	.28	.04	-.05	-.05	.00	.09	.18	.11	.08
2. Ambivalence	.10	.02	.04	-.09	-.03	.04	.12	.06	-.17
3. Demands for Aggression	-.08	.15	.31	-.25	.04	.12	.10	.09	.04
4. Parental Aggression	.29	.17	.14	-.07	.03	.18	.35	.31	-.28
5. General Aggression	.09	.20	.30	-.22	.04	.18	.25	.22	-.13
6. Self-Esteem	.06	.00	.05	-.16	-.09	.15	.21	.22	.02
7. Husband-Wife Relation.	.17	-.09	-.04	.03	-.02	.03	.31	.24	-.03
8. Adjustment	.15	-.06	.00	-.04	-.06	.13	.34	.31	.24
9. Role	.28	.71	.81	.77	.69	.11	.17	.36	-.01

*A correlation of .30 is significant at the .05 level using a two-tailed test.

tudy, the interrelationships between the mother, father and son tend to lead to more disturbance in the father-son than in the mother-son relationship. This may partially account for why the findings confirmed the hypotheses for the fathers and sons but not for the mothers and sons.

IMPLICATIONS FOR RESEARCH IN PARENT-CHILD RELATIONS

Parsons advances the expressive-instrumental role continuum as a variable which theoretically applies to all relationships regardless of specific content. It is structural in that it is not linked to relations which emphasize particular characteristics as opposed to others which identify other qualities. Expressive and instrumental roles, as defined in this study, are "structural" in the sense that within each parental group scores on the role variable were for the most part unrelated to other behavior characteristics such as rejection, ambivalence, etc., at least as measured by attitude scales.

In the view of the writer, Parsons' structural approach merits attention on the grounds that the relevancy of the role concept to the study of interpersonal relationships is enhanced to the extent that it touches on behavioral characteristics which differentiate it from those associated with other concepts. Consequently, the story completion test, to the extent that it operationally defines expressive and instrumental roles in this fashion, may have potential as a research tool. This is to be distinguished from the procedure employed in other studies such as Kagan and

Lemkin (1960) who measured instrumental roles in terms of aggression and punitiveness and expressive roles in relation to nurturance. This is not only inconsistent with Parsons' theoretical definition but tends to introduce considerable overlap between the role concept and other constructs such as attitude.

The major findings for the study indicated that the role of the father is critical to the father-son relationship. Rejection, ambivalence, and aggression by fathers who take expressive roles tend to be associated with disturbance in the son's behavior more so than is the case for the same attitudes in conjunction with instrumental role taking by fathers. The findings for the mothers did not support any of the hypotheses, and in fact, tended to reject them in favor of an alternative. For mothers, negative attitudes in association with instrumental role taking may be more crucial to behavior difficulties in sons.

The fact that the samples employed in this study apparently focused on the more disturbed families raises some question as to the extent that the findings may be generalized to other samples from the same population. To the writer's knowledge, however, very few if any studies have attempted to utilize role as was done in this case. Consequently, the findings are important in that they point to what appears to be a fruitful area of research in parent-child relationships.

The mean difference between fathers and non-working

mothers on the role variable, as given in table 4, is significant in the expected direction, but it is not as pronounced as would be expected. Another finding regarding the role variable which is contrary to expectations is that showing practically a zero correlation between the role scores for husband-wife pairs. Theoretically at least mothers and fathers presumably take complementary roles with sons which would indicate a negative correlation on the role scale. These results may be the product in part of the peculiar samples utilized, but they also suggest that further clarification is needed as to the factors which determine role taking by parents.

The results for the relationships between parental attitudes and behavior of the sons show that most of them are insignificant. This, again, is contrary to expectations, particularly as the impact of the mother on the son's behavior. The contrast is particularly marked with respect to the findings of Winder and Rau (1959). They showed many more significant relationships between the Stanford Parent Attitude Questionnaire variables and the Peer Nomination Inventory dimensions than was the case for this study. Again, the samples employed in this investigation may partially account for this.

Several other research problems are indicated. Role taking by fathers is apparently a critical factor in the son's adjustment, and this in turn, may be a function of the mother's role and of the identification between father

and son. Instrumental roles by fathers may facilitate this process while instrumental roles by mothers may impede this. Second, this raises the question of how parental roles affect the adjustment of girls. The postulation is that expressive role taking by the mother may enhance a daughter's adjustment and identification with her while expressive role taking by fathers may interfere with this.

Some clarity as to the impact of particular combinations of parental roles within a given family on the behavior of the sons is shown in Appendix F. A comparison of mean scores for the dependent variables is given with respect to cases in which both parents are expressive, both are instrumental, the fathers are expressive and the mothers instrumental, and the fathers are instrumental and the mothers expressive. With respect to aggression, dependency, and withdrawal, the results strongly suggest that the least disturbance in sons is in relation to instrumental role taking by fathers and expressive role orientations by mothers. The most disturbance in sons would appear to occur when both parents take the same role.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study is oriented around the application of role theory toward the analysis of family relationships with particular reference to Parsons' theory of action. Within this context, an inquiry was directed toward the notion that the differential effect of parental attitudes on the behavior of preadolescent sons is a function of the differential roles taken by parents.

The samples, predominantly middle-class, included 47 father-son pairs and 56 mother-son pairs. For each parent participating in the study measures were obtained for the role variable and for eight attitude scales: rejection, ambivalence, demands for aggression, parental aggression, general aggression, self-esteem, husband-wife relationship, and adjustment. The variables for each son included aggression, dependency, withdrawal, and perceived parental rejection.

The role variable was defined in terms of the expressive-instrumental continuum as developed by Parsons. It was measured by a story completion test designed to operationalize expressive and instrumental roles within the context of the Parsonian theory of action. Attitudes were assessed by the Stanford Parent Attitude Questionnaire.

Aggression, dependency, and withdrawal in sons were measured by the Peer Nomination Inventory and perceived rejection by the Parent Authority-Love Scale.

The hypotheses, in their general form, indicated that negative parental attitudes will be more significantly related to disturbance in sons in terms of the dependent variable when they occur within an expressive role context than when they are associated with instrumental role taking by parents. Hypotheses were derived separately for mothers and fathers and for each attitude variable and each dependent variable. This amounted to 32 predictions for the father-son sample and 32 for the mother-son sample.

To test these hypotheses, each parent's scores on the attitude and role scales were multiplied together to yield eight role-attitude interactional variables. High scores on each of the interactional distributions indicated the association between negative attitude traits and expressive roles and low scores the association between negative traits and instrumental roles. Regression coefficients and their significance in predicting each of the four dependent variables were obtained for each of the interactional variables.

The results indicated that, of the 32 predictions for the father-son sample, five of the hypotheses were confirmed in relation to aggression in sons and three with respect to dependency. None of the hypotheses for the mother-son sample were confirmed. Rejection, ambivalence, demands

for aggression, parental aggression, and general aggression in fathers who take expressive roles were indicated to be more significantly related with aggression in sons than the same attitudes in relation to instrumental role taking by fathers. For dependency in sons, significant interactions in the predicted direction were revealed for rejection, parental aggression, and general aggression by fathers. The findings for the mothers' parental aggression indicated that the hypotheses were actually rejected in favor of alternative ones. Parental aggression by mothers who take instrumental roles was indicated to be more significantly related to aggression and perceived rejection in sons than parental aggression by mothers who take expressive roles. This tends to be the opposite of that found for fathers and is the reverse of that predicted for mothers.

The discussion focused on possible differences between the impact of fathers' and mothers' roles on the behavior of sons. Attention was given to some of the conditions which may have accounted for the absence of confirmation of the hypotheses for the mothers. The nature of the samples and its effect on the findings was also discussed. Finally, the relevancy of the expressive-instrumental role concept to research in parent-child relations and the implications of the findings for future studies were examined.

1

11

12

REFERENCES

- Aberle, D. F., and Naegele, K. D. "Middle-class fathers' occupational role and attitudes toward children," In N. W. Bell and E. F. Vogel (Eds.), The family. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1960.
- Ackerman, N. W. The psychodynamics of family life. N.Y.: Basic Books, Inc., 1958.
- Adams, Elsie B., and Sarason, I. G. "Relation between anxiety in children and their parents," Child Developm., 1963, 34, 237-246.
- Baldwin, A. L., Kalhorn, Joan, and Breeze, Fay H. "Patterns of parent behavior," Psychol. Monogr., 1945, 58, No. 3 (Whole No. 268).
- Bales, R. F. Interaction process analysis. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Press, Inc., 1950.
- Bales, R. F., and Slater, P. E. "Role differentiation in small decision-making groups," In T. Parsons and R. F. Bales (Eds.), Family, socialization and interaction process. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1955.
- 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," J. Consult. Psychol., 1959, 23, 107-118.
- Becker, W. C., Peterson, D. R., Luria, Zella, Shoemaker, D. J., and Hellmer, L. A. "Relations of factors derived from parent-interview ratings to behavior problems of five year olds," Child Developm., 1962, 33, 509-535.
- Brim, O. G., Jr. "The parent-child relation as a social system: I Parent and child roles," Child Developm., 1957, 28, 343-364.
- Emmerich, W. "Young children's discriminations of parents and child roles," Child Developm., 1959, 30, 403-419.
- Emmerich, W. "Family role concepts of children age six to ten," Child Developm., 1961, 32, 106-112.

- Eron, L. D., Banta, T. J., Walder, L. O., and Laulicht, J. H. "Comparison of data obtained from mothers and fathers on childrearing practices and their relation to child aggression," Child Developm., 1961, 32, 457-472.
- Farber, B. "An index of marital integration," Sociometry, 1957, 20, 117-134.
- Farber, B. "Effects of a severely mentally retarded child on family integration," Monogr. Soc. Res. Child Developm., 1959, 24, No. 2 (Serial No. 71).
- Farber, B. "Family organization and crisis: maintenance of integration in families with a severely retarded child," Monogr. Soc. Res. Child Developm., 1960, 25, No. 1 (Serial No. 75).
- Farber, B. "Marital integration as a factor in parent-child relations," Child Developm., 1962, 33, 1-14.
- Himmelstrand, U. Social pressures, attitudes, and democratic process. Stockholm, Sweden: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1960.
- Hoffman, M. L. "Power assertion by the parent and its impact on the child," Child Developm., 1960, 31, 129-143.
- Huntington, R. M. "Needs and interactions: a study of the marital relationship," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., 1958.
- Kagan, J. "The child's perception of the parent," J. Abnorm. Soc. Psychol., 1956, 53, 257-258.
- Kagan, J., and Lemkin, Judith. "The child's differential perceptions of parental attributes," J. Abnorm. Soc. Psychol., 1960, 61, 440-447.
- Kagan, J., Hasken, Barbara, and Watson, Sara. "Child's symbolic conceptualization of parents," Child Developm., 1961, 32, 625-636.
- Kenkel, W. F. "Husband-wife interaction in decision making and decision choices," J. Soc. Psychol., 1961a, 54, 255-262.
- Kenkel, W. F. "Dominance, persistence, self-confidence, and spousal roles in decision making," J. Soc. Psychol., 1961b, 54, 349-358.

- McCord, W., McCord, Joan, and Howard, A. "Familial correlates of aggression in nondelinquent male children," J. Abnorm. Soc. Psychol., 1961, 62, 79-93.
- Merton, R. K. Social theory and social structure. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1957.
- Mills, T. M. "Power relations in three person groups," Amer. Soc. Rev., 1953, 18, 351-357.
- Mills, T. M. "The coalition pattern in three person groups," Amer. Soc. Rev., 1954, 19, 657-667.
- Parsons, T. "Some fundamental categories of the theory of action: a general statement," In T. Parsons and E. A. Shills (Eds.), Toward a general theory of action. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1951a.
- Parsons, T., and Shills, E. A. "Values, motives, and systems of action," In T. Parsons and E. A. Shills (Eds.), Toward a general theory of action. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1951b.
- Parsons, T. The social system. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1951c.
- Parsons, T. "The American family: its relations to personality and to the social structure," In T. Parsons and R. F. Bales (Eds.), Family, socialization and interaction process. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1955a.
- Parsons, T. "Family structure and the socialization of the child," In T. Parsons and R. F. Bales (Eds.), Family, socialization and interaction process. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1955b.
- Parsons, T., and Bales, R. F. "The dimensions of action space," In T. Parsons, R. F. Bales, and E. A. Shills, Working papers in the theory of action. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1953.
- Peterson, D. R., Becker, W. C., Hellmer, L. A., Shoemaker, D. J., and Quay, H. C. "Parental attitudes and child adjustment," Child Developm., 1959, 30, 119-130.
- Peterson, D. R., Becker, W. C., Shoemaker, D. J., Luria, Zella, and Hellmer, L. A. "Child behavior problems and parental attitudes," Child Developm., 1961, 32, 151-162.

- Quade, A. E. "The relationship between marital adjustment and certain interactional patterns in problem-solving situations," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1955.
- Sarbin, T. R. "Role theory," In G. Lindzey (Ed.), Handbook of social psychology, Vol. I. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Press, Inc., 1954.
- Strodtbeck, F. L. "The family as a three person group," Amer. Soc. Rev., 1954, 19, 23-29.
- Thibaut, J. W., and Kelley, H. H. The social psychology of groups. N.Y.: Wiley and Sons, 1959.
- Vogel, E. F. "The marital relationship of parents and the emotionally disturbed child," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., 1958.
- Wiggins, J. S., and Winder, C. L. "The peer nomination inventory: an empirically derived sociometric measure of adjustment in preadolescent boys," Psychol. Rep. (Monogr. Supplm.), 1961, 9, 643-677.
- Williams, W. C. "The PALS tests: a technique for children to evaluate both parents," J. Consult. Psychol., 1958, 22, 487-495.
- Winder, C. L., and Rau, Lucy. "Parental attitudes associated with social deviance in preadolescent boys," J. Abnorm. Soc. Psychol., 1962, 23, 107-118.
- Zelditch, M. "Role differentiation in the nuclear family: a comparative study," In T. Parsons and R. F. Bales (Eds.), Family, socialization and interaction process. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1955.

APPENDIX A

SCT INSTRUCTIONS AND STORIES

You will be presented with some stories of everyday situations involving parents and a child. In each of the stories the child mentioned by name is a son around 10 to 12 years old. For each story you are asked to describe how you would feel and what you would think about the situation presented, what you would do and say about it, and how you would act. Although you may never have been faced with the exact situation described, you will still have your own ideas as to what you would say and how you would act if it did happen. Remember, parents view everyday happenings involving children differently so it is important that you tell how you yourself would feel and what you would think about the situation presented, what you would do and say about it, and how you would act.

CODE NUMBER: _____

1. Although there is nothing physically wrong, Tommy sometimes wets the bed. This morning when I looked in to see if he was up, Tommy was already getting dressed. Although he didn't say anything about it, I could see that he had wet the bed. I _____

(In the space below tell how you would feel and what you would think about this situation, what you would do and say about it, and how you would act.)

2. Johnny sometimes puts off doing things. He had an important school assignment due at the end of the week. When I asked him about it, he said he would start right away. The night before it was to be turned in he came to me and said, "I haven't started the report and I have to turn it in tomorrow. Will you help me?" I _____

(In the space below tell how you would feel and what you would think about this situation, what you would do and say about it, and how you would act.)

3. One of David's regular jobs is to pick up his room a little each morning. One morning he was arguing with me about it and said, "Shut up and leave me alone." I _____

(In the space below tell how you would feel, and what you would think about this situation, what you would do and say about it, and how you would act.)

4. Danny has at times taken things that don't belong to him. One day he was having a lot of fun playing with a model airplane. I didn't remember seeing it before, and when I asked him about it he said, "I found it on the way home from school." A few minutes later the manager of a toy store called and told me that Danny had taken an airplane and left before he could be stopped. From his description I could see that it was the airplane Danny was playing with. I _____

(In the space below tell how you would feel and what you think about this situation, what you would do and say about it, and how you would act.)

5. Mark doesn't like to share his toys very much. One evening his younger brother was playing with one of Mark's toys. When Mark noticed it, he grabbed the toy and said, "Give me that! It's mine and you can't have it!" I _____

(In the space below tell how you would feel and what you would think about this situation, what you would do and say about it, and how you would act.)

APPENDIX B

SCORING MANUAL FOR THE SCT

INTRODUCTION

Each story response is divided into statements and these are scored according to the scoring criteria on which the SCT is based. The scoring categories consist of affectivity, expressive symbolism, affective involvement, task-oriented general, task-oriented I, task-oriented II, and task-oriented III. Any given statement is scored in terms of only one category while other statements from the same response may be scored under other categories. Thus, a complete story response may include only one or a combination of categories.

There are three major differentiations which are critical to this scoring procedure. The first pertains to a distinction between statements which indicate some action taken or involvement with the problem situation presented in the story from those which reflect a value, belief, or opinion of the respondent. For example, the statement, "I would find out what was bothering him," indicates involvement and action taken while "I would wonder what was bothering him" implies more reflection and speculation than it does action. Statements of action or involvement must be clearly specified.

The first differentiation is relevant to the scoring of the affectivity and expressive symbolism categories. These two bear directly on statements which reflect feeling, speculation, and value judgments while the other categories pertain more directly to statements indicating action or involvement. The second differentiation contrasts the scoring procedure for statements showing a general task-oriented approach from those revealing a more specific task-orientation. The former are usually rather abstract and sometimes moralistic while the latter are linked more closely with the specific problem presented in the stimulus story. Such statements as "I would talk to him about the values of sharing" and "I would make sure that he knew it was wrong to steal" are included under the task-oriented general criterion. In contrast to these, "I would make him share his toy with his brother" and "he would have to return it" are classified under specific task-oriented approaches.

The third differentiation compares the scoring procedure for the three specific task-oriented criteria. The principal issue here is whether or not a specific task-oriented statement indicates that the problem-solving attempt is restricted entirely to verbal communication with the boy in the stimulus story. If it is not so restricted it is scored differently. The statement, "I would see that he did not drink anything before going to bed," is not considered to stress verbal interaction entirely while "I would tell him not to drink anything before going to bed" is

considered to be entirely verbal.

The complexity of this scoring system is simplified considerably by several procedures. First, each story response is separated into statements so that this is usually not a question. Second, the number of statements representing a given category does not enter into the scoring. Only one statement is required for a story response to be classified under the affectivity category, for example, and the same holds for the other categories. Consequently, once a statement has been judged to be consistent with a particular criterion no further consideration needs to be given as to whether other statements of the same story response are also representative of the same category. Furthermore, this rule also alleviates the situation where there is uncertainty about whether or not a statement fits into a category by allowing the scorer to look for another statement which is clearly indicative of the same criterion.

Third, a given story response is rated under one of the three specific task-oriented criteria but never more than one. Fourth, the affective involvement and task-oriented general categories do not figure into the scoring of a response unless it cannot be rated in terms of any of the other scoring variables. Sometimes a response includes alternative plans for action, such as "if this were the first time, I would if it were the second time, I would". The fifth rule helps eliminate problems bearing of deciding between them. The procedure followed

was one in which all the alternatives are considered in the scoring.

A useful scoring procedure is to first score in terms of the affectivity variable, then for expressive symbolism, and finally in relation to the task-oriented variables. The presence of any of these eliminates the necessity of rating the response in terms of affective involvement and task-oriented general. The remainder of the manual is devoted to the particular scoring categories. In each case examples are given which illustrate the category and attention is given to any special problems.

SCORING CRITERIA

Affectivity and Expressive Symbolism categories

These involve statements which deal with expression of feeling, speculation as to what might be involved and as to what should or should not be done, and reflection of the respondent's beliefs and values. The principal definition of these two categories is that the statements do not in themselves indicate involvement with the main character in the story and action taken with respect to the problem situation presented. Statements of this type of classified under affectivity and expressive symbolism even if they are associated with others which do reveal involvement and action taken.

A. Affectivity. This is scored for any statement

indicating positive or negative affect. Examples of this are given below.

1. In most instances this is indicated very directly as for example "I'd be mad," "I would be upset," and "I would be happy." Other emotions expressed include "glad," "worry," "pity," "disturbed," and the like. It is helpful to contrast these statements with one like "I would tell him I was angry," which indicates involvement with the story character, and because of this, is scored under another category.
2. Statements indicating denial of affect.
 - a. "I would not feel anything at all."
 - b. "Wouldn't bother me much."
3. Statements suggesting guilt. Particular attention needs to be paid to this since it is often expressed indirectly.
 - a. "I would wonder if he was getting enough attention at home."
 - b. "I would try to discover if this was caused by pressure at home."
 - c. "I would feel I had failed."

B. Expressive Symbolism. This is scored for statements indicating reflection of beliefs, values, and speculations. Examples of this are given below.

1. Statements of values, beliefs, expectations, and needs.
 - a. "I would not allow a child to tell me to shut up."
 - b. "I think that all children do things like this."
 - c. "I would hope that he would develop a more generous attitude."
 - d. "Children this age need reminding."
 - e. "Ideally I like to prevent this by attempting to set values."
 - f. "I would hope to know my child."
2. Speculations and thoughts as to what was underlying the problem and as to intentions to act or not act in a particular way. Note that these examples do not in themselves describe any action actually taken.



- a. "I would wonder and try to figure out why it had occurred." Here action is implied and contrasts with "I would talk with the child and find out," which is not scored under B.
 - b. "The task at hand would be to get the report finished that night."
 - c. "I would not help him."
 - d. "There would be no argument about picking up his room."
3. Statements indicating the feeling tone with which a respondent would say or do something.
- a. "I would get an answer in a loving manner."
 - b. "I would act in a very sincere manner."
4. Statements of action which in themselves ignore the problem situation.
- a. "I would leave the room and get busy."
 - b. "I would leave him alone."
5. Statements about and references to the respondent's own family. References which are clearly unrelated to the problem situation presented in the stimulus story are always scored under B. However, statements indicating some personal experience which bears directly on the problem presented are scored in the same fashion as any other statement.
6. Statements suggesting defensiveness on the part of the respondent.
- a. "You almost have to know the situation and the child to answer." Such statements need to be differentiated from others indicating alternatives which are not scored under B: "If Mark was not playing with the toy I would"

Affective Involvement and Task-Oriented General Categories

These categories include statements which in themselves clearly indicate involvement with the main character in the stimulus story and action taken with respect to the problem presented. They fall somewhere between the first

two scoring criteria and the three specific task-oriented criteria. The general task-oriented approach differs from the more specific ones in that the former is more abstract and less specifically linked to the particular content of the story. It should be remembered that these two categories are not scored unless the response cannot be classified under any of the other criteria. For cases like this, statements are scored under C, D, and CD in the event of combinations.

C. Affective Involvement. This is scored for statements which suggest affective interaction with the main character in the stimulus story in that negative or positive feelings are communicated to the boy, punishment is administered, and attempts are made to get at underlying problems or feelings. The C category differs from the task-oriented variables in that little attention is given to working out a solution to the problem presented. Several classes of examples are given below.

1. Statements indicating expression of negative or positive feeling.
 - a. "I bawled him out."
 - b. "Probably yell at him."
 - c. "I would give him a little understanding hug."
 - d. "I would tell him I know how tired he must get from so much nagging."
2. Statements suggesting punishment either physical, indirect, or unspecified. This would be the case for statements which talk about punishment in a very general way rather than being specifically linked to the content of the problem situation.

- a. "I would spank him."
- b. "Would more than likely punish him."
- c. "He would be deprived of a privilege for a while."

An example of a statement about punishment which is scored under the task-oriented variables rather than C is "suspend his allowance until he got squared away with the job." This is because it is tied specifically with the reality of the story.

- 3. Statements which ask questions or supply information.
 - a. "I said Danny where did you get the airplane."
 - b. "I would tell him I knew that he had wet the bed."
- 4. Statements suggesting demands for apologies.
 - a. "I would ask him if there was something he had to say to me."
 - b. "I would make him apologize to the store owner."
- 5. Statements pertaining to actions involving person or persons not mentioned in the stimulus story.
 - a. "I would discuss this with the doctor."
 - b. "I would probably discuss this with his daddy."
 - c. "I would go see his teacher."
- 6. Statements showing attempts to discover underlying causes.
 - a. "Would talk to Mark and try to discover some of his reasons."
- 7. Stimulus story 5 includes a "younger brother." Any reference to this secondary character is scored C, regardless of its nature.
 - a. "I would feel pity for the younger brother."
 - b. "I would try to get the younger child interested in something else."

These statements should be compared with those pertaining to both characters, e.g., "I suggested that both boys share," which are not automatically scored under C.

8. Stimulus story 3 includes both "talking back" and "refusal to do a job" as problems. Special attention should be given as to which problem the statements refer. Those relating to "talking back" tend to be affective in nature and scored C. Those pertaining to the "refusal" problem may be more task-oriented and not necessarily scored under C.

D. Task-Oriented: General. This is scored for statements which show a shift away from affective involvement and toward task-orientation. As mentioned above, this category differs from the more specific task-oriented ones in that its approach is normative, sometimes moralistic, and usually rather abstract.

1. "I would proceed to tell him the wrong and right of it."
2. "I would tell Danny why he or anyone else should not steal."
3. "I would try to tell him the importance of sharing."
4. Statements which employ such terms as "others," "things," "someone," and "habit" are not considered to be linked specifically with the story content and are scored under D.
 - a. "I would talk to him about others' possessions . . . he wouldn't want someone taking his things."
 - b. "Tell him not to snatch things."
 - c. "Tell him to share his things."

These should be contrasted with a statement like "tell him to share his toys with his brother" which is specific and scored under the specific task-oriented variables.

Task-Oriented: I, Task-Oriented: II, and Task-Oriented: III Categories

These criteria include statements which are more concretely task-oriented than those pertaining to task-

oriented general. They generally tend to focus on solutions to the problem presented in one way or another which are closely tied with the content presented in the stimulus story. The three categories differ within themselves in the degree of personal by the parent in his task-oriented approach to the problem situation presented, as least in so far as suggested by particular statements. Task-orientation I is presented as reflecting the most involvement and task-orientation III the least.

A complete response to a story may be scored in one of these three criteria, if approach statements are present, but never more than one. When statements representing all three are present, the response is scored under task-oriented I. When task-oriented II and III are indicated the response is scored in terms of the former. A response is scored under task-oriented III only in cases when such statements occur in the absence of statements representing the other two categories. It is also well to remember that a statement is classified under task-oriented III only when it indicates that a task-oriented approach is incorporated entirely within verbal communication with the boy in the story. If it is not it is scored in terms of one of the other two task-oriented variables.

E. Task-Oriented: I. This is scored for statements suggesting that the responsibility for carrying out some task-oriented action in relation to the problem situation presented is more or less shared by the parent and the boy.

Examples are given below.

1. Statements indicating "help" would be given.
 - a. "I would help him organize his report."
 - b. "I would help him clean up the room."
2. Statements indicating future commitment on the part of the parent.
 - a. "From then on I would pay more attention to his homework."
 - b. "I would wake him up before he went to bed."
3. Statements involving active participation by the parent.
 - a. "I would take it back to the store."
 - b. "I would go with him back to the store."
 - c. "I would take the toy away from the older boy."

F. Task-Oriented: II. This is scored for statements which are interpreted as showing a shift away from the parent taking responsibility and toward the boy taking more. In most cases, the statements include a key word such as "make," "insist," "have," etc.

1. "I would make him pay for it."
2. "I would have him remake the bed."
3. "I would insist that Mark give the toy back."
4. "David's chores would be completed."

G. Task-Oriented: III. This applies to statements which show the task-orientation to be entirely verbalized to the boy. The assumption behind this distinction is that telling a boy what is to be done or what is expected of him without any qualifying conditions which are not verbalized to him represents more of a neutral position than that indicated for the E and F categories.

1. Usually verbalization is indicated directly.
 - a. "I asked him to take care of his pajamas."
 - b. "I warned him he would have to dig for himself."
 - c. "I pointed out some particular cases where Mark played with some of his toys and that he would have to share with his brother."
 - d. "I instructed Danny that he would have to return the plane."
2. Sometimes the statement indicates a future commitment for the parent, but as long as this is verbalized to the boy it is scored G rather than E.
 - a. "I'd suggest I might have to come wake him up."
 - b. "I then advised him if in the future he wanted help to come to me."
3. Sometimes the verbalization is revealed by the use of conversational quotes.
 - a. "No Johnny the assignment was given to you and you have to do it."
 - b. "Mark, while the toy is yours you have to share it with your brother."

These statements may be compared with "I would tell him not to do it," "I would say get control of yourself," and "I would say no" are not specifically task-oriented enough and are scored C.

APPENDIX C

Mother Form of the

STANFORD PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

The following statements have been made by parents about themselves, their children, and their families. Please read each statement and decide how it applies to you. Look at the next page of this questionnaire for a minute and you will see that there are four columns on the right hand side of the page. On the left side of the page there are statements. You should put one check mark next to each statement. You may put the check mark under SA or A or D or SD. SA means you agree strongly with the statement. A means you agree with the statement more than you disagree with it. D means you disagree with the statement more than you agree with it. SD means that you strongly disagree with the statement.

If you agree strongly with the statement or feel sure that it applies to you, put a check mark in the column marked SA. SA means Strongly Agree.

If you are sure that a statement does not apply to you or you strongly disagree with the statement, put a check mark in the column marked SD. SD means Strongly Disagree.

Use the A (Agree) or D (Disagree) columns for statements you are less sure about or feel less strongly about.

Please mark every statement, even though some may not seem to describe you or your family. For example, there might be a statement about brothers and sisters and you may have only one child. Give the answer according to what you believe you would think or feel or do if the statement did apply, or the situation did come up.

If you have more than one son in the 4th, 5th, and 6th grades, please mark the statements as they apply to your oldest son _____. For example, if you have both a 6th grade son and a 4th grade son, you would mark the statements as they applied to the 6th grade son. Some statements have blank spaces in them. They are to be marked as they apply to this son.

Work as quickly as you can. You do not need to think about each statement too carefully--just give your

impression. In other words, answer every one, but do not think too long about any one. Start with number 1 and do each one in order. Give your impression of each statement quickly and go on to the next one.

CODE NUMBER: _____

	M-1			
	SA	A	D	SD
1. He's not as aggressive as he might be at times.				
2. I don't think there's any too big difference between boys and girls as far as responsibility in the house goes.				
3. I'm sort of inept at playing with babies.				
4. If somebody feels they could pick on you and you're not going to do anything about it, they'll pick on you that much more.				
5. I don't like it when he comes and asks me things while I'm eating, and I get annoyed.				
6. His father has always been very good at playing games with him and keeping him amused and doing most anything for him.				
7. I'd say that in past years I have showed my affection too much, now I try not to overdo it.				
8. I'm not as tolerant as I should be, I feel.				
9. I have never had any arguments with our neighbors.				
10. Calm, reasoned chastisement is the most effective punishment.				
11. Quite often when we try to do something for him, he doesn't seem to appreciate it and we kind of feel he should.				
12. I'll say that some of the pretty violent scenes I've had with him were absolutely uncalled for on my part.				

	M-2			
	SA	A	D	SD
13. For his own self-protection, he should know how to handle himself.				
14. I know that it's only healthy for a boy to fight.				
15. My husband is indifferent and doesn't show affection, and I sometimes think _____ may turn out to be like him.				
16. His father isn't strict with him. He tells _____ he knows he didn't mean it, he wouldn't do it again, so he isn't strict with him.				
17. Even if I'm hostile in my mind toward someone, I won't show it.				
18. It hurts me when he talks back to me.				
19. To my way of thinking, he seems to want an extraordinary amount of attention.				
20. I think that a boy or a girl can have very similar responsibilities. I wouldn't say any longer that it's strictly a woman's work maintaining a home.				
21. I would only step in to stop a fight if he started using a stick or some other object to hit another child.				
22. He thinks he knows everything, but he doesn't. He'll stand there and argue that white is black even when you try to explain things to him.				

	M-3			
	SA	A	D	SD
23. According to what I know about my husband, _____ seems to be very much like he was at that age.				
24. He's a kid who's hard to please; he's just contrary.				
25. He knows that we love him.				
26. I think _____ feels closer to his father than to me because his father is more lenient with him.				
27. When _____ and I have disagreements we always kiss and make up--we both feel better if we do this.				
28. I'm pretty quick-tempered.				
29. I'm sure that _____ tells me whenever there is anything bothering him.				
30. I don't think _____ was born at the best time in our marriage.				
31. My husband wants everything ship-shape and done right now and he's the biggest procrastinator you ever saw.				
32. I think we cooperate on the big decisions.				
33. I've told him, "If you think you're right and the other fellow's trying to run over you, son, you slug him. Or if something happens to be yours and somebody tries to take it away from you, you fight for it."				

	M-4			
	SA	A	D	SD
34. A lot of times I take him to a picture show or something on weekends.				
35. If there has been a quarrel I tell him if he can't fight his own battles he will have to stay in his own house.				
36. My husband thinks I nag _____ too much because I do keep at him at times.				
37. If he and the other kid are the same size, I let them fight it out.				
38. We praise him when we think he would appreciate it and bubble over it--not just for school work or if his room is kept or his shoes are shined.				
39. I just can't think of anything where I would say he should be like my husband, because I think he's fine.				
40. I don't think boys should do housework type of chores--I think they should do things like carrying newspapers out or doing something in the yard or running errands.				
41. If my husband had punished unwisely and _____ was in the right then I would tell _____ I thought he was in the right.				
42. _____ wasn't very affectionate when he was younger.				
43. The kids get to hear words I have no business saying around the house because I get angry.				

	M-5			
	SA	A	D	SD
44. He doesn't do too much we can praise him for.				
45. I've never encouraged him to use his fists to defend himself.				
46. I wish I knew how close _____ feels to me.				
47. _____ maybe thinks I get too upset over things that he might want to do.				
48. I'd like him to be masculine in regard to sports and hobbies and reading material and so forth.				
49. Sometimes he seems to do things just to annoy me and I find this hard to understand.				
50. I think I get talked into things.				
51. Frankly, I'm just away from him too much of the time, and this is not good.				
52. Sometimes I think I understand _____ pretty well but then there are some things he does that I don't understand at all.				
53. I feel that probably I have been a little bit lacking in that knack of getting down onto his level on a lot of things.				
54. He feels by crying, I suppose, he'll get what he wants. We tell him it won't do him much good to cry.				
55. I fear I don't help him as much as I should.				

	M-6			
	SA	A	D	SD
56. Once he did come home with a dirty word and I knew someday it would come and yet I guess I did get kind of shaky about it.				
57. When boys and girls are somewhat older there are probably some differences in their activities, but they all seem pretty much alike to me now.				
58. I hope he'll be better able to go out and sway people better than I can. I hope he'll have more chance than I have.				
59. I feel our best time is when we just sit and talk.				
60. Usually if someone treats me unfairly, I just feel injured. I like to avoid unpleasantness if possible.				
61. I think I've always hugged and kissed him, and if he climbed up in my lap, I'd hold him for a while.				
62. _____ has been left alone very little. There's always some member of the family in the house.				
63. I feel quite close to him because he'll generally come to me and put his arms around me and things like that.				
64. My husband is too much on the defensive, too meek. He doesn't oppose things he doesn't like.				

	M-7			
	SA	A	D	SD
65. My husband doesn't discuss things--talk things over--as much as I would like.				
66. I feel he's too inclined to hold things within himself--it's good to be able to show anger.				
67. I try to kiss him and he'll back away from me.				
68. I like my son to be smarter than me.				
69. I show my affection very openly no matter where we are.				
70. I tell him he has to fight his own battles and not come tattling to me.				
71. We show our affection for each other--we're not reserved about it at all.				
72. If I've punished him and he goes to his bed room and cries, I've insisted he stay there if he's going to cry.				
73. I suppose I should give more consideration to his safety when he's out playing but I don't.				
74. I don't believe that you should teach a child to fight.				
75. As far as rules go, I just simply can't be firm enough to please my husband.				
76. We either play whatever game he wants to play or read if he wants to read.				

	M-8			
	SA	A	D	SD
77. I would expect him to take on more yardwork as he gets older, but not housework.				
78. I don't like to have scenes with people.				
79. He feels he has to have his own way, and that's like my husband, and I don't feel that's a very good trait.				
80. When I'm angry about something, I like to get it out in the open and get it over with.				
81. I would like him to have some interest in art, music, and culture.				
82. I don't think that he should do things like setting the table, hanging curtains or washing dishes, unless he wants to, but this should not be required or encouraged.				
83. I think he likes attention and, believe me, it's lavished on him.				
84. You know, you take your annoyances out on the children unfortunately.				
85. I think to some extent I don't want him to be quite as easy going as my husband.				
86. I certainly wouldn't want him to play with dolls and such.				
87. The thing that makes me maddest of all is to be treated unfairly or to be unjustly accused.				

	M-9			
	SA	A	D	SD
88. The first two years of _____'s life are sort of a blur--I don't remember very much about them.				
89. I can't think of anything I would like him to be I wouldn't expect in a girl.				
90. I don't think I understand my husband very well; I don't understand what brings on his moods.				
91. I think that boys should have more manual chores than girls, such as mowing the lawn; I wouldn't expect that of a girl.				
92. I can't figure him out sometimes--I don't know what makes him tick.				
93. My husband's a great one for making mountains out of molehills.				
94. I think _____ has to stand up for himself.				
95. He's smart like his father; he's got a good head on his shoulders.				
96. When I flip my lid, I flip, and I flip whether the children happen to be there or a group of people, and get it off my chest.				
97. I'd like him to be considerate and thoughtful--sentimental, to a degree, more so than his father is in some respects.				
98. Sometimes I'm at my wits end trying to figure out what to do with that boy.				

	M-10			
	SA	A	D	SD
99. I'd like him to stick up for his own rights.				
100. It's more important for boys than for girls to find out early what they're interested in and follow it through.				
101. I really enjoy reading to _____ before he goes to bed.				
102. I tell him that if he gets pushed around, he should just turn around and push back.				
103. I don't get so irritated very easily. I learned to control my temper years ago.				

APPENDIX D

Father Form of the STANFORD PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

The following statements have been made by parents about themselves, their children, and their families. Please read each statement and decide how it applies to you. Look at the next page of this questionnaire for a minute and you will see that there are four columns on the right hand side of the page. On the left side of the page there are statements. You should put one check mark next to each statement. You may put the check mark under SA or A or D or SD. SA means you agree strongly with the statement. A means you agree with the statement more than you disagree with it. D means you disagree with the statement more than you agree with it. SD means that you strongly disagree with the statement.

If you agree strongly with the statement or feel sure that it applies to you, put a check mark in the column marked SA. SA means Strongly Agree.

If you are sure that a statement does not apply to you or you strongly disagree with the statement, put a check mark in the column marked SD. SD means Strongly Disagree.

Use the A (Agree) or D (Disagree) columns for statements you are less sure about or feel less strongly about.

Please mark every statement, even though some may not seem to describe you or your family. For example, there might be a statement about brothers and sisters and you may have only one child. Give the answer according to what you believe you would think or feel or do if the statement did apply, or the situation did come up.

If you have more than one son in the 4th, 5th, and 6th grades, please mark the statements as they apply to your oldest son _____. For example, if you have both a 6th grade son and a 4th grade son, you would mark the statements as they applied to the 6th grade son. Some statements have blank spaces in them. They are to be marked as they apply to this son.

Work as quickly as you can. You do not need to think about each statement too carefully--just give your impression. In other words, answer every one, but do not think too long about any one. Start with number 1 and do each one in order. Give your impression of each statement quickly and go on to the next one.

CODE NUMBER: _____

	F-1			
	SA	A	D	SD
1. I get tired of the whole darned brood, not just _____, but the whole bunch.				
2. It's more important for boys than for girls to find out early what they're interested in and follow it through.				
3. Sometimes he seems to do things just to annoy me and I find this hard to understand.				
4. If he and the other kid are the same size, I let them fight it out.				
5. If I go away for a week on a trip, he doesn't really miss me too much.				
6. I would like him to be more of an athlete.				
7. If I'm a little lax on some of my duties, my wife gets a little irritated and wants them done right away.				
8. I wish I knew how close _____ feels to me.				
9. I'm not as tolerant of him as I should be, I feel.				
10. I don't think that he should do things like setting the table, hanging curtains or washing dishes, unless he wants to, but this should not be required or encouraged.				
11. I don't like to have scenes with people.				

	F-2			
	SA	A	D	SD
12. I'd say that in past years I have showed my affection too much. Now I try not to overdo it.				
13. I'll say that some of the pretty violent scenes I've had with him were absolutely uncalled for on my part.				
14. I tell him that if he gets pushed around, he should just turn around and push back.				
15. I don't think he should start fights, but if anyone else starts one I think he should finish it even if he has to come home with two black eyes.				
16. I can't think of anything I would like him to be I wouldn't expect in a girl.				
17. I'd say there's a lot of room for improvement when it comes to my wife and I understanding each other.				
18. I would hate for him to be effeminate.				
19. I have never had any arguments with our neighbors.				
20. It hurts me when he talks back to me.				
21. Sometimes I think I understand _____ pretty well but then there are some things he does that I don't understand at all.				

	F-3			
	SA	A	D	SD
22. I think that boys should have more manual chores than girls, such as mowing a lawn; I wouldn't expect that of a girl.				
23. I'd like him to stick up for his own rights.				
24. I take the first opportunity, after I've cooled down and I'm sure he has cooled down, to re-cement our relationships.				
25. If my wife gets irritated with me, I try to kid her out of it.				
26. _____ has been left alone very little. There's always some member of the family in the house.				
27. He likes for me to be at home as much as possible; not to go out.				
28. When my wife was pregnant with _____, we had a hell of a time--we really got on one another's nerves.				
29. When he was a baby and he cried, we felt that there was something that demanded attention and attempted to console him.				
30. I think what makes me maddest of all is to be treated unfairly or to be unjustly accused.				
31. We either play whatever game he wants to play or read if he wants me to read something to him.				

	F-4			
	SA	A	D	SD
32. I don't think I took as much care of him when he was a baby as a father should.				
33. It's been very, very seldom that a fight or an argument between my wife and myself lasted overnight.				
34. If my wife and I have a difference of opinion on some matter with regard to raising_____, I'm stumped--I don't quite know how to settle it.				
35. He's not as aggressive as he might be at times.				
36. I feel quite close to him because he'll generally come to me and put his arms around me and things like that.				
37. I tell him he has to fight his own battles and not come tattling to me.				
38. I can't understand how my wife can make certain decisions without consulting me.				
39. I don't try to stop_____from getting into fights; I try to figure out whether he's justified or not.				
40. I think I've always hugged and kissed him, and if he climbed up in my lap, I'd hold him for a while.				
41. My wife's probably a little stricter than I am with him.				

	F-5			
	SA	A	D	SD
42. I'd like him to be masculine in regard to sports and hobbies and reading material and so forth.				
43. I'm more concerned about appearances than my wife is....She doesn't care what people are going to say or think about her.				
44. I try to kiss him and he'll back away from me.				
45. I'm pretty quick-tempered.				
46. He doesn't do too much that we can praise him for.				
47. I would like him to be more aggressive in taking care of himself.				
48. He thinks he knows everything, but he doesn't. He'll stand there and argue that white is black, even when you try to explain things to him.				
49. I'd hate to have him be like me all the time; I'm no shining example.				
50. It's very important for a boy to think and to learn how to use his brains--more so than for a girl.				
51. He's a kid who's hard to please; he's just contrary.				
52. I think I get talked into things.				
53. _____ maybe thinks I get too upset over things that he might want to do.				

	F-6			
	SA	A	D	SD
54. _____ wasn't very affectionate when he was young.				
55. I think that I'm a better qualified judge of human nature than the average person.				
56. Quite often when we try to do something for him, he doesn't seem to appreciate it and we kind of feel he should.				
57. I feel that probably I have been a little bit lacking in that knack of getting down onto his level on a lot of things.				
58. I've had a rough schedule for quite a while now, working pretty hard and not having adequate relaxation and not having a chance to get away from the house and the family and all that.				
59. I'd like him to be a little less cautious than my wife.				
60. Sometimes I'm at my wits end trying to figure out what to do with that boy.				
61. I think he likes attention and, believe me, it's lavished on him.				
62. My wife and I don't spend much time together--only when the whole family gets together.				
63. When he was a baby, I used to walk around the room with him when he was crying.				
64. I don't make it a practice to ignore him or refuse to speak to him if he's been bad.				

	F-7			
	SA	A	D	SD
65. We show our affection for each other--we're not reserved about it at all.				
66. I just can't think of anything where I should say he should not be like my wife, because I think she's fine.				
67. We never have any disagreements in front of the kids.				
68. If someone feels that they can pick on you and you're not going to do anything about it, they'll pick on you that much more.				
69. I would say that _____ and I aren't as happy with each other as we might be.				
70. Frankly, I'm just away from him too much of the time, and this is not good.				
71. I feel our best time is when we just sit and talk.				
72. I've told him, "If you think you're right and the other fellow's trying to run over you, son, you slug him. Or if something happens to be yours and somebody tries to take it away from you, you fight for it."				
73. I wish he felt as close to me as I do to him.				
74. To my way of thinking, he seems to want an extraordinary amount of attention.				
75. I suppose I should give more consideration to his safety when he's out playing but I don't.				

	F-8			
	SA	A	D	SD
76. I think that a boy or a girl can have very similar responsibilities. I wouldn't say any longer that it's strictly a woman's work maintaining the home.				
77. I hope my son is going to have a social, outgoing personality.				
78. I'm sure that _____ tells me whenever there is anything bothering him.				
79. I don't believe that you should teach a child to fight.				
80. As far as taking revenge on a person, I don't think it's right under any circumstances.				
81. If I'm irritated at my wife, I can't hit her and I can't yell at her and so I resort to sarcasm.				
82. For his own self-protection, he should know how to handle himself.				
83. I am constantly warning him of all kinds of dangers, like electricity, knives, and streets and everything.				
84. I know that it's only healthy for a boy to fight.				
85. We praise him when we think he would appreciate it and bubble over it--not just for school work or if his room is kept or his shoes are shined.				
86. You know, you take your annoyances out on the children, unfortunately.				

	F-9			
	SA	A	D	SD
87. Things that bother my wife will not bother me.				
88. We've had some very violent explosions over lying.				
89. I can tell just how he's going to feel about things.				
90. I don't think boys should do housework type of chores--I think they should do things like carrying newspapers out or doing something in the yard or running errands.				
91. I can't figure him out sometimes--I don't know what makes him tick.				
92. My wife is pretty tied down with housework and various activities and I don't think she has much time for_____, other than taking care of his needs.				
93. I like to hear him talk and, in fact, I kind of delight in seeing him arguing or debating a little with his mother.				
94. I don't get irritated very easily. I learned to control my temper years ago.				
95. When I flip my lid, I flip, and I flip whether the children happen to be there or a group of people, and get it off my chest.				
96. My wife is too much on the defensive, too meek. She doesn't oppose things she doesn't like.				

	F-10			
	SA	A	D	SD
97. The kids get to hear words I have no business saying around the house because I get angry.				
98. I think we cooperate on the big decisions.				
99. He's pretty much of a momma's boy.				
100. I feel that it's important for a boy to learn to stand up for himself.				
101. I have felt that my wife and I aren't as sexually compatible as I thought we should be.				
102. My wife's a great one for making mountains out of molehills.				
103. I rough-house with the children quite a little bit, and we fight, hitting in the body, and so I suppose automatically I have encouraged him to use his fists, at least so he knows how to use them.				

APPENDIX E

Items for each scale of the STANFORD PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Mother Form

Affection Demonstrated: Items 25, 27, 29, 34, 38, 59,
61, 62, 63, 69, 71, 76, 83, 101.

Rejection: Items 3, 5, 7, 11, 19, 22, 24, 42, 44, 46,
49, 52, 54, 67, 72, 88, 92.

Demands for Aggression: Items 1, 4, 13, 14, 21, 33, 35,
37, 45, 66, 70, 74, 94, 99, 102.

Parental Aggression: Items 9, 10, 17, 28, 43, 60, 78,
80, 84, 87, 96, 103.

Self-Esteem: Items 8, 12, 18, 47, 50, 51, 53, 55, 56,
58, 68, 73, 98.

Husband-Wife Relationship: Items 6, 15, 16, 26, 30,
31, 32, 36, 39, 41, 64, 65, 75, 79, 85, 90, 93,
95, 97.

Sex-Role Expectations: Items 2, 20, 23, 40, 48, 57,
77, 81, 82, 86, 89, 91, 100.

Father Form

Affection Demonstrated: Items 24, 26, 27, 29, 31, 36,
40, 61, 63, 64, 65, 71, 73, 78, 85, 89.

Rejection: Items 1, 3, 5, 8, 12, 21, 44, 46, 48, 51,
54, 56, 69, 74, 91.

Demands for Aggression: Items 4, 14, 15, 23, 35, 37,
39, 47, 68, 72, 79, 82, 84, 93, 100, 103.

Parental Aggression: Items 11, 19, 30, 45, 80, 86,
88, 94, 95, 97.

Self-Esteem: Items 9, 13, 20, 32, 34, 49, 52, 53, 55,
57, 58, 60, 70, 75, 83.

Husband-Wife Relationship: Items 7, 17, 25, 28, 33,
38, 41, 43, 59, 62, 66, 67, 81, 87, 92, 96, 98,
101, 102.

Sex-Role Expectations: Items 2, 6, 10, 16, 18, 22,
42, 50, 76, 90, 99.

APPENDIX F

Mean scores for the dependent variables in relation to role taking by fathers and mothers

There were 41 cases in which both fathers and mothers from the same family took part in the study. These 41 subjects were rated as expressive or instrumental depending on whether their scores on the role variable fell above or below the median. They were then divided into four role classifications or types which are as follows: both fathers and mothers expressive (FEME); fathers expressive and mothers instrumental (FEMI); fathers instrumental and mothers expressive (FIME); both fathers and mothers instrumental (FIMI). There were 10 cases in each group with the exception of the FIME class which had 11. One of these was eliminated on a random basis.

A preliminary attempt was made to examine some possible relationships between these four parental role types and behavioral disturbance in sons. The table below gives the mean scores for the aggression (A), dependency (D), withdrawal (W), perceived rejection of fathers (PRF) and perceived rejection of mothers (PRM) variables in relation to each role type.

Role type	A	D	W	PRF	PRM
FEME	290.8	210.0	83.5	25.6	26.4
FEMI	203.6	215.1	76.3	28.9	23.2
FIME	103.9	97.9	50.3	26.3	23.2
FIMI	196.3	147.4	127.0	28.7	25.6

APPENDIX G

RAW SCORES FOR THE MOTHER-SON SAMPLE

Family Number	Rejection	Ambivalence	Demands for Aggression	Parental Aggression	General Aggression	Self-Esteem	H-W Relationship	Adjustment	Role	Aggression	Dependency	Withdrawal	Perceived Rejection
100	22	53	23	20	43	26	25	51	57	185	321	111	23
101	18	45	19	21	40	15	13	28	32	035	035	030	26
102	25	58	16	15	31	21	20	41	45	510	510	180	18
103	24	44	21	16	37	22	22	44	63	060	060	000	26
105	13	36	17	14	31	17	17	34	55	570	390	240	27
106	13	40	22	11	33	14	08	22	45	147	126	049	17
107	27	50	28	14	42	23	18	41	56	643	582	519	30
108	18	38	29	17	46	16	17	33	38	049	035	093	19
109	17	44	19	20	39	17	27	44	67	056	007	000	14
110	26	48	24	11	35	23	22	45	78	231	154	028	20
111	24	49	25	18	43	17	17	34	66	116	063	035	15

APPENDIX G (continued)

Family Number	Rejection	Ambivalence	Demands for Aggression	Parental Aggression	General Aggression	Self-Esteem	H-W Relationship	Adjustment	Role	Aggression	Dependency	Withdrawal	Perceived Rejection
113	23	52	21	12	33	22	10	32	41	042	007	138	21
114	29	52	22	17	39	24	21	45	35	414	321	784	24
118	25	58	20	21	41	23	20	43	73	140	042	028	11
121	05	30	23	13	36	09	04	13	63	098	021	014	22
122	22	37	25	12	37	19	14	33	43	285	156	052	34
124	10	39	23	17	40	11	11	22	50	070	022	020	25
125	28	52	30	17	47	22	27	49	34	065	028	014	16
126	13	45	26	09	35	17	19	36	69	034	051	063	34
127	29	56	22	21	43	18	18	36	09	550	422	062	14
129	18	42	25	20	45	20	21	41	57	096	369	784	25
130	27	51	24	16	40	22	21	43	63	102	070	035	18
131	24	50	16	19	35	28	15	43	73	169	213	091	26
132	29	54	22	16	38	20	24	44	18	272	259	098	18

APPENDIX G (continued)

Family Number	Rejection	Ambivalence	Demands for Aggression	Parental Aggression	General Aggression	Self-Esteem	H-W Relationship	Adjustment	Role	Aggression	Dependency	Withdrawal	Perceived Rejection
133	22	42	21	14	35	19	20	39	25	021	021	063	23
135	16	37	27	13	40	18	19	37	46	055	065	051	30
136	21	59	23	22	45	26	07	33	64	169	123	030	13
137	14	39	19	16	35	18	20	38	50	076	170	136	38
138	20	39	21	17	38	23	20	43	61	231	231	045	23
139	18	54	27	10	37	17	15	32	45	050	120	480	25
141	30	57	23	21	44	29	32	61	43	100	100	028	15
142	14	49	31	05	36	13	03	16	51	701	553	066	31
143	23	52	29	15	44	26	36	62	50	200	170	030	16
301	17	33	21	18	39	19	14	33	51	006	054	049	24
302	19	43	23	17	40	22	16	38	22	180	135	225	32
303	24	53	29	19	48	29	35	64	47	085	097	040	27
304	21	42	26	20	46	25	20	45	45	126	113	070	22

APPENDIX G (continued)

Family Number	Rejection	Ambivalence	Demands for Aggression	Parental Aggression	General Aggression	Self-Esteem	H-W Relationship	Adjustment	Role	Aggression	Dependency	Withdrawal	Perceived Rejection
305	21	48	22	19	41	21	17	38	56	257	425	234	21
306	26	51	26	20	46	19	18	37	48	395	590	180	21
307	28	51	26	16	42	23	27	50	52	409	072	153	24
308	19	49	25	18	43	13	07	20	50	050	030	010	18
310	12	42	20	18	38	10	26	36	55	012	099	018	27
311	17	41	26	16	42	21	09	30	77	103	114	012	22
312	24	53	29	17	46	22	20	42	68	300	140	030	37
313	23	49	31	13	44	24	29	53	56	037	076	102	38
314	18	51	15	10	25	20	12	32	58	065	020	010	24
315	22	45	22	16	38	18	22	40	53	271	112	026	18
316	17	44	23	16	39	23	15	38	41	022	025	053	29
318	10	36	30	14	44	04	04	08	67	036	022	010	19
319	16	49	24	11	35	25	32	57	59	040	040	025	26

APPENDIX G (continued)

Family Number	Rejection	Ambivalence	Demands for Aggression	Parental Aggression	General Aggression	Self-Esteem	H-W Relationship	Adjustment	Role	Aggression	Dependency	Withdrawal	Perceived Rejection
320	33	52	26	20	46	24	14	38	39	690	489	065	31
321	24	45	25	19	44	22	29	51	72	267	266	140	22
322	28	48	22	23	45	21	25	46	61	000	070	130	22
324	27	53	25	16	41	29	19	48	49	056	063	052	22
325	19	48	23	12	35	17	12	29	46	430	470	040	20
326	06	41	25	09	34	15	04	19	67	380	330	020	23

APPENDIX H

RAW SCORES FOR THE FATHER-SON SAMPLE

Family Number	Rejection	Ambivalence	Demands for Aggression	Parental Aggression	General Aggression	Self-Esteem	H-W Relationship	Adjustment	Role	Aggression	Dependency	Withdrawal	Perceived Rejection
200	20	53	35	17	52	26	15	41	18	185	321	111	25
201	15	45	24	11	35	20	24	44	27	071	035	030	26
202	16	39	27	12	39	14	30	44	36	060	060	000	19
203	16	44	28	16	44	22	24	46	56	570	390	240	20
204	20	49	30	14	44	27	23	50	66	147	126	049	37
206	15	45	23	11	34	29	33	62	45	049	035	093	18
207	17	49	25	10	35	22	19	41	45	014	014	021	22
209	12	33	22	17	39	35	22	57	28	231	154	028	16
210	21	50	28	14	42	26	23	49	16	042	007	138	26
211	22	54	27	17	44	23	26	49	28	414	321	055	31
213	21	51	21	09	30	30	26	56	24	140	042	028	18

APPENDIX H (continued)

Family Number	Rejection	Ambivalence	Demands for Aggression	Parental Aggression	General Aggression	Self-Esteem	H-W Relationship	Adjustment	Role	Aggression	Dependency	Withdrawal	Perceived Rejection
215	10	43	32	09	41	19	16	35	38	098	021	014	20
216	06	31	25	12	37	11	18	29	68	260	200	130	26
217	18	46	27	12	39	21	16	37	26	285	156	052	32
218	19	54	33	13	46	24	23	47	23	034	051	063	29
219	10	43	26	09	35	15	24	39	54	169	213	091	34
220	09	35	23	11	34	20	09	29	63	169	123	030	20
221	07	39	24	16	40	26	22	48	68	076	170	136	41
222	10	37	42	14	56	18	22	40	21	050	120	480	33
223	00	43	36	06	42	13	29	42	27	070	057	050	15
224	22	55	21	14	35	29	22	51	71	231	231	045	13
225	20	51	26	14	40	23	18	41	60	701	553	066	39
226	21	52	25	13	38	22	22	44	70	093	049	056	24
227	20	50	22	18	40	20	18	38	84	550	422	062	21

APPENDIX H (continued)

Family Number	Rejection	Ambivalence	Demands for Aggression	Parental Aggression	General Aggression	Self-Esteem	H-W Relationship	Adjustment	Role	Aggression	Dependency	Withdrawal	Perceived Rejection
228	14	43	21	13	34	16	18	34	23	021	021	063	21
402	15	52	29	07	36	19	29	48	36	180	135	225	35
403	17	43	23	17	40	25	24	49	47	006	054	049	42
404	05	38	38	21	59	20	21	41	57	085	097	040	33
405	09	40	35	15	50	19	12	31	46	130	035	040	24
406	09	42	32	17	49	26	27	53	20	257	425	234	39
407	24	53	25	13	38	26	28	54	69	012	099	018	16
408	22	50	31	15	46	23	21	44	49	395	590	180	29
409	17	46	22	12	34	23	24	47	56	409	072	153	22
410	09	38	24	12	36	13	15	28	46	050	030	010	32
411	22	48	30	12	42	25	20	45	32	103	114	012	20
412	16	50	28	15	43	20	25	45	66	300	140	030	29
413	21	47	33	18	51	28	25	53	45	037	076	102	48

APPENDIX H (continued)

Family Number	Rejection	Ambivalence	Demands for Aggression	Parental Aggression	General Aggression	Self-Esteem	H-W Relationship	Adjustment	Role	Aggression	Dependency	Withdrawal	Perceived Rejection
414	14	43	30	15	45	25	23	48	15	065	020	010	32
415	13	41	27	14	41	19	37	36	52	022	025	053	30
416	21	49	31	13	44	20	29	49	32	120	117	072	22
417	18	46	24	08	32	23	19	42	45	126	113	070	39
418	24	50	27	15	42	15	23	38	50	271	112	026	22
419	24	59	20	19	39	26	27	53	54	056	028	140	38
420	21	42	32	18	50	19	28	47	36	690	489	065	26
421	20	44	27	11	38	23	20	43	30	056	063	052	21
422	15	50	26	10	36	22	15	37	60	430	470	040	19
423	17	49	27	09	33	21	11	32	65	090	108	468	14

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293104737659