CONSCIENCE ORIENTATION AND FAMILY INTERACTION IN EARLY ADOLESCENT BOYS

Thesis for the Degree of Ph. D.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
Jo Anne H. Lifshin
1970

This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

CONSCIENCE ORIENTATION AND FAMILY INTERACTION
IN EARLY ADOLESCENT BOYS

presented by

Jo Anne H. Lifshin

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in Psychology

Lucy R. Ferguson
Major professor

Date March, 1970

ABSTRACT

CONSCIENCE ORIENTATION AND FAMILY INTERACTION

IN EARLY ADOLESCENT BOYS

By

Jo Anne H. Lifshin

Previous investigations of the relationship between the child's moral judgment and parental behavior have generally yielded ambiguous results or have not supported such a relationship. Hoffman and Saltzstein (1964, 1967), however, found consistent relationships between parental disciplinary practices and three forms of conscience orientation which are similar to Kohlberg's (1964) stages of moral judgment. The present research was designed to investigate the relationship between the child's flexible-humanistic, rigid-conventional, or "externalized" conscience orientation and relevant family interaction variables.

The subjects for the research were 18 twelve to fourteen year old boys and their mothers and fathers from Lansing, Michigan, and two communities around Lansing which are socioeconomically heterogeneous.

The conscience orientations of 82 boys were assessed from responses to hypothetical stories developed by Hoffman and Saltzstein (1964, 1968). Difficulties arose in securing the desired samples for the family interaction assessment. Eight of 13 (62%) intact families of humanistically oriented boys, 9 of 28 (32%) intact families of conventionally oriented boys, and a single family of an "externally" oriented child chose to

participate in the family interaction assessment. The identity of the variables which contributed to the selectivity of participation is unknown. The data analyses were limited to the humanistic and conventional groups because only one subject showed a predominantly "externalized" orientation.

The early adolescent boys and their parents participated in family interaction sessions, in which the relevant parental and child variables were assessed, and completed the Attribute Preference Inventory. The families role-played hypothetical situations concerning disobedience, theft, cheating and physical aggression. The response frequencies of the family interaction variables were rated independently by two raters from tape recorded responses.

The findings did not directly support the author's expectation of significant differences between the frequencies with which the various family interactions occurred among the humanistic and conventional groups. The humanistic group was expected to elicit information and give expectations with greater frequency than the conventional group, and the conventional group was expected to express disappointment and negative feeling more frequently than the humanistic group. Of the 33 variables which were expected to differentiate between the groups, only fathers' expressions of disappointment significantly (.05 level) differentiated between the humanistic and conventional subjects. This finding was in the predicted direction. Significant patterns of correlations differentiating between the humanistic and conventional groups were not sustained. Hoffman and Saltzstein's (1964) findings of greater frequency of use of induction and power assertion by humanistic parents than by conventional parents, and greater frequency of use of love withdrawal techniques by conventional parents than by humanistic parents, were not

supported by the data. The present results supported their report of greater flexibility in the humanistic group than in the conventional group. This lack of significant findings may be attributable to sampling problems; the unequal rates of participation of conventional and humanistic families may have masked actual differences or otherwise biased the results.

Although the response frequencies of the family interaction variables were similar, inspection of the correlations between the family interaction variables significant at the .05 level revealed both similarities and differences between the groups. The parental roles appear to be differentiated by the consequences of the parent's expression of negative feeling in interaction. Negative feeling expressed by the mother apparently inhibits interaction by the child, while the father's expression of negative feeling was associated with the child's increased requests for information, including challenging the parent. These differences in parental roles may reflect the importance of the child's perception of the mother as nurturant and the father as the enforcer of societal standards.

Interaction in the conventional group appeared to show a restricted, "fact-finding" pattern in contrast to a flexible, feeling-oriented pattern in the humanistic group. The conventional child, whose experience centers primarily around the disciplinary situation per se, may follow parental expectations or reject them. This set of alternatives seems to reduce the possibility of mutual exploration, with his parents, of the implications of deviation or conformity in varying situations. Greater opportunity exists for the humanistic child to explore the conditions under which deviation is appropriate, and the humanistic parent seems to reinforce his child's experimental explorations of the disciplinary area.

The humanistic child may have greater opportunity than the conventional child to utilize his resources in the formation of humanistic moral judgment.

The relationships cited suggest that family interaction plays at least an indirect role in conscience orientation, although interaction may be more directly reflected in other dimensions of moral development.

References

Hoffman, M. L. Personal communication, 1968.

Hoffman, M. L., and Saltzstein, H. D. Techniques and processes in moral development. Report of Research, October, 1964, The Merrill-Palmer Institute, Research Grant Reference Number M-2333, National Institute of Mental Health.

Hoffman, M. L., and Saltzstein, H. D. Parent discipline and the child's moral development. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 5, 45-57.

Kohlberg, L. Development of moral character and moral ideology. In M. L. Hoffman and L. W. Hoffman (Eds.), Review of child development research. Vol. 1. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964, Pp. 383-431.

CONSCIENCE ORIENTATION AND FAMILY INTERACTION IN EARLY ADOLESCENT BOYS

By

Jo Anne H. Lifshin

A THESIS

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Psychology

1970

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author expresses her appreciation to Dr. Lucy R. Ferguson for her continued patience, support and guidance as thesis advisor. Appreciation is also accorded to Dr. John Hurley, Dr. Albert Rabin, and Dr. William Stellwagen for their valuable suggestions in formulating the thesis problem and in reading the thesis.

The author thanks Miss Ida Zektick for her generous contributions in the development of the family interaction variables.

Mr. Tom VanDyke, Principal, Bath Junior High School, Bath, Michigan; Mr. Fred Gable, Principal, Williamston Junior High School, Williamston, Michigan; Mr. Thacker, Executive Office, Boy Scouts of America; and Mr. John Hewitt, Scoutmaster, Meryl Colt Boy Scout Troop; are thanked for their cooperation in obtaining subjects and their interpretation of the project to subject families.

The author expresses her appreciation for the willing assistance and spontaneous contributions to the modification of the rating system to the following undergraduate raters: Carl Beysiegel, Ruth Drachler, Barbara Gross, and Bill Kohen.

The author especially accords appreciation to those families who participated in the research.

Finally, the author wishes to express appreciation to her husband, Arthur Lifshin, whose support greatly enabled the author to complete this final goal of graduate school.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES v

LIST OF APPENDICES vii

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE 3

Theoretical Discussion 3

Internalized Versus "Externalized" Conscience Orientations 5

Flexible-Humanistic and Rigid-Conventional Forms of Internalized Conscience 8

Review of Relevant Research 9

Experimental Modification of Moral Judgment 13

Conclusion 15

III. HYPOTHESES 16

IV. METHODS 18

Pilot Study 18

Subjects 18

Assessment of Conscience Orientation 20

Assessment of Parental and Child Variables from Family Interaction Situations 25

Assessment of Attribute Preferences 31

Analysis of Data 32

V. RESULTS

General Statement 33

Results Relevant to Specific Hypotheses 33

Other Relationships Among Family Interaction Variables 39

Informational Aspects of Family Interaction 40

Negative Responses by the Parents in Family Interaction 46

Differential Involvement in the Disciplinary Encounter 49

Results Relevant to Attribute Preferences 54

Relationships Between Family Interaction Variables and Subject Variables 59

Concluding Remarks 60

VI. DISCUSSION 62

Introductory Statement 62

Predicted Relationships Between Family Interaction and Conscience Orientation 62

Sampling Problems 64

The Role of Negative Feeling in Interaction 67

Group Differences in Disciplinary Interaction 68

Theoretical Considerations 70

Assessment of Conscience Orientation 72

Family Interaction 73

Concluding Statement 74

VII. SUMMARY 76

BIBLIOGRAPHY 80

APPENDICES 82

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Reliability of Conscience Orientation Data	23
2.	Distribution of Conscience Orientations	24
3.	Parental and Child Variables Assessed in Interaction Situations	28
4.	Reliability of Parents' Family Interaction Variables	29
5.	Reliability of Children's Family Interaction Variables	30
6.	Comparison of Parental Behavior in Humanistic and Conventional Groups	35
7.	Comparison of the Child's Behavior in Humanistic and Conventional Groups	36
8.	Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between the Variables, Parent Elicits Information and Parent Gives Expectations	37
9.	Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between the Variables, Parent Explains, and Emphasizes Restoration; and Parent Shows Positive Feeling	38
10.	Frequency of Significant (.05 Level) Pearson Product Moment Correlations in the Humanistic Group	41
11.	Frequency of Significant (.05 Level) Pearson Product Moment Correlations in the Conventional Group	41
12.	Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Mothers' and Fathers' Informational and Related Variables	42
13.	Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Mothers' and Children's Informational Variables	43
14.	Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Fathers' and Children's Informational and Related Variables	44
15.	Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Mothers' Negative Feeling and Related Variables and Children's Highly Emotional Responses	47

16. Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Fathers' Negative Feeling and Related Variables and Children's Highly Emotional Responses 47

17. Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Fathers' Negative Feeling and Giving Irrelevant Information and Children's Informational Variables 48

18. Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Mothers' Negative Feeling and Related Variables 50

19. Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Fathers' Negative Feeling and Related Variables 50

20. Correlations Between Family Interaction Variables Which Illustrate a Differential Group Approach: Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Mothers' and Children's Variables 51

21. Correlations Between Family Interaction Variables Which Illustrate a Differential Group Approach: Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Fathers' and Children's Variables 52

22. Comparison of Attribute Preferences in Humanistic and Conventional Groups 54

23. Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Preferred Attributes for a Boy and for a Girl and Parent Gives Alternatives 56

24. Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Preferred Attributes for a Boy and for a Girl and Parents' Expressions of Positive Feeling 58

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix		page
A.	Form Letter to Parents Requesting Their Cooperation	82
B.	Subject Variables	83
C.	Instruments for the Assessment of Conscience Orientation and Instructions for Administering Them	86
D.	Instructions for Rating Conscience Orientation Responses	94
E.	Family Interaction Situations and Instructions for Administering Them	100
F.	Illustrations of Parental and Child Variables Assessed in Family Interaction Situations	102
G.	The Attribute Preference Inventory	109
H.	Means and Standard Deviations of Response Frequencies of Family Members in Interaction Situations	111
I.	Correlations Between Family Interaction Variables	114
J.	Correlations Between Attribute Preferences and Family Interaction Variables	123
K.	Correlations Between Family Interaction Variables and Subject Variables	129
L.	Response Frequencies of Family Interaction Variables	135
M.	Raw Scores for Attribute Preferences	141
N.	Conscience Orientation Scores	145
O.	Raw Scores of Family of "Externalized" Subject	147

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Although the relationships between parental child-rearing practices and children's moral conduct and emotional concomitants have been subjected to extensive empirical investigation, the relationship between moral judgment and parental practices remains relatively unexplored. The concept of moral judgment as advanced by Piaget (1932) has primarily led to research following in the developmental tradition. The object of these studies has been to establish a developmental sequence, and in some instances, to relate developmental sequences to such factors as intelligence quotient, socioeconomic class and peer relationships. Research on relationships between children's moral conduct (i.e., resistance to temptation) and emotional concomitants (i.e., guilt) and parental practices has developed primarily from the theoretical tradition of Freud and later learning theory modifications. A large body of research literature shows specific patterns of relationships between parental practices and conscience development, particularly internalization of conscience contrasted with a moral response based on fear of detection and punishment, or "externalization" of conscience.

Hoffman and Saltzstein (1964) investigated the relationship between moral judgment and parental reports of disciplinary practices. Rather than utilizing the stages of moral judgment as described by Piaget (1932) and Kohlberg (in Hoffman and Hoffman, 1964), Hoffman and Saltzstein defined moral judgment in terms of flexible-humanistic, rigid-conventional

and "externalized" approaches. These conscience orientations consist of two internalized and one "externalized" orientation.

This research is designed to investigate certain relationships between the conscience orientations of early adolescent boys and selected parental variables. The conscience orientation types which will be related to parental variables are: the flexible-humanistic (humanistic), the rigid-conventional (conventional), and the "externalized" types. The quotation marks around the "externalized" form of conscience orientation differentiate this fear-based response from the conscience deriving from the superego in the humanistic and conventional forms.

An attempt will be made to determine whether or not relationships exist between conscience orientation as manifested by the child and the content of verbal communication by the parent and the parent's emotional reactions to the child and the other parent. The parental variables which will be assessed have been modified from Hoffman and Saltzstein's (1964) interview variables.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Theoretical Discussion

The investigation of moral judgment gained its impetus from the introduction of cognitive aspects of conscience development as proposed by Piaget (1932). Piaget conceives of the child as advancing in an orderly manner with increasing chronological age from a stage of moral realism in which rules are perceived as fixed, external things to a stage of moral subjectivity in which intent and effect on others is considered, and rules are perceived as instruments of human purpose and values. All children are assumed to progress through these delineated stages.

Kohlberg (in Hoffman and Hoffman, 1964) has subjected Piaget's view of moral development to empirical testing and has established six moral orientations at three levels of development. These are:

Level I. Permoral

Type 1. Punishment and obedience orientation.

Type 2. Naive instrumental hedonism.

Level II. Morality of Conventional Role-Conformity

Type 3. Good-boy morality of maintaining good relations, approval of others.

Type 4. Authority maintaining morality.

Level III. Morality of Self-Accepted Moral Principles

Type 5. Morality of contract, of individual rights, and of democratically accepted law.

Type 6. Morality of individual principles of conscience.

The moral stages, according to Kohlberg (in Hoffman and Hoffman, 1964) are an outgrowth of interaction with others rather than biologically or neurologically determined. The moral judgment manifested by the child may not directly represent introjection or the teaching of the parents. The child, however, must relate his values to a comprehended social order and his own goals as a social being. In reference to his moral stage analysis, Kohlberg considers that an individual predominantly manifests the characteristics of one stage, but may show thinking characteristics of a neighboring stage. Kohlberg further indicates that he does not consider judgment to become "moral" until early adolescence, while morality of conduct develops earlier.

Moral judgment appears as one dimension of moral development. This predominantly cognitive dimension has been approached, with the exception of Hoffman and Saltzstein's (1964, 1967) work, from a stage analysis point of view. In contrast to this approach, the psychoanalytic and social learning theories consider conscience to form in the early years, and it ordinarily is not expected to change in any fundamental way throughout life. Piaget's (1932) focus on cognitive aspects of conscience development does not exclude emotional factors, but Piaget assumes that behavior is consonant with moral judgment.

Psychoanalytic theory asserts that conscience develops during the processes of anaclitic identification and identification with the aggressor (Fenichel, 1945). By conforming to the standards of the parents, the child is able to resolve his ambivalence toward the parent figures and to retain their love. The forerunners of conscience appear in the process of anaclitic identification. In this process, the very young

child conforms to the socializing expectations of the mother, whom he loves but also hates for her restrictions on his autonomy, to maintain a loving relationship with her. The actual internalization of conscience develops when the child globally incorporates the standards of the same-sex parent to resolve the Oedipal conflict. The child can then maintain a loving relationship with the oppostie sex parent and with the same-sex parent who is loved but is also a hated and feared competitor for the opposite sex parent's affection.

Social learning theory, like psychoanalytic theory, stresses the importance of the early years in the development of conscience. In this view, however, anaclitic identification gains greater prominence, and reinforcement contingencies used by the family and situational differences play a crucial role in the specification of learning conditions. The child need not globally incorporate the same-sex parent's standards; either parent may serve as the controller of resources. Both psychoanalytic theory and social learning theory basically stress conscience as the internalization of societal expectations, partially due to the development of social learning theory as a translation of psychoanalytic theory into learning theory terms.

Internalized Versus "Externalized" Conscience Orientations

Within psychoanalytic theory (Fenichel, 1945), reliance on fear of external detection and punishment indicates a fixation of the individual at the pre-Oedipal stage, manifesting an inadequately developed superego. Thus, when anxiety about external factors rather than superego anxiety controls the individual's moral responses, this individual does not manifest a conscience orientation per se. This form of moral response has been explored as an "externalized" conscience orientation, however.

The "externalized" conscience orientation is differentiated from an internalized orientation in which internal behavioral controls are utilized. Those individuals who manifest an internalized conscience maintain their internalized standards regardless of the probability of being caught and punished. The general process of internalization as conceptualized by psychoanalytic and social learning theories has been stated in the preceding section.

Two views of the internalization process are proposed in social learning theory. In the operant conditioning model of social learning theory, attention has primarily focused on the role of reinforcement contingencies in the internalization of conscience. Bandura and Walters (1964), however, assert that direct reinforcement is not necessary for the acquisition of prosocial responses. Modeling is considered by Bandura and Walters to be at least as effective as direct reinforcement for the acquisition of new responses and inhibition of previously learned responses. The application of the modeling effect to moral judgment as investigated by Bandura and McDonald (1963) will be discussed in a later section.

Dollard and Miller (1950) place greater emphasis on the unconscious conflicts that may develop in the acquisition of conscience than do Bandura and Walters. They view what is unconscious as that which cannot be verbalized, as distinguished from the psychoanalytic model. The very young child cannot verbalize anxiety, and thus, his anxieties surrounding the socialization process and development of prosocial responses may appear later as part of a neurotic pattern. According to Dollard and Miller, the primary field for the development of standards lies in toilet training. The child must learn to inhibit a natural response and conform to the parent's expectations. The possibility exists, however, that the

parent's responses at this time are characteristic of their disciplinary behavior rather than this period being of primary importance in itself. The primary way in which the pattern for conformity to the parent's standards is established is through the child's desire to conform in order to maintain the parent's love. When the child does not conform, the parent withdraws love and the child must make some restitutive act to regain the lost love.

The manner in which the parent obtains conformity from the child is considered by social learning theorists to be the primary determinant of the conscience orientation of the child. Physical punishment without explanation of expectations is related to an "externalized" orientation, while the psychological techniques which rely on reasoning and withdrawal of love are highly related to an internalized conscience orientation.

Several explanations for these relationships between parental disciplinary techniques and conscience orientation have been advanced. Modeling may play an important role because the model presented during the disciplinary encounter differs. Allinsmith and Greening (1955) emphasize the possible modeling effects when the parent who uses predominantly physical punishment openly expresses anger and when the parent who relies on psychological discipline controls his anger.

Disciplinary techniques cannot be considered in isolation from affective variables. Sears, Maccoby and Levin (1957) assert that warmth is necessary for love withdrawal to be effective. Hypothetical models for parental behavior developed from factor analyses of parental variables by Becker and Schaefer (Becker, in Hoffman and Hoffman, 1964) have shown control and affective factors to vary independently, and various combinations present very different patterns of parent behavior.

Hill (1960) questions Sears, Maccoby and Levin's assertion that conscience is greater with love oriented techniques per se. He stresses the frequency of conflicting sources of reinforcement in the life of the child (primary, secondary and vicarious reinforcement). Hill proposes that the primary factor in psychological discipline as related to internalization may not be the love orientation per se but something related to it. This may be because punishment lasts until symbolic renunciation is made. Physical punishment is over quickly and deprivation spans a fixed period of time, but love withdrawal lasts until the child makes restitution, apologizes, or promises not to repeat the act.

Another factor which may be important in the relationship between parental discipline and conscience orientation is the amount of information communicated. Aronfreed (1961) emphasizes the role of information in providing cognitive and behavioral resources for the child. These resources enable him to examine his actions independently and accept responsibility for them. Hoffman and Saltzstein (1964, 1967) found evidence for three conscience orientations and concomitant parental patterns of disciplinary practices. The information communicated is considered by Hoffman and Saltzstein to be greater in the pattern stressing induction rather than love withdrawal per se, which stresses the behavior of the parent.

Flexible-Humanistic and Rigid-Conventional Forms of Internalized Conscience

The three forms of conscience orientation for which Hoffman and Saltzstein found evidence were the "externalized" orientation, in which the individual fears detection and punishment by an external source, the flexible-humanistic orientation and the rigid-conventional orientation. The person with a humanistic conscience orientation is primarily concerned with the

effects of an act on others and shows empathy toward the individual who has been harmed. The conventional conscience orientation stresses the importance of internalized standards regardless of their implications for others. The similarity between Hoffman and Saltzstein's moral orientations and Kohlberg's (in Hoffman and Hoffman, 1964) levels of moral judgment may be noted.

The theoretical views discussed suggest a causal relationship between parental disciplinary practices and the child's moral development. While emphases on cognitive dimensions and emphases on emotional dimensions of moral development present differing perspectives of the roles of maturation and interaction with parents, the parent remains an important influence on the form the conscience of the child will assume.

Review of Relevant Research

Hoffman and Saltzstein (1964, 1967) found consistent relationships between the child's moral development and parental disciplinary practices. These relationships appeared for moral indices of guilt, internal moral judgment, acceptance of responsibility, consideration for other children and identification. Hoffman and Saltzstein (1967) found the use of induction by mothers of middle class children consistently associated with advanced moral development. Induction referred to empathy arousing techniques which emphasize the discomfort to others caused by the child's deviant acts. The frequent use of power assertion by the mother was consistently associated with weak moral development. Power assertion referred primarily to physical punishment, threats of physical punishment and deprivation. Love withdrawal was infrequently related to the moral indices. Love withdrawal referred to the withdrawal of parental love until restitution

was made, with emphasis on the consequences of his behavior for the actor (the child or other person producing these consequences).

Few significant correlations were found between the child's moral judgment and the father's disciplinary practices or between lower class children's moral development and their mothers' reports of their disciplinary practices.

Hoffman and Saltzstein's results led to these conclusions about basic cognitive and emotional factors in the disciplinary encounter. Power assertion is most likely to arouse intense anger and frustrate needs for autonomy. The child may imitate a model of discharge of anger. Induction focuses the child's attention on harm done to others, while both power assertion and love withdrawal compel the child to focus on consequences of his behavior for the actor, usually himself. A high relationship was found between affection and the moral indices, a finding which led the authors to explore the existing behavioral and emotional resources of the child. They especially emphasized the greater probability of arousal of empathy through induction techniques.

Several differences in disciplinary practices appeared when Hoffman and Saltzstein (1964) compared parents of humanistically and conventionally oriented subjects. The parents of conventionally oriented children more frequently appeared to use love withdrawal, ego attack and guilt induction. Parents of the humanistic group used reasoning and expression of disappointment and utilized some power assertion. These parents made more varied responses and probably presented a model of expression of anger in an appropriately modulated manner. Parents of conventional subjects appeared to induce greater anxiety, which could result in greater need for impulse control, and avoided following up demands to avoid risking open conflict

with the child. When the parents' own moral orientations were assessed, only one moral judgment item differentiated the moral orientations of the humanistic group from the moral orientations of the conventional group.

Hoffman (1963) and Kohlberg (1963) have reviewed the literature on relationships among parental disciplinary practices and internalized and "externalized" conscience orientations.

The precise role of parental practices in the development of moral judgment is ambiguous and the data are inconclusive. Findings from investigations of these relationships following the Piaget-Kohlberg tradition generally do not support Hoffman and Saltzstein's (1964, 1967) findings. Data from MacRae's (1954) investigation of the relationship between moral judgment of five to fourteen year old boys, using Piaget and Lerner type questions, and parental practices were inconclusive. MacRae emphasized the cognitive aspects of the Piaget-Lerner questions in contrast to the emotional aspects of violation of norms.

Kohlberg (in Hoffman and Hoffman, 1964) states that the moral orientation of the child does not appear to be dependent on the permissiveness or democracy of the home atmosphere. He states, however, that specific punishment practices may lead to the persistence of a moral ideology of punishment into adolescence or adulthood although they do not appear necessary for the formation of such an ideology.

There does appear to be a general consensus from research findings that moral judgment becomes more mature with increasing chronological age, independent of environmental factors. Kohlberg found the premoral form of moral judgment to decrease with age. Morality of conventional role-conformity increased until age thirteen and then stabilized, and morality of self-accepted moral principles continued to increase from thirteen to sixteen.

Turiel's (1966) findings supported Kohlberg's developmental continuum. He found that when subjects were exposed to the content of neighboring developmental stages, they assimilated the next higher stage more readily than a stage two levels higher or a more immature stage. Turiel considered that his findings supported Kohlberg's assertion that attainment of a stage of moral judgment involves a reorganization of the preceding modes of thought and requires integration of the preceding stages.

Bandura and McDonald (1963) also found evidence of an increase in subjectivity of moral judgment although they were readily able to modify their subjects' type of moral judgment through modeling.

Other developmental research has supported increasing maturity of moral judgment with increasing chronological age (Dembo (1941), Durkin (1959), Grinder (1964), Gump and Kounin (1961)).

There is some indication that definite relationships exist between intelligence quotient and socioeconomic class and the development of moral judgment. Hoffman and Saltzstein's (1967) findings of specific relationships between parental practices and moral judgment for their middle class sample but not for their lower class sample have been reported previously. Kaplan (1967) found lower class subjects to show more immature moral judgment and found no support for hypothesized relationships between responses to frustration and moral judgment when socioeconomic class was controlled. Kohlberg (in Hoffman and Hoffman, 1964) found that working class and middle class children moved at different rates through the same stages; middle class children seemed to move faster and farther.

Kohlberg (in Hoffman and Hoffman, 1964) reports that the level of moral thought can be clearly distinguished from general intellectual level. He reports that there is a moderate correlation between moral

judgment and intelligence quotient (r = .31), but there is a high relationship between moral judgment and age when intelligence quotient is controlled (r = .59). Pringle and Edwards (1964), however, found some evidence that brighter children showed discrimination between "right and wrong" in both simple and complex situations while less bright children showed similar discrimination only in relatively clear cut cases.

Experimental Modification of Moral Judgment

One issue which arises in the discussion of moral judgment is whether or not it is susceptible to experimental manipulation. If an individual's predominant mode of moral judgment can be modified readily through experimental manipulation, stages of moral judgment are probably not as clearly demarcated as is accepted in developmental theory. The possibility of experimental modification of moral judgment also increases the range of potential influences on level of moral judgment.

Bandura and McDonald (1963) considered that their experimental evidence demonstrated that moral judgment is less age specific than implied by Piaget, and that children's moral judgment can be altered or even reversed by manipulation of response reinforcement contingencies and the provision of appropriate social models. One group was exposed to a model using a different stage of moral judgment from the one manifested by the child, and subjects were reinforced for imitation. A second group was exposed to the model only. A third group was reinforced in an operant conditioning paradigm. Reversal from subjective to objective modes of moral judgment appeared as well as the reverse. Modeling alone was as effective as reinforcement with modeling, and both were more effective than operant conditioning alone.

Turiel (1966) states that Bandura and McDonald have not established reasonable doubt about Piaget's stage theory of moral development. He criticizes their conclusion on the grounds that they investigated only one dimension of moral judgment theory and modified only specific verbal responses. Turiel concluded that integration of previous stages and reorganization do occur when an individual approaches a new stage of moral judgment.

A possibility exists that moral judgment as a cognitive dimension is susceptible to experimental manipulation while emotional aspects of moral development are less susceptible to situational modification. Grinder's (1964) data from comparison of response in a "real-life" temptation situation and "moral realism" and "immanent justice" led him to conclude that conscience strength in general increases with chronological age. Behavioral and cognitive dimensions, however, appear to develop independently. Kohlberg (in Hoffman and Hoffman, 1964) states that moral conduct may become stabilized earlier than moral judgment. Ruma and Mosher (1967), however, found stages of moral judgment related to most of their indices of guilt when they attempted to draw together Piaget's concept of moral judgment and measures of guilt derived from psychoanalytic theory. Content analysis of interview data was especially highly related to moral judgment.

The majority of research findings support the existence of stages of moral judgment which increase in maturity with increasing chronological age. Trends from analyses of data suggest that moral judgment is not completely independent of behavioral indices of conscience nor of environmental influence. From the predominant research literature, however, it it difficult to state with Bandura and McDonald (1963) that moral judgment is a function of reinforcement contingencies and imitation.

Conclusion

Most of the research reviewed utilized Kohlberg's (in Hoffman and Hoffman, 1964) schema of moral judgment. This schema does not directly parallel Hoffman and Saltzstein's (1964) categorization of forms of conscience orientation which is utilized in this research. Similarities are apparent, but findings may not be directly applicable. The results of the research literature suggest that stages of moral judgment may not be as highly demarcated as Piaget and Kohlberg state nor can moral judgment be considered predominantly a function of reinforcement contingencies and modeling effects as social learning theory would propose.

Most of the research has utilized only children's or parents' reports. The current study attempts to assess parental behavior in hypothetical situations and to relate this behavior to the child's moral judgment. Further evidence of the existence or absence of a relationship between moral judgment and parental practices should appear when the direct interaction of the family members is considered.

CHAPTER III

HYPOTHESES

Based upon theoretical expectations and previous research, one may hypothesize that certain parent and child interaction variables will be significantly correlated and will differentiate between families of boys who are humanistic, conventional or "externalized" in moral orientation. The following hypotheses may be made:

Hypothesis 1: There are significant differences between parents of humanistic, conventional and "externalized" boys for the following variables:

1 - parent elicits child's view (general, discipline, other individuals)
2 - parent gives information and establishes situation
3 - parent gives expectations for child and emphasizes growth
4 - parent shows highly emotional expression of request or expectations
5 - parent explains and emphasizes restoration
6 - parent shows disappointment and gives adverse consequences to the parent
7 - parent gives alternatives
8 - parent uses power assertion
9 - parent shows positive feeling and support
10 - parent rejects and shows negative feeling
11 - parent gives irrelevant information or avoids experimental situation

Hypothesis 2: Variables 1 and 3 will be significantly correlated in a positive direction and will show the following pattern when humanistic, conventional and "externalized" groups are compared: $H > C > E$.

Hypothesis 3: Variables 5 and 9 will be significantly correlated in a positive direction and will show the following pattern when humanistic, conventional and "externalized" groups are compared: $H = C > E$.

Hypothesis 4: Variables 4 and 6 will be significantly correlated in a positive direction and will show the following pattern when humanistic, conventional and "externalized" groups are compared: C > H > E.

Hypothesis 5: Variable 8 will show the following pattern when humanistic, conventional and "externalized" groups are compared: E > C = H.

Hypothesis 6: Variable 10 will show the following pattern when humanistic, conventional and "externalized" groups are compared: E > C > H.

Variables 2, 7 and 11 showed definite trends in the pilot study. Specific hypotheses are given, however, only for theoretically based predictions about the variables.

Hypothesis 7: There are significant differences between humanistic, conventional and "externalized" boys for the following variables:

1 - child requests information
2 - child gives information
3 - child expresses moral standards
4 - child gives reasons for deviant behavior
5 - child reflects others' feelings or acknowledges others' pain
6 - child confesses
7 - child denies
8 - child suggests discipline or restores situation
9 - child refuses to commit self
10 - child minimizes or rationalizes situation

CHAPTER IV

METHODS

Pilot Study

A pilot study, using 10 twelve to fourteen year old boys and their parents from upper middle class and middle class areas of Lansing, Michigan, was completed prior to the initiation of this study. The families who participated in the pilot study were suggested to the experimenter by friends and colleagues, and they were contacted informally to obtain their participation in the preliminary part of the research.

The pilot data were utilized in illustrating relevant variables and determining procedure. These data indicated that it would be meaningful to initiate the study.

Subjects

The subjects used in this research were family groups composed of twelve to fourteen year old boys and both of their parents. The boys were students at Bath Junior High School, Bath, Michigan, Williamston Junior High School, Williamston, Michigan, and members of the Meryl Colt Boy Scout Troop. The Bath and Williamston communities are heterogeneous socio-economically, and a total population of all boys in one school class could be obtained. The Meryl Colt Boy Scout Troop draws its members from a middle to upper middle class area in western Lansing, Michigan. The research was limited to boys to reduce the number of variables to be analyzed. Twelve to fourteen year old boys were selected because moral

judgment appears relatively stable at that age (Kohlberg, in Hoffman and Hoffman, 1964).

Cooperation was obtained from the principals of the Bath and Williamston Junior High Schools and from the Boy Scout Executive Officer and Scoutmaster of the Meryl Colt Boy Scout Troop. Letters were sent to all families within the potential sample (See Appendix A, p. 82), and those families who did not wish to participate were asked to notify the appropriate personnel of their objections at that time. It was stressed that cooperation was not required because the principals or Boy Scout officials sanctioned the research.

Conscience orientation instruments were administered to all eighth grade boys present on one day at the Bath and Williamston Junior High Schools and to members of the Meryl Colt Boy Scout Troop. The conscience orientation instruments were administered by the experimenter to the eighth grade boys in a group during a study hall period in their home room at Bath Junior High School. The instruments were similarly administered to the eighth grade boys in a group during a study hall period in the lunchroom at Williamston Junior High School and to the Meryl Colt Boy Scout Troop at a Boy Scout meeting in the gymnasium of the Meryl Colt School. No other adult was present during administration of the instruments at Bath or at Williamston. Adult leaders remained in a remote part of the gymnasium during administration to the Boy Scouts. The experimenter read the instructions and encouraged the boys to follow the printed instructions in their test booklets. Questions about the instructions were answered at that time. The instruments required approximately one hour to complete. The data were collected during one session for all subjects except ten boys at Bath Junior High School. These boys completed their responses during a second session the following week.

Eighty-two usable sets of conscience orientation responses were obtained. These boys had intact families, were within the twelve to fourteen year age limit, and their responses were completed appropriately.

Although only two families initially refused to participate in the research, several parents who sanctioned their sons' participation in the assessment of conscience orientation later declined to participate in the family interaction sessions. Only eight intact families of the thirteen (62%) who were contacted from the humanistic group participated. Nine families of conventionally oriented boys of twenty-eight (32%) contacted participated. The one family of the "externally" oriented child participated in the family interaction sessions. The identity of the variables which resulted in this highly selective participation in the family interaction phase of the research remains unknown.

Each family who participated in the family interaction sessions was paid $5.00 to increase motivation to participate.

The distributions of intelligence quotients, fathers' and mothers' occupations and education and ordinal position are presented in Appendix B, pp. 83-85. Intelligence quotients were obtained from the boys' schools and are primarily based upon scores from the group-administered.[1]

Assessment of Conscience Orientation

A selected part of a test battery developed by Hoffman and Saltzstein (Hoffman, private communication, 1968; Hoffman and Saltzstein, 1964) was used to assess the conscience orientations of the early adolescent subjects.

[1]The subjects were paid from All-University Research Grant funds awarded to Dr. Lucy R. Ferguson by Michigan State University (East Lansing, Michigan).

Four moral judgment items used in Hoffman and Saltzstein's 1964 study and two items developed recently by Hoffman were used. Hoffman and Saltzstein consider the crucial indicators of differentiation between the three types of conscience orientation to be choices in moral judgment situations. They, therefore, used only moral judgment items. Nine sentence completion items which Hoffman and Saltzstein used for other assessment purposes were found to be highly correlated with the patterning of moral judgment items in the pilot study and were, therefore, used for further clarification of conscience orientation. Other instruments from the Hoffman and Saltzstein test battery were excluded after the pilot study because they were not as highly correlated with moral judgment. Permission was obtained from Dr. Hoffman to use the battery of tests.

The moral judgment items are hypothetical stories in which one or more transgressions or potential transgressions are presented. The subject is asked to decide which transgression is worse, whether or not the hero should have transgressed and why, or to respond to similar questions. The sentence completion items focus on the child's values and his reactions to his parents. The test booklet used for assessment of conscience orientation, including moral judgment and sentence completion items and instructions for their administration, is shown in Appendix C, pp. 86-93.

The questions which accompany the hypothetical moral judgment stories were scored for predominance of "externalized," humanistic or conventional conscience orientation.

For detailed instructions for rating moral judgment and sentence completion items, refer to Appendix D, pp. 94-99.

The following questions were used as major indicators of conscience orientation:

Story I, questions 1 and 3a;
Story II, questions 1 and 6;
Story III;
Story IV;
Story V, question 1;
Story VI, question 1.

Only the questions listed above were scored; responses to the other questions were used for clarification. This scoring technique follows Hoffman and Saltzstein (1964).

Each of the responses to the scored questions was coded as humanistic (H), conventional (C), or "externalized" (E).

> Humanistic responses referred to those responses which showed humanistic principles such as concern for others' feelings, trust, and flexibility of conventional principles when extenuating circumstances arose.
>
> Conventional responses referred to those responses which showed rigid adherence to conventional moral standards.
>
> "Externalized" responses referred to those responses which showed concern with the deviant person's chances of being caught and punished.

When the responses showed a definite (H), (C), or (E) orientation, three points were assigned for that orientation. The three conscience orientations, however, are not mutually exclusive. When responses showed a predominant orientation and a secondary orientation, two points were assigned for the predominant orientation, and one point was assigned for the secondary orientation. Some responses could not be coded.

Sentence completion items were rated in the same manner as the moral judgment items. Items 2, 6 and 7 were not scored because they seldom reflected the conscience orientations of the subjects.

Three advanced undergraduate students enrolled in Psychology 490, Special Problems, at Michigan State University (East Lansing, Michigan, were trained by the experimenter to rate conscience orientation responses

in the manner described above. The pilot study data were utilized to train raters. Reliability was estimated through comparisons of the ratings of the students and the experimenter for six subjects, using the Intraclass Correlation method (Guilford, 1954). The Intraclass Correlation method enables an estimate of the intercorrelations of ratings of N persons from all possible pairs of raters. The method provides an estimate of the level at which one rater's ratings correlate with those of other raters, and the average intercorrelation for all raters. Responses from boys who could not be included in the final sample because they were older than the selected age limit of fourteen years comprised the data used to estimate reliability. The reliabilities are shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Reliability of Conscience Orientation Data

	Conscience orientation		
	Humanistic	Conventional	"Externalized"
Reliability for one rater	.95	.96	.97
Average reliability of four raters	.99	.99	.99

N = 6

The responses of each subject in the final sample were rated by two of the undergraduate raters. In view of the high estimate of reliability, the raters reached agreement on items that they coded differently when they rated them independently. The final scores were the result of joint agreement reached in collaboration between the two raters.

The distribution of the conscience orientations assessed for the 82 boys whose responses were usable is shown in Table 2.

Table 2

Distribution of Conscience Orientations

	Manner of assessment		Number of subjects
	Moral judgment	Total response (Moral judgment and sentence completion)	
Predominant conscience orientation	Humanistic	Humanistic	10
	Humanistic	Conventional	5
	Conventional	Conventional	53
	Conventional	Humanistic	10
	Conventional	"Externalized"	3
	"Externalized"	"Externalized"	1

The conscience orientation groups were primarily formed by selecting subjects whose responses consistently showed the greatest discrepancies between their predominant conscience orientation and their expressions of other orientations. The original selection criterion, a consistent predominant conscience orientation score which exceeded a subject's expressions of other orientations by a factor of >1-1/2, was modified. Moral judgment is considered to be the primary indicator of conscience orientation (Hoffman and Saltzstein, 1964), and the moral judgment scores were weighted in group selection to increase the size of the groups. Thirteen subjects were selected for the humanistic group, and 28 subjects were selected for the

conventional group. Most of these subjects showed predominant conscience orientation scores which exceeded their expressions of other orientations by a factor of >1-1/2 on the moral judgment items. The remaining subjects showed a predominant conscience orientation consistently, and in one case, showed a very high discrepancy between the predominant conscience orientation and secondary orientation for sentence completion and total response scores. The thirteen boys forming the humanistic group were matched with conventional subjects for intelligence quotients, and fathers' and mothers' occupations and educations. The conscience orientation scores of the subjects whose families participated in the family interaction situations are shown in Appendix N, pp. 145-146. The scores of the family of the "externalized" subject for the various assessment procedures are shown in Appendix O, pp. 147-149.

The data analyses were limited to investigation of the humanistic and conventional groups because only one subject showed an "externalized" orientation.

Assessment of Parental and Child Variables from Family Interaction Situations

Parental and child variables relevant to the study were assessed from tape recorded responses obtained from standardized situations in which the early adolescent boys interacted with their parents.

Five standard hypothetical situations which involved a deviation or a possible deviation were developed to obtain family interaction data. The situations optimally required the family to confront each other and resolve a disciplinary issue. One of the hypothetical situations was used for orienting families to role-playing and was not coded. The four situations which were coded focused on disobedience, theft, cheating, and physical

aggression. Four situations which were used in the pilot study were rejected because they were either inappropriate for the age selected or were regarded as too threatening to parents.

The hypothetical situations and instructions for the interaction sessions are shown in Appendix E, pp. 100-101.

The interaction data were collected from all families in the same Psychological Clinic room over a period of three months. The families' memories were refreshed about the general objectives of the research and the use of tape recordings and observation of the session through the one-way mirror. Family members were asked to wait to ask questions about the research that might influence responses until after the session. Most families completed the interaction sessions in about 45 minutes. Interaction relevant to each hypothetical situation was limited to five minutes since the pilot study results indicated that there was extensive variation in verbosity of families and that the additional productivity of extended discussion was minimal. Families were asked to state that they were finished if they completed role-playing prior to the five minute limit.

The standard instructions were read to the family group. These instructions requested the families to say and do as much as possible what they would say and do at home in a similar situation. Interaction between the boy and his parents was initiated. The experimenter remained in the clinic room during role-playing of the warm-up situation to encourage interaction when necessary. After the first situation to be coded was read, the experimenter went to the observation booth where she observed the interaction. The experimenter returned only to read the three remaining hypothetical situations. At the end of the interaction session, family members completed the Attribute Preference Inventory, and discussion about the session was initiated when it appeared appropriate.

Each statement of the interaction about each hypothetical situation was coded into one of the variables listed below. Statements were usually defined as one sentence, although a compound sentence sometimes included more than one unitary statement.

The variables which were scored are shown in Table 3.

Illustrations of these variables are shown in Appendix F, pp. 102-108.

These variables parallel, to a great extent, the dimensions of induction, love-withdrawal and power assertion. Some of them were drawn from the research literature, and some were developed from exploration of the pilot study data by the experimenter and Miss Ida Zektick, Department of Psychology, Michigan State University (East Lansing, Michigan). Further modifications were made during training sessions with the undergraduate raters. These modifications included the addition of the variables: parent reflects feeling, parent moralizes and child gives highly emotional response.

Two undergraduate students enrolled in Psychology 490, Special Problems, at Michigan State University (East Lansing, Michigan), were trained by the experimenter to code statements into the designated categories. Tape-recorded data from the pilot study were used for training raters. One of the raters, however, was unable to complete the ratings although this was not known until it was too late to obtain another undergraduate rater. The experimenter and one student completed the ratings. Although the experimenter was familiar with the conscience orientations of the boys, the high reliabilities for the variables seem to indicate that this familiarity influenced the ratings minimally. Reliability was estimated through comparison of the ratings of the student and experimenter for six families, using the Intraclass Correlation method (Guilford, 1954). These reliabilities are shown in Tables 4 and 5.

Table 3

Parental and Child Variables Assessed in Interaction Situations

	Family member	
	Mother and father	Child
Variable	1 elicits child's view	1 requests information
	2 gives information	2 gives information
	3 gives expectations and emphasizes growth	3 expresses moral standard
	4 shows highly emotional response	4 gives reasons
	5 explains, emphasizes restoration	5 reflects feeling
	6 shows disappointment, adverse consequences for parent	6 confesses
	7 gives alternatives	7 denies
	8 uses power assertion	8 suggests discipline, restores situation
	9 shows positive feeling	9 refuses to commit self
	10 shows negative feeling	10 minimizes, rationalizes
	11 gives irrelevant information or avoids situation	11 shows highly emotional response
	12 reflects feeling	
	13 moralizes	

Table 4

Reliability of Parents' Family Interaction Variables

Variable	Mother		Father	
	Reliability for one rater	Average reliability of two raters	Reliability for one rater	Average reliability of two raters
Elicits child's view	.98	.99	.94	.96
Gives information	.91	.95	.86	.93
Gives expectations and emphasizes growth	.96	.98	.72	.83
Shows highly emotional response	00	00	.51	.68
Explains, emphasizes restoration	.67	.80	.89	.94
Shows disappointment, adverse consequences for parent	.77	.87	.75	.86
Gives alternatives	.87	.93	.98	.99
Uses power assertion	1.00	1.00	.98	.99
Shows positive feeling	.97	.98	1.00	1.00
Shows negative feeling	.80	.89	.77	.87
Gives irrelevant information or avoids situation	.97	.98	1.00	1.00
Reflects feeling	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Moralizes	1.00	1.00	.83	.91

N = 6

Table 5

Reliability of Children's Family Interaction Variables

Children's variables	Reliability for one rater	Average reliability of two raters
Requests information	1.00	1.00
Gives information	.80	.89
Expresses moral standard	.46	.63
Gives reasons	.83	.91
Reflects feeling	.54	.70
Confesses	.97	.99
Denies	.89	.94
Suggests discipline, restores situation	.96	.98
Refuses to commit self	1.00	1.00
Minimizes, rationalizes	.89	.93
Shows highly emotional response	1.00	1.00

N = 6

The variables, parent shows highly emotional response, child expresses moral standard, and child reflects feeling, were dropped because of their low rating reliabilities.

Assessment of Attribute Preferences

Each member of the family groups completed the Attribute Preference Inventory (Randolph and Hurley, 1968) independently following the family interaction session. The Attribute Preference Inventory, which required about five minutes to complete, contains ten attributes which are ranked from the most desirable to the least desirable for a boy and for a girl of a certain age. The family members ranked the attributes for a child the same age as the boy who participated in the research.

The Attribute Preference Inventory is shown in Appendix G, pp. 109-110.

The predominant attribute preferences, ranging from highly expressive to highly conventional, were obtained by summing the rankings for expressive dimensions: curious, assertive and self-reliant, and imaginative and creative; and subtracting the rankings of the conventional dimensions: neat and clean, considerate and cooperative, and respectful toward adults. A subject can obtain a score ranging from +21 if the expressive dimension is fully dominant to -21 if the conventional dimension is fully dominant.

The correlations between two forms of the Attribute Preference Inventory were shown by Randolph and Hurley (1968) to be significant at the .05 level (r = .70 for preferences for a boy and r = .66 for preferences for a girl). The consistency between two forms of the scale and demonstrated validity of the measure indicate that preferred attributes are reliably measured by this scale.

Analysis of Data

The first step in the analysis of the data from the interaction situations was the computation of the total frequency of statements for each variable for each family member for each hypothetical situation. These totals represented the mean of the frequencies scored independently by the two raters. The mean range of these total frequencies was typically from 0 to 5. Because of the small total frequencies and the large number of variables, it was decided to sum across situations. To obtain a constant frequency of total response, these data were then converted to percentages of the total frequency for each family member. No significant differences appeared between the total response frequencies of humanistic and conventional family members, which indicates that the conversion of data does not mask important differences.

The humanistic and conventional groups' response frequencies of the family interaction variables and Attribute Preference Inventory scores were compared by analysis of variance tests. The F values from the analysis of variance tests were converted to t values (Walker and Lev, 1953) for greater convenience in completion of the data analyses.

The variables were then correlated, using Pearson Product Moment correlations, to determine existing relationships among them. A factor analysis would have been desirable. A factor analysis was inappropriate in this case, however, because the small number of subjects and large number of variables yielded an underdetermined matrix.

The data were analyzed using the CDC 3600 computer at Michigan State University (East Lansing, Michigan). Analysis of variance and correlation programs from the Michigan State University Computer Library were used.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS

General Statement

The predicted differences in family interaction of humanistic and conventional subjects were generally unsupported, although some differential patterns of correlations emerged. Certain variables were expected to differentiate primarily between the two internalized groups and the "externalized" group. The absence of an "externalized" group prevented these comparisons.

Results Relevant to Specific Hypotheses

Hypotheses 1 and 7: Hypotheses 1 and 7 predicted significant differences between the conscience orientation groups for the family interaction variables. On the basis of the findings, the null hypotheses of no significant differences between the groups could not be rejected. The only variable which significantly differentiated between the humanistic and conventional groups at the .05 level was, father shows disappointment, where conventional fathers exceeded humanistic fathers as was predicted in Hypothesis 4. Only the variable, child requests information, showed a trend ($p < .10$) toward differentiation between the groups. Humanistic boys exceeded conventional boys on this variable. These findings provide a very tenuous basis for discussion because they were the only two, of 33 comparisons, which reached or tended toward the determined significance level.

The findings indicate that the frequencies of these responses were similar for the two groups. All of the family interaction variables were expected to differentiate between the humanistic and conventional groups except for the following: parent explains, and emphasizes restoration; parent shows positive feeling; and parent uses power assertion. These variables were expected to differentiate only between "externalized" and internalized subjects, and therefore, similar response frequencies for the humanistic and conventional groups for these variables supported Hypothesis 1.

The results of the comparisons between the humanistic and conventional groups for the family interaction variables are shown in Tables 6 and 7. The means and standard deviations of the groups for these variables are shown in Appendix H, pp. 111-113, and the raw scores upon which the statistical tests were based are shown in Appendix L, pp. 135-140.

Hypothesis 2: Hypothesis 2 predicted a significant positive relationship among and significant differences between groups for the variables: parent elicits information, and parent gives expectations. On the basis of the findings, the null hypothesis of no significant difference between the groups could not be rejected, and the predicted positive correlation was not confirmed. Neither of these variables differentiated between the humanistic and conventional groups. The only definite relationship between them was a significant negative correlation for fathers in the conventional group. The correlations between these variables are shown in Table 8.

Hypothesis 3: A positive relationship between parent explains, and emphasizes restoration; and parent shows positive feeling was predicted in Hypothesis 3. These variables were expected to differentiate only between the internalized and the "externalized" groups, and the lack of

Table 6

Comparison of Parental Behavior in Humanistic and Conventional Groups

Variable	Mother	Father
	t value	t value
Parent		
elicits child's view	0.35	0.89
gives information	0.53	1.18
gives expectations and emphasizes growth	0.45	0.79
explains, emphasizes restoration	0.26	0.17
shows disappointment, adverse consequences to parent	0.94	1.91*
gives alternatives	0.88	0.71
uses power assertion	1.55	0.10
shows positive feeling	0.85	0.14
shows negative feeling	0.17	0.32
gives irrelevant information or avoids situation	1.06	1.10
reflects feeling	0.24	1.17
moralizes	1.03	0.36

N = 8 for humanistic group and N = 9 for conventional group.
*$p < .05$.

Table 7

Comparison of the Child's Behavior in Humanistic and Conventional Groups

Variable	Child
	t value
Child	
requests information	1.94
gives information	0.87
gives reasons	1.04
confesses	0.14
denies	1.59
suggests discipline, restores situation	0.80
refuses to commit self	0.44
minimizes, rationalizes	0.96
shows a highly emotional response	0.66

N = 8 for humanistic group and N = 9 for conventional group.

Table 8

Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between the Variables, Parent Elicits Information and Parent Gives Expectations

		Parent elicits information			
		Mother		Father	
		H[a]	C[b]	H[a]	C[b]
Parent gives expectations	Mother	-08	27	27	-29
	Father	33	-27	-37	-90**

[a]Humanistic group.
[b]Conventional group.
N = 8 in humanistic group and N = 9 in conventional group.
**p < .01.

significant differences between humanistic and conventional groups is in accordance with Hypothesis 3. The significant correlation between father explains, and emphasizes restoration; and mother shows positive feeling in the humanistic group supported Hypothesis 3. The correlations between these variables were predominantly positive in the humanistic group, but most of the correlations were too low to draw definite conclusions from them. The variables seemed independent in the conventional group. The correlations between these variables are shown in Table 9.

Table 9

Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between the Variables, Parent Explains, and Emphasizes Restoration; and Parent Shows Positive Feeling

	Parent explains and emphasizes restoration			
	Mother		Father	
	H[a]	C[b]	H[a]	C[b]
Parent shows positive feeling: Mother	08	00	65*	-01
Parent shows positive feeling: Father	21	-42	18	-04

[a]Humanistic group.
[b]Conventional group.
$N = 8$ in humanistic group and $N = 9$ in conventional group.
*$p < .05$.

Hypothesis 4: Hypothesis 4, which predicted a positive relationship between parent gives a highly emotional response, and parent shows disappointment, and significant differences between groups for these variables, was only partially testable. The low rating reliability of the variable, parent

gives a highly emotional response, prevented valid correlations of the two variables. The data supported the hypothesized differentiation between groups for father shows disappointment, and the null hypothesis of no significant difference between the groups was rejected. The data did not support the hypothesized differentiation for mother shows disappointment, however, and the null hypothesis could not be rejected for this comparison. The finding of greater frequency of disappointment responses by conventional fathers was the only significant finding among several comparisons.

Hypothesis 5: Hypothesis 5 predicted that the variable, parent gives alternatives, would differentiate between the internalized and "externalized" groups. The lack of significant differentiation between humanistic and conventional groups for this variable is, therefore, in accordance with Hypothesis 5.

Hypothesis 6: Hypothesis 6 predicted significant differences between groups for the variable, parent rejects, and shows negative feeling. The null hypothesis of no significant difference between the groups could not be rejected on the basis of the data. The response frequencies of rejection and negative feeling were similar for both mothers and fathers in the two groups.

Other Relationships Among Family Interaction Variables

Several correlations between variables for which specific hypotheses were not formulated were significant at the .05 level. These relationships, which focused on informational aspects of interaction, parents' negative responses, and the flexibility of the child's involvement in the disciplinary process, are reported in the following sections. The correlations between all family interaction variables are shown in Appendix I, pp. 114-122.

Although there were few significant correlations, more were obtained than would be expected by chance. A tabulation of these correlations is shown in Tables 10 and 11. It can be seen from Tables 10 and 11 that in all cases except the child-child and father-father correlations in the humanistic group, the number of significant values was equal to or greater than 5% of the total. Five per cent of the correlations would be expected to be significant by chance alone in accordance with the .05 probability significance level used.

The significant correlations formed different clusters in the two groups. This indicates that there are some differences in the patterns of interaction of humanistic and conventional families in hypothetical disciplinary situations, although the actual frequencies of responses do not differ and no predicted relationships were found. The small number of significant correlations, however, requires that the inferences drawn from these relationships must remain tentative.

Informational Aspects of Family Interaction

The informational aspects of family interaction formed one of the central clusters which differentiated between the humanistic and conventional groups. The correlations which are included in this cluster are all possible correlations between eliciting information and giving information, and those correlations between informational variables and other variables which were significant at the .05 level in at least one of the groups. Eliciting information and giving information were significantly correlated for one family member and between family members in several cases. The correlations of informational variables are shown in Tables 12 through 14.

Differences appeared between the groups, and between the mother-child relationship and the father-child relationship. Greater similarity appears

Table 10

Frequency of Significant (.05 Level) Pearson Product Moment Correlations in the Humanistic Group

Family Member	Family member								
	Mother			Father			Child		
	Number of significant r's	Total r's	% significant	Number of significant r's	Total r's	% significant	Number of significant r's	Total r's	% significant
Mother	3	66	5						
Father	11	144	8	1	66	2			
Child	8	108	7	5	108	5	1	36	3

Table 11

Frequency of Significant (.05 Level) Pearson Product Moment Correlations in the Conventional Group

Family Member	Family member								
	Mother			Father				Child	
	Number of significant r's	Total r's	% significant	Number of significant r's	Total r's	% significant	Number of significant r's	Total r's	% significant
Mother	5	66	8						
Father	9	144	6	8	66	12			
Child	15	108	14	6	108	6	2	36	6

Table 12

Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Mothers' and Fathers' Informational and Related Variables

Mothers' variables	Fathers' variables					
	Elicits child's view		Gives information		Gives irrelevant information	
	H[a]	C[b]	H[a]	C[b]	H[a]	C[b]
Elicits child's view	53	24	-82*	44		
Gives information	-56	-10	73*	-15	-10	85**

[a]Humanistic group.
[b]Conventional group.
N = 8 in humanistic group and N = 9 in conventional group.
*$p < .05$.
**$p < .01$.

Table 13

Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Mothers' and Children's Informational Variables

Mothers' variables	Children's variables			
	Requests information		Gives information	
	H[a]	C[b]	H[a]	C[b]
Elicits child's view	-67	-76*	-13	74*
Gives information	22	82**	42	-63

[a]Humanistic group.
[b]Conventional group.
$N = 8$ in humanistic group and $N = 9$ in conventional group.
*$p < .05$.
**$p < .01$.

Table 14

Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Fathers' and Children's Informational and Related Variables

Fathers' variables	Children's variables							
	Requests information		Gives information		Suggests discipline, restores situation		Refuses to commit self	
	H[a]	C[b]	H[a]	C[b]	H[a]	C[b]	H[a]	C[b]
Elicits child's view	-75*	-05	-01	-40	29	67*	21	73*
Gives information	76*	-27	21	45				
Shows negative feeling	51	76*	17	-70*				
Gives irrelevant information	60	98**						

[a]Humanistic group.
[b]Conventional group.
N = 8 for humanistic group and N = 9 for conventional group.
*$p < .05$.
**$p < .01$.

between the information responses of mothers and fathers in the humanistic group than in the conventional group. Mothers' and fathers' eliciting information is positively related, and their giving information is positively related. Mothers' eliciting information, however, is negatively related to fathers' giving information, and fathers' eliciting information is negatively related to mothers' giving information. There are similarities in the mother-child and father-child correlations in the humanistic group, although these relationships were not significant in most cases.

Major differences appeared between the mother-child and father-child relationships in the conventional group. The mother's eliciting information is negatively related to the child's requesting information, and positively related to the child's giving information. Her giving information is positively related to the child's eliciting information and negatively related to his giving information. With the exception of the eliciting information-requesting information correlation, these relationships are reversed for the father-child relationship.

More definite relationships between information variables appeared for mothers and sons in the conventional group and for fathers and sons in the humanistic group. For mothers and sons in the conventional group, there is a definite pattern of a positive relationship between eliciting information and giving information. For fathers and sons in the humanistic group, the father's eliciting information and the child's requests for information are significantly positively related to the child's requests for information. Within the conventnioal group, however, the son's information responses were more strongly related to the father's negative feeling and giving irrelevant information than to giving and eliciting relevant information. The father's information responses were more strongly related to the child's suggestion

of discipline and refusal to commit himself than to the child's information responses in the conventional group. It may be noted that the father's giving irrelevant information was significantly positively related to the mother's giving information in the conventional group, while in the humanistic group, the mother's giving information was related to the father's giving relevant information.

Negative Responses by the Parents in Family Interaction

Parental rejection and negative feeling is central to the second cluster of significant correlations. The correlations which are included in this cluster are primarily those which showed significant (.05 level) relationships between negative feeling and other family interaction variables for one parent in at least one group. In a few cases, nonsignificant correlations between variables which were both significantly related to negative feeling are shown. These correlations are shown in Tables 15 through 17.

The variables, mother rejects and shows negative feeling, mother gives irrelevant information, and mother moralizes, were all highly positively related to child gives a highly emotional response in both groups. In most cases, these relationships were significant. The fathers' similar responses were, with the exception of father moralizes, positively related to child gives a highly emotional response. The only significant correlation in this set was between father gives irrelevant information and child gives a highly emotional response. The father's negative feeling and irrelevant information were more highly correlated with the child's information responses than with the child's highly emotional responses.

The variables, mother shows negative feeling, mother gives irrelevant information and mother moralizes, are all positively correlated in both

Table 15

Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Mothers' Negative Feeling and Related Variables and Children's Highly Emotional Responses

Mothers' variables	Children's highly emotional responses	
	Humanistic group	Conventional group
Shows negative feeling	96**	86**
Gives irrelevant information	86**	95**
Moralizes	71*	50

N = 8 for humanistic group and N = 9 for conventional group.
*p < .05.
**p < .01.

Table 16

Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Fathers' Negative Feeling and Related Variables and Children's Highly Emotional Responses

Fathers' variables	Children's highly emotional responses	
	Humanistic group	Conventional group
Shows negative feeling	43	60
Gives irrelevant information	90**	46
Moralizes	-13	50

N = 8 for humanistic group and N = 9 for conventional group.
**p < .01.

Table 17

Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Fathers' Negative Feeling and Giving Irrelevant Information and Children's Informational Variables

Fathers' variables	Children's variables			
	Requests information		Gives information	
	H[a]	C[b]	H[a]	C[b]
Shows negative feeling	51	76*	17	-70*
Gives irrelevant information	60	98**		

[a]Humanistic group.
[b]Conventional group.
$N = 8$ for humanistic group and $N = 9$ for conventional group.
*$p < .05$,
**$p < .01$.

groups. The relationships are more ambiguous for the fathers. These correlations are shown in Tables 18 and 19.

Differential Involvement in the Disciplinary Encounter

The clusters of significant correlations for the humanistic and conventional groups indicate that parental responses elicit different child responses or child responses elicit different parental responses in the groups. These differences appear although both groups use the same responses with equal frequency in their approaches to disciplinary situations. The clusters of significant correlations in the information area show differences between the two groups. The parental negative feeling cluster, however, was similar for both groups. The manner in which certain parental approach responses are related to child responses shows different patterns of relationships in the groups. The correlations illustrating these relationships primarily include those which were significant (.05 level) in at least one group. In two cases, correlations were included which showed trends toward significance ($p < .10$) in one group which were highly discrepant from the correlations in the other group. These correlations are shown in Tables 20 and 21.

The configuration of the significant relationships between mothers' and children's responses seems to indicate a "fact-finding" approach to the disciplinary situation in the conventional group. The mother's requests for information and giving of alternatives are positively related to the child's giving information. In the humanistic group, a trend appears for a positive relationship between maternal requests for information and child gives reasons. The conventional mother's giving of information is positively related to the child's requests for information and minimization of the situation. The mother's power assertion is also positively related to

Table 18

Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Mothers' Negative Feeling and Related Variables

Variable		Humanistic group		
		Variable		
		Shows negative feeling	Gives irrelevant information	Moralizes
Conventional group	Shows negative feeling	--	74*	84**
	Gives irrelevant information	76*	--	37
	Moralizes	47	41	--

N = 8 for humanistic group and N = 9 for conventional group.
*p < .05.
**p < .01.

Table 19

Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Fathers' Negative Feeling and Related Variables

Variable		Humanistic group		
		Variable		
		Shows negative feeling	Gives irrelevant information	Moralizes
Conventional group	Shows negative feeling	--	12	47
	Gives irrelevant information	74*	--	-18
	Moralizes	40	-03	--

N = 8 for humanistic group and N = 9 for conventional group.
*p < .05.

Table 20

Correlations Between Family Interaction Variables Which Illustrate
A Differential Group Approach:
Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Mothers' and Children's Variables

Mothers' variables	Children's variables													
	Requests information		Gives information		Gives reasons		Denies		Suggests discipline, restores situation		Refuses to commit self		Minimizes, rationalizes	
	H[a]	C[b]	H[a]	C[b]	H[a]	C[b]	H[a]	C[b]	H[a]	C[b]	H[a]	C[b]	H[a]	C[b]
Elicits child's view			-13	74*	65	-40								
Gives information	22	82*					82*	-63					-26	93**
Gives expectations													80*	-77*
Explains									-07	86**				
Shows disappointment							-19	72*						
Gives alternatives			-63	74*										
Uses power assertion	-35	70*											-24	92**
Shows positive feeling			67	15			76*	-17						
Reflects feeling			84**	-45							-39	84**		

[a]Humanistic group.
[b]Conventional group.
N = 8 for humanistic group and N = 9 for conventional group.
*p < .05.
**p < .01.

Table 21

Correlations Between Family Interaction Variables Which Illustrate
A Differential Group Approach:
Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Fathers' and Children's Variables

Fathers' variables	Children's variables									
	Requests information		Denies		Suggests discipline, restores situation		Refuses to commit self		Minimizes, rationalizes	
	H[a]	C[b]	H[a]	C[b]	H[a]	C[b]	H[a]	C[b]	H[a]	C[b]
Elicits child's view	-75*	-05			29	67*	21	73*		
Gives information	76*	-27								
Explains			86**	09						
Gives alternatives									90**	-04

[a]Humanistic group.
[b]Conventional group.
N = 8 for humanistic group and N = 9 for conventional group.
*p < .05.
**p < .01.

the child's requests for information and minimization in the conventional group, but is not significantly related to any child variable in the humanistic group. The mother's explanation and emphasis on restoration in the conventional group is related to the child's suggestion of discipline. This relationship does not appear in the humanistic group.

In the humanistic group, the child's information responses are more related to the mother's feeling responses than to direct, authoritative responses, and the interaction seems to be a more subtle one. The child's giving of information in the humanistic group is positively related to the mother's positive feeling and reflection of feeling, although the mother's positive feeling and the child's giving information are not significantly correlated. This pattern differs from the relationship between the child's giving information and maternal requests for information and giving alternatives in the conventional group, The child's refusal to commit himself is positively related to the mother's reflection of feeling in the conventional group. The child's denial in the humanistic group is positively related to maternal giving of information and positive feeling, while in the conventional group, this child response is related to maternal disappointment. The child's minimization in the humanistic group is related to mother's giving expectations, while it is related to mother's giving information and power assertion in the conventional group.

These findings did not appear for the father-son relationships. The conventional fathers' requests for information, however, were positively related to the child's suggestion of discipline and refusal to commit himself. These findings tend to appear within the "fact-finding" framework of the mother-child relationship within the conventional group. The relationships among the father-son responses in the humanistic group do not contradict the configuration of the mother-son relationships, although they do

not provide direct support for it. The "fact-finding" pattern does not appear in the humanistic father-son relationships. The father's giving of information is positively related to the child's requests for information. His explanations and emphases on restoration are positively related to the child's denial, and his giving of alternatives is related to the child's minimization. Some similarities appear between the conventional mother-son relationships and the humanistic father-son relationship, but these similarities are based on minimal data.

Results Relevant to Attribute Preferences

The Attribute Preference Inventory, which assesses individuals' preferences for predominantly expressive or predominantly conventional characteristics of children, was expected to differentiate between humanistic and conventional groups. No significant differences appeared between the two groups for mothers', fathers' or boys' attribute preferences as is shown in Table 22.

Table 22

Comparison of Attribute Preferences in Humanistic and Conventional Groups

Family member	Attribute preferences for a boy	Attribute Preferences for a girl
	F value	*F* value
Mother	0.98	0.09
Father	0.01	0.01
Child	0.95	0.00

N = 8 for humanistic group and *N* = 9 for conventional group.

The correlations between the Attribute Preference Inventory scores and the family interaction variables are shown in Appendix J, pp. 123-128. The attribute preference scores are shown in Appendix M, pp. 141 - 144. Positive correlations are indicative of high expressive attribute preference scores when the frequency of the relevant family interaction variable is high. Negative correlations are indicative of high conventional attribute preference scores when the frequency of the relevant family interaction variable is high.

In the humanistic group, 4% (4 of 99) of the correlations between family interaction variables and attribute preferences for a boy were significant, and 5% (5 of 99) of the correlations between family interaction variables and attribute preferences for a girl were significant. In the conventional group, only 2% (2 of 99) of the correlations between family interaction variables and attribute preferences for a boy were significant, and 2% (2 of 99) of the correlations between family interaction variables and attribute preferences for a girl were significant. The small number of significant (.05 level) correlations between preferred attributes and family interaction variables requires that any conclusions about them must remain tentative.

More than half of the significant correlations emerged between preferred attributes and mothers' expressions of positive feeling and parental expressions of alternatives. The frequency with which these interaction responses were significantly related to preferred attributes suggests that these findings are nonrandom. The correlations between fathers' and mothers' giving alternatives and preferred attributes are shown in Table 23.

Table 23

Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Preferred Attributes for a Boy and for a Girl and Parent Gives Alternatives

Variable	Preferred attributes					
	Humanistic group			Conventional group		
	Mother	Father	Child	Mother	Father	Child
Mother gives alternatives	85** (86**)[a]	32 (46)	-29 (-17)	-41 (-41)	-23 (-02)	-08 (-29)
Father gives alternatives	63 (75*)	37 (52)	-31 (-30)	41 (28)	-05 (-22)	04 (05)

[a]Bracketed items refer to preferences for a girl.
*$p < .05$.
**$p < .01$.

The correlations between parents' expressions of alternatives and preferred attributes lend support to the differential patterning of correlations found among family interaction variables. Differential consequences of expressions of alternatives by humanistic and conventional parents appear to be related to their expressive or conventional attribute preferences. The similarities found between humanistic mothers' and fathers' patterning of correlations among family interaction variables emerged for the correlations between expressions of alternatives and preferred attributes. In the conventional group, mothers and fathers differed. In the humanistic group, mothers' expressions of alternatives were significantly positively related only to fathers' giving alternatives. Fathers' giving alternatives was also significantly positively related to mothers' giving expectations and children's minimization of the situation. The expressive or conventional nature of family interaction is not explicit in these correlations.

In the conventional group, mothers' expressions of alternatives had a higher relationship to their conventional preferences than to their expressive preferences. These correlations were moderate (r = -41). Fathers' expressions of alternatives were related to mothers' expressive preferences (r = 41 for preferences for a boy and r = 28 for preferences for a girl). In the conventional group, the "fact-finding" pattern which emerged in family interaction included giving of alternatives. Mothers' expressions of alternatives were significantly positively related to their requests for information and to fathers' and children's giving information, and negatively related to fathers' expressions of negative feeling. Reflection of feeling was significantly positively related to expressions of alternatives by fathers in the conventional group. The "fact-finding" pattern of interaction is consistent with conventional preferences, although the correlations between giving alternatives and preferred attributes did not achieve significance in the conventional group. The relationship between expressive preferences and giving alternatives in the humanistic group may indicate that expressive preferences are consistent with a flexible approach. The consequences of giving alternatives appear to differ in the two groups. In the humanistic group, the expressions of alternatives may encourage the child to view expressive characteristics positively, or the mother's positive view of expressive characteristics may enable her to give alternatives within a framework of exploratory expression by the child. Alternatives may be viewed within a more rigid framework in which the child is restricted to parentally determined alternative forms of behavior in the conventional group.

The correlations between mothers' and fathers' expressions of positive feeling and preferred attributes are shown in Table 24.

Table 24

Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Preferred Attributes for a Boy and for a Girl and Parents' Expressions of Positive Feeling

Variable	Preferred attributes					
	Humanistic group			Conventional group		
	Mother	Father	Child	Mother	Father	Child
Mother shows positive feeling	-28 (-44)[a]	-52 (-60)	59 (19)	69* (67*)	68* (55)	53 (70*)
Father shows positive feeling	-13 (00)	-04 (-12)	57 (34)	03 (04)	-05 (18)	39 (24)

[a]Bracketed items refer to preferences for a girl.
*$p < .05$.
**$p < .01$.

The correlations between mothers' expressions of positive feeling and preferred attributes appear to be isolated from the interrelationships between the family interaction variables. Mothers' expressions of positive feeling were not significantly correlated with any other family interaction variable. The finding that expressive preferences are related to expressions of positive feeling in the conventional group, but not in the humanistic group, warrants further study. An investigation of this phenomenon may be especially fruitful in clarifying the consequences of parental expressions of emotion for child behavior. There is a suggestion that both mothers' and fathers' expressions of positive feeling are related to the children's expressive preferences in both groups.

These findings suggest that preferred attributes are not independent of family interaction. The results suggest that further investigation

of the relationship between the parents' emotional responses and consequences of these responses for children's behaviors and preferred characteristics would be fruitful.

Relationships Between Family Interaction Variables and Subject Variables

The correlations between family interaction variables and subject variables are presented in Appendix K, pp. 129-134.

The following findings are of interest. The child's highly emotional response and mothers' and fathers' giving irrelevant information were all significantly (.05 level) positively related to fathers' occupations in the humanistic group. When the father's occupation tended toward the professional end of the continuum, the response frequencies of these variables were high, and lower response frequencies were associated with less skilled occupations.

The following family interaction variables were significantly positively correlated with the child's ordinal position in the humanistic group: mother gives alternatives, father gives alternatives, father reflects feeling, and child minimizes. In the conventional group, trends in the positive direction appeared for the relationships between ordinal position, and mother gives alternatives and child minimizes. Trends in the negative direction appeared in the conventional group for father gives alternatives and father reflects feeling and ordinal position. Ordinal position and the variable, father gives information, were significantly positively related in the conventional group. A trend in the negative direction appeared for this relationship in the humanistic group. The positive correlations indicate that the response frequencies of the relevant variables increase as the child's position in the family changes from first born to youngest in the family.

Mother's education was significantly positively related to child's suggestion of discipline for the humanistic group, and to mother's positive feeling and father's reflection of feeling for the conventional group. The positive correlations indicate that more advanced educational status by the mother is associated with higher response frequencies of the relevant variables. Less advanced educational status by the mother was associated with lower response frequencies.

The child's intelligence quotient was significantly negatively related to the mother's giving alternatives for the humanistic group.

The preceding report of the significant correlations between subject variables and family interaction variables indicates that the expression of certain family interaction responses is probably associated with demographic factors. The large number (21%) of significant correlations between family interaction variables and ordinal position suggests that parents use differing responses with children who occupy different positions in the family, and that children in differing positions in the family use differing responses. This demographic variable was not controlled in this study, but the findings suggest that the relationship between ordinal position and family interaction would be a fruitful area for further research. The family interaction variables which were related to father's occupation all appeared in the parental negative feeling cluster, and the findings suggest that these relationships may be affected by the occupational status of the father.

Concluding Remarks

The results showed an absence of significant findings between the frequencies with which the various family interactions occurred among the humanistic and conventional groups. The predicted relationships were

generally unsupported. In some cases, the predictions were untestable because of the absence of an "externalized" group. Some clusters of significant relationships appeared from inspection of the correlations between the family interaction variables. These clusters indicated that the informational aspects of interaction and the areas of involvement of the family members in the disciplinary situation were differently patterned in the groups. The consequences of expressions of negative feeling are similar for mothers of both groups and for fathers of both groups, although the child's pattern of response differs for mother's and father's expressions of negative feeling.

CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION

Introductory Statement

The data do not appear to differentiate distinctly between the interaction characteristics of humanistically and conventionally oriented families. It can be concluded from these findings that conscience orientation, as defined, is independent of family interaction. This conclusion, however, appears to be unwarranted in view of the differences in correlations between the humanistic and conventional groups. Although these differences were limited in number, they were related to previous research and formed specific patterns. The humanistic child appears to be involved differently in the family interaction than does the conventional child. A "fact-finding" type of interaction appears in the conventional group, whereas in the humanistic group, the interaction appears to be more subtle and involves feeling responses. Similar patterns do appear, however, for the use of the parent's negative responses in the two groups. Although both groups appeared to use a predominantly psychological approach to the disciplinary situation, there appear to be possibilities of differential reinforcement contingencies or authority patterns in the family.

Predicted Relationships Between Family Interaction and Conscience Orientation

The data indicate that the relationship between family interaction and conscience orientation is more complex than originally predicted. The response frequencies of the family interaction variables did not differentiate

between the groups. Several factors may account for this lack of differentiation. These factors will be discussed in detail later in the chapter.

It is probable that the response frequencies of the relevant variables are similar for families who use psychological disciplinary techniques. Some parental responses, however, may elicit different child responses, or the child responses may elicit different parental responses in the two groups. For example, the lack of differentiation between groups and lack of correlation between the variables, parent elicits information and parent gives expectations, indicate that they are used with equal frequency in both groups. In the humanistic group, these variables appear to be used to elicit the child's general view or are used in general discussion. In the conventional group, these same variables seem to be used in a more dominant manner by the parents than in the humanistic group. Power assertion appears more directly related to the child's informational responses in the conventional group than in the humanistic group, although these variables did not differentiate directly between the groups.

Negative feeling, however, was used with equal frequency in both groups, and this response appeared to operate similarly in the two groups in relationship to the arousal of highly emotional responses by the child.

Other factors which may have accounted for the lack of differentiation between groups are the following. A subject's responses to the cognitive moral judgment items may bear little relationship to his behavior or to verbal statements concerning behavior in interaction with his parents. The groups may need to be at the extreme ends of the humanistic-conventional continuum to elicit differences in family interaction. The small number of subjects may have obscured actual differences. Real differences which might have

appeared if two-person interactions between mothers and sons and fathers and sons had been assessed may have been nullified in the three-person interactions. Other family interaction situations might have been developed which would have elicited more differentiation between humanistic and conventional groups, i.e., subjects could have been instructed to decide between humanistic and conventional approaches.

Sampling Problems

One of the major difficulties in the study was the small number of subjects, which may have obscured group differences or otherwise biased the results. It was difficult throughout the study to obtain a large sample. The schools hesitate to participate in a study which may be highly threatening to the parents. The Bath and Williamston schools were extremely cooperative, but they carefully reviewed the assessment materials for potential threat to parents. Situations with greater power than those used were dropped because of their potentially threatening effect on schools and parents. Although it was stated clearly in preliminary communication that parents were not required to cooperate because the schools did, some parents misunderstood the initial letter, and they dropped out of the study when they learned that the schools did not demand their participation.

No differences in the demographic data were found between those families who participated in the family interaction portion of the study and those who refused to do so. The majority of refusals were overtly due to the families being too busy, or part of the family being away from home during the data collection period. Many of these subjects, however, were probably threatened by the possibility of disclosing information which they felt was private. The payment of subjects for their participation seemed

to have little effect on their motivation. It is possible that payment would have affected the motivation of "externalized" subjects.

The subjects who did participate in the family interaction assessment constituted a selective sample of highly cooperative subjects. Eight of 13 (62%) of the families contacted in the humanistic group participated in the family interaction sessions as compared to 9 of 28 (32%) in the conventional group. This difference in willingness to cooperate may be inherent in the groups. The characteristics of the humanistic orientation may result in greater readiness to assist in socially productive research. The conventional families, who seemed more oriented toward authority in their interaction than the humanistic families, may have been less willing to be observed and potentially evaluated in relationship to other families. The role the schools played in sanctioning the research and making initial contact with the families may have aroused anxiety in many families.

It is likely that the small number of subjects obscured real differences between groups in family interaction. Several *t* tests and correlations which tended toward significance and showed large differences in group means would probably have been significant with a larger group of subjects. Increased degrees of freedom and reduced variance would be expected with an increased sample size, and would contribute toward significance in more of the cases where real differences probably existed. The differences which did appear between groups suggest that there are actual differences in humanistic and conventional subjects which would be clarified with greater numbers of subjects. Further research including subjects who were unwilling to participate in the present research is necessary to confirm or negate the current findings and speculations.

The parent-child situations were not popular with the boys. This may reflect the surge for independence by the early adolescent boys. This lack of interest, however, was in contrast to the interest of the boys in the pilot study. These boys were from the East Lansing area, and they and their parents were generally acquainted with research at Michigan State University, although their parents were not all in the academic professions. It also appeared that some Bath and Williamston parents utilized their sons' objections rather than expressing their own feelings about participation. Several mothers would have participated in the study if their husbands had been available or interested.

An optimally large sample could have been obtained more easily by using only upper-middle class, academically oriented families, or by restricting interaction to mothers and sons. Socioeconomic class did not account for the differential findings in this research, but a considerable amount of data would have been lost by restricting socioeconomic class or eliminating the father from family interaction.

As in most research of this type, it was impossible to control all desirable variables. Variables such as ordinal position, which was related to several family interaction variables, might have been controlled with a large number of subjects.

The absence of "externalized" subjects presented difficulties. Several variables which were expected to differentiate between internalized and "externalized" subjects were untestable due to this. It is probable that the original number of subjects was too small to form optimally sized groups, especially the "externalized" group. It is also probable that some subjects, who showed conventional or humanistic moral judgment, may respond in an "externalized" manner to an actual deviation situation. Junior high school

boys are generally aware of societal expectations, and although the experimenter did not interact with them consistently as an authority figure, she was probably perceived as an authority figure by the boys. More internalized responses may have been given to the experimenter than would be given in a group of their peers. It is possible that "externalized" judgments would have been more characteristic of boys who refused to complete their assessment materials or were too old or otherwise dropped from the study than those who remained.

Hoffman and Saltzstein's (1964) data were collected over ten years ago. The societal patterns have probably moved toward a more humanistic approach to others. The "externalized" pattern, in the developmental framework, would be expected to move also. It would probably move toward a more conventional approach. It is also possible that with greater exposure to child psychology, parents may be using more psychological techniques in disciplinary interactions with their children.

The extremes of the conscience orientation groups, especially the "externalized" group, may be needed to find gross differences in family interaction. Subjects who would definitely be "externalized" should be obtained for further research. Subjects might be obtained from sources such as the courts.

The Role of Negative Feeling in Interaction

Disciplinary interaction appears to be affected by the expression of negative feeling by the parents. The use of these responses has similar effects in both of the groups. The effects of the expression of negative feeling by the mother, however, differs from that of the father.

The mother's expression of negative feeling is positively related to her giving irrelevant information and moralizing. These responses are

associated with the arousal of highly emotional responses in the child, and they seem to inhibit interaction by the child regardless of the child's conscience orientation. When the father manifests negative feeling, however, the child appears to be stimulated to ask questions and challenge the parents in a relatively calm manner.

The differentiation of roles of the father and mother in the interaction is more clearly seen in reference to negative feeling than in regard to any other variable. The inhibition of response by the child in response to the mother's expression of negative feeling supports Hoffman and Saltzstein's (1967) speculation that love withdrawal techniques may produce highly emotional responses in the child, inhibiting his use of more constructive resources and producing higher levels of guilt. More resources can be utilized by the child when the father manifests negative feeling than when the mother does so. The role of the mother as the nurturant parent may be threatened by her expression of negative feeling, leading the child to attempt to obtain restoration of love, whereas the child is more likely to confront the father in the presence of similar responses. This is probably due to the child's perception of the mother as nurturant and the father as a societal spokesman. The possibility of resurgence of an Oedipal conflict at the particular age of the boys in this study should also be considered.

Group Differences in the Disciplinary Interaction

The data indicate that the humanistic group is more flexible in its approach to disciplinary situations than the conventional group. In the humanistic group, the parents seem to function similarly. The child's responses appear more closely related to the responses of the parent which are feeling oriented rather than to the parent's direct elicitation of

information or demands for restitution. Humanistic subjects appear to approach the disciplinary process within a broader framework than the conventional group. Humanistic parents tended to give more irrelevant information than conventional parents, although the differentiation was not significant, and while this may indicate greater avoidance of the situation by humanistic parents, it also may indicate greater breadth of exploration with the child.

The relationships among responses in the conventional group suggest a parentally dominated, "fact-finding" type of approach to disciplinary encounters. An assertive approach by the mother is suggested by the similarity of relationships between her use of power assertion and giving information, and the child's responses. There appears to be greater role division between the parents in the conventional group than in the humanistic group. The mother appears to elicit information and provide the pattern for the determination of appropriate discipline, while the father supports the mother by providing reinforcement through negative feeling.

The differences which appeared in the parent-child relationships support the flexible orientation of humanistic subjects and rigid approach of conventional subjects found by Hoffman and Saltzstein (1964). The data, however, did not support the pattern of their findings of greater use of reasoning, disappointment and power assertion by parents of humanistic subjects, and greater use of love withdrawal, ego attack and guilt induction by parents of conventional subjects. It should be noted, however, that the variables; disappointment, power assertion, and reasoning; were viewed differently in this research than in Hoffman and Saltzstein's study. Disappointment was combined with parents' giving of adverse consequences to self and was considered to be both theoretically, and from the pilot study

data, more characteristic of conventional subjects. Power assertion and reasoning were not considered to differentiate between the groups.

The group differences suggest that the conventional child is more restricted in his interaction than the humanistic child. The conventional child, whose experience centers primarily around the disciplinary situation per se, may follow parental expectations or reject them. In doing so he excludes exploration, with his parents, of the implications of deviation or conformity in varying situations. The humanistic child has an opportunity for greater exploration of conditions under which deviation is appropriate. The humanistic parents seem to reinforce the child's experimental explorations of the disciplinary area. The humanistic child may also have greater freedom to utilize his resources and to develop his moral judgment through lack of restriction of the discussion by the parents. The conventional child appears to be reinforced for restricting his exploration to the immediate situation and to restoration. There is also an indication that he uses the parental pattern in the interaction with them as a model. The greater flexibility of the humanistic group may provide a greater opportunity for the humanistic child to move cognitively toward a humanistic mode or moral judgment than for the conventional child. The data do not indicate whether or not their moral behavior would differ, but indicates that more situational factors may be considered by the humanistic child than the conventional child.

Theoretical Considerations

The data did not support the prediction from social learning theory that interaction responses would be used with differential frequency by humanistic and conventional groups. Differences did appear, however, in

the flexibility of the approaches of the groups. The pattern of interaction in the conventional group, which appeared to be more restricted and "fact-finding," can be more readily explained by specific reinforcement of responses than can the interaction of the humanistic group.

A combination of reinforcement and modeling is probably the dominant mechanism involved in the response patterns which differentiated between the groups. Modeling of the parents' flexibility or restriction may have provided a basis for the child's eventual humanistic or conventional cognitive behavior. Viewing the results in terms of modeling provides a broader basis for identification of important factors in the social learning process, and the limitation of predictions to specific variables seems to neglect important aspects of the social learning process. One of the major difficulties of a modeling explanation in this study, however, is that the critical modeling may have occurred at an earlier period of the child's life.

The variables which reinforce the situation specific responses predominant in the child's interaction in the conventional group are more readily identifiable than the reinforcing agents for the exploratory responses predominant in the child's interaction in the humanistic group. It appears, however, that positive feeling and reflection of feeling are the reinforcing agents for the child's exploratory responses in the humanistic group. In the absence of reinforcement, the exploratory responses may extinguish in the conventional group, and the situation specific responses may extinguish in the humanistic group.

A possible psychoanalytic explanation cannot be excluded on the basis of the data. The extent of punitiveness of the parents at the time of the formation of the superego, and the extent to which they influenced the degree of protectiveness and reassurance of the superego, could be

reflected in the child's conscience orientation. The possibility of explanation of the findings of the research by either psychoanalytic or social learning theory is expected because many of the hypotheses of social learning theory are based on psychoanalytic statements. Social learning theory, however, seems to provide a more specific framework through which the differences between the "fact-finding" interaction of the conventional group and the exploratory interaction of the humanistic group can be explained.

The distinction between the nurturant role of the mother and the role of the father in teaching societal expectations appears in the data. The children in both groups seem to challenge the father in the presence of his negative feeling. This differentiation in the parental roles may reflect a resurgence of the Oedipal conflict. It may also reflect specific reinforcement contingencies developed to accommodate the child's increasing independence. The similarities between groups are in accordance with expected characteristics of families of individuals with an internalized conscience. These characteristics are explained globally in psychoanalytic theory and in greater detail in social learning theory.

Developmental trends were not assessed since the subjects were selected from one age group at which moral judgment should be relatively stable. The data tend to show that conscience orientation, as assessed, is not entirely the product of a fixed developmental process. Comparison of the data with data from other age groups might show, however, that family interaction interacts with a developmental process.

Assessment of Conscience Orientation

The moral judgment items used for the assessment of conscience orientation (Hoffman and Saltzstein, 1964) were developed for a study in which a

much larger original group of subjects was available than in the present study. The original selection criterion required that the subject's predominant conscience orientation score consistently exceed his expressions of other orientations by a factor of >1-1/2. This criterion was modified; moral judgment scores were weighted to increase the size of the groups.

Almost all internalized boys gave both humanistic and conventional responses to conscience orientation stories. A subject's predominant orientation, however, often appeared more distinct from inspection of the responses than his scores indicated. Specific instructions for ratings were developed for the undergraduate raters, in contrast to Hoffman and Saltzstein's (1964) global ratings, and the conscience orientations were rated with high reliability.

The conscience orientation instruments were paper and pencil tasks. It would be important in future research to explore moral judgment in terms of statements in a group of peers and decisions in experimental situations. The moral judgment items appear valid for differentiation of conscience orientation types if subjects are available whose responses are almost exclusively within one orientation. It might be more practical to determine the conditions under which individuals are more likely to stress humanistic and conventional tendencies.

Family Interaction

Assessment of direct interaction appears to be a promising method for the investigation of family process. Interview data, such as Hoffman and Saltzstein (1964) used, may show patterns of discipline relevant at previous periods that are unavailable in direct interaction. Clues about the effect of affective factors and interrelations between family members cannot be directly determined in interview procedures. For example, a

highly emotional ego attack can appear in an interaction situation, but it is not likely to be reported by the parent.

The number of variables necessary to describe the interaction process can become awkward, and further work could be done to weight certain variables or combine them. Video-taping would provide more specific data than reliance on verbal communication of the subjects.

More correspondence between the conscience orientation stories and family interaction situations would have provided important data. If subjects had been required to decide between a humanistic and conventional approach in the interaction situations, a more direct comparison with the conscience orientation responses would have been possible.

Two-person interactions between mother and son and father and son could have been compared beneficially to the three-person interactions. The differentiation between parental roles in the conventional group and similarity of parental responses in the humanistic group could have been tested in this manner. It is plausible that one parent may predominate in influencing the child's tendency toward humanistic or conventional moral judgment.

Concluding Statement

Although sampling problems prevented making all intended comparisons, the data showed both similarities and a major area of differentiation in the humanistic and conventional groups. The parental roles appear to be differentiated, and the child responds to the mother's nurturance and the father's expectations for societal behavior. These similarities form a picture of an early adolescent child in accordance with a resurgence of the Oedipal conflict or asserting his independence. The groups were differentiated by a flexible approach in the humanistic group as compared

to restriction of interaction in the conventional group to the disciplinary process per se. Modeling and reinforcement patterns appear to account for these differences.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY

A stage analysis approach to moral judgment (Kohlberg, in Hoffman and Hoffman, 1964; Piaget, 1932), the cognitive dimension of moral development, has shown children to progress from a stage of moral realism to a stage of moral subjectivity. The behavioral and emotional dimensions of moral development, approached from hypotheses developed from psychoanalytic and social learning theories, show systematic relationships with the disciplinary practices of the parents. Although moral judgment is considered to be influenced by interaction with others, previous investigations of the relationship between the child's moral judgment and parental behavior have generally yielded ambiguous results or have not supported such a relationship. Hoffman and Saltzstein (1964, 1967), however, found consistent relationships between parental disciplinary practices and three forms of conscience orientation which are similar to Kohlberg's (in Hoffman and Hoffman, 1964) stages of moral judgment. The present research was designed to investigate the relationship between the child's flexible-humanistic, rigid-conventional, or "externalized" conscience orientation and relevant family interaction variables.

The subjects for the research were 18 twelve to fourteen year old boys and their mothers and fathers from Lansing, Michigan and two communities around Lansing which are socioeconomically heterogeneous.

The conscience orientations of 82 boys were assessed from responses to hypothetical stories developed by Hoffman and Saltzstein (1964, 1968).

Subjects were asked to determine which of two deviations was worse or whether or not the hero should have deviated and why. Difficulties arose in securing the desired samples for the family interaction assessment. Eight of 13 (62%) intact families of humanistically oriented boys, 9 of 28 (32%) intact families of conventionally oriented boys, and a single family of an "externally" oriented child chose to participate in the family interaction assessment. The identity of the variables which contributed to the selectivity of participation is unknown. The data analyses were limited to the humanistic and conventional groups because only one subject showed a predominantly "externalized" orientation. Humanistic subjects were matched with conventional subjects for intelligence quotients and socioeconomic class.

The early adolescent boys and their parents participated in family interaction sessions, in which the relevant parental and child variables were assessed, and completed the Attribute Preference Inventory. The families role-played hypothetical situations concerning disobedience, theft, cheating and physical aggression in a manner as similar as possible to their typical style of spontaneous interaction. The response frequencies of the family interaction variables were rated independently by two raters from tape recorded responses.

The findings did not directly support the author's expectation of significant differences between the frequencies with which the various family interactions occurred among the humanistic and conventional groups. The humanistic group was expected to elicit information and give expectations with greater frequency than the conventional group, and the conventional group was expected to express disappointment and negative feeling more frequently than the humanistic group. Of the 33 variables which were

expected to differentiate between the groups, only fathers' expressions of disappointment significantly (.05 level) differentiated between the humanistic and conventional subjects. This finding was in the predicted direction. Significant patterns of correlations differentiating between the humanistic and conventional groups were not sustained. Hoffman and Saltzstein's (1964) findings of greater frequency of use of induction and power assertion by humanistic parents than by conventional parents, and greater frequency of use of love withdrawal techniques by conventional parents than by humanistic parents, were not supported by the data. The present results supported their report of greater flexibility in the humanistic group than in the conventional group. This lack of significant findings may be attributable to sampling problems; the unequal rates of participation of conventional and humanistic families may have masked actual differences or otherwise biased the results.

Although the response frequencies of the family interaction variables were similar, inspection of the correlations between the family interaction variables significant at the .05 level revealed both similarities and differences between the groups. The parental roles appear to be differentiated by the consequences of the parent's expression of negative feeling in interaction. Negative feeling expressed by the mother apparently inhibits interaction by the child, while the father's expression of negative feeling was associated with the child's increased requests for information, including challenging the parent. These differences in parental roles may reflect the importance of the child's perception of the mother as nurturant and the father as the enforcer of societal standards.

Interaction in the conventional group appeared to show a restricted, "fact-finding" pattern in contrast to a flexible, feeling-oriented pattern

in the humanistic group. The conventional child, whose experience centers primarily around the disciplinary situation per se, may follow parental expectations or reject them. This set of alternatives seems to reduce the possibility of mutual exploration, with his parents, of the implications of deviation or conformity in varying situations. Greater opportunity exists for the humanistic child to explore the conditions under which deviation is appropriate, and the humanistic parent seems to reinforce his child's experimental explorations of the disciplinary area. The humanistic child may have greater opportunity than the conventional child to utilize his resources in the formation of humanistic moral judgment.

The relationships cited suggest that family interaction plays at least an indirect role in conscience orientation, although interaction may be more directly reflected in other dimensions of moral development.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allinsmith, W., and Greening, T. C. Guilt over anger as predicted from parental discipline: A study of superego development. American Psychologist, 1955, 10, 320.

Aronfreed, J. The nature, variety and social patterning of moral responses to transgression. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 63, 223-240.

Bandura, A. A., & McDonald, F. J. Influence of social reinforcement and the behavior of models in shaping children's moral judgments. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 67, 274-281.

Bandura, A., & Walters, R. H. Social learning and personality development. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1964.

Becker, W. C. Consequences of different kinds of parental discipline. In M. L. Hoffman & L. W. Hoffman (Eds.), Review of child development research. Vol. 1. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964. Pp. 169-208.

Dembo, T. Recent studies in moral conflict at the Iowa Child Welfare Research Station. Psychological Bulletin, 1941, 38, 733.

Dollard, J., & Miller, N. E. Personality and psychotherapy. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950.

Durkin, D. Children's concepts of justice: A comparison with the Piaget data. Child Development, 1959, 30, 59-67.

Fenichel, O. The psychoanalytic theory of neurosis. New York: W. W. Norton, 1945.

Grinder, R. E. Relations between behavioral and cognitive dimensions of conscience in middle childhood. Child Development, 1964, 35, 881-891.

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

Gump, P. V., & Kounin, J. S. Milieu influences in children's concepts of misconduct. Child Development, 1961, 32, 711-720.

Hill, W. F. Learning theory and the acquisition of values. Psychological Review, 1960, 67, 317-331.

Hoffman, M. L. Childrearing practices and moral development: Generalizations from empirical research. Child Development, 1963, 34, 295-318.

Hoffman, M. L. Personal communication, 1968.

Hoffman, M. L., and Saltzstein, H. D. Techniques and processes in moral development. Report of Research, October, 1964, The Merrill-Palmer Institute, Research Grant Reference Number M-2333, National Institute of Mental Health.

Hoffman, M. L., & Saltzstein, H. D. Parent discipline and the child's moral development. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 5, 45-57.

Kaplan, L. J. The relationship between the child's responses to frustration and his moral judgment. Dissertation Abstracts, 1967, 27-8B, 2859-2860.

Kohlberg, L. Moral development and identification. In H. W. Stevenson (Ed.), Child psychology, the 62nd yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963.

Kohlberg, L. Development of Moral character and moral ideology. In M. L. Hoffman & L. W. Hoffman (Eds.), Review of child development research. Vol. 1. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964. Pp. 383-431.

MacRae, D., Jr. A test of Piaget's theories of moral development. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1954, 49, 14-18.

Piaget, J. The moral judgment of the child. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1932.

Pringle, M. L. K., & Edwards, J. B. Some moral concepts and judgments of junior school children. British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 1964, 3, 196-215.

Randolph, C. C., & Hurley, J. R. Preferred qualities in eight-year-olds: The Attribute Preference Inventory. Unpublished manuscript, Michigan State University, 1968.

Ruma, E. H., & Mosher, D. L. Relationship between moral judgment and guilt in delinquent boys. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1967, 72, 122-127.

Sears, R. R., Maccoby, E. E., & Levin, H. Patterns of child rearing. Evanston, Ill.: Row Peterson, 1957.

Turiel, E. An experimental test of the sequentiality of developmental stages in the child's moral judgments. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 3, 611-618.

Walker, H. M., & Lev, J. Statistical inference. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1953.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

FORM LETTER TO PARENTS REQUESTING THEIR COOPERATION

FORM LETTER TO PARENTS REQUESTING THEIR COOPERATION

To: Parents of Junior High School Boys at _____ Junior High School

I am interested in how junior high school age boys view rules and am planning a research project to study the ways boys view rules as they apply in social situations and how their parents communicate rules to them. In this study I will be asking your son to complete stories about some generally accepted rule, to rank the importance of some areas of life to him, and to complete other similar tasks. I will then ask some of the boys' parents to participate in one one-half hour session. In these sessions, I will present several hypothetical situations and ask you and your son to say to each other what you would say if these situations happened in your family. I am not interested in judging the best way to view rules or to communicate them, but I am interested in the different ways families view and communicate rules.

I am planning to begin the study during the week of April 15 and to finish it by June 1. Each child who participates will participate only for approximately one hour in school, and some families will be asked to participate in the additional session to be scheduled at your convenience.

I would like to stress that all necessary measures will be taken to insure the privacy of each family who participates. The records will be kept confidential. I am interested, however, in talking about the study with families who participate and will send you a letter describing the general findings when the study is finished.

The research has been planned with the full authorization and cooperation of Mr. Tom VanDyke, Principal, _____ Junior High School, with the understanding that any parents who do not wish their son to participate should so instruct us. I do hope your son will be able to participate.

Please call me if you have any questions about the study or instructions about your child's participation.

Sincerely,

Jo Anne Lifshin
Psychology Graduate Student
Michigan State University
Home phone: 489-4115

APPENDIX B

SUBJECT VARIABLES

SUBJECT VARIABLES

Distribution of Intelligence Quotients

Intelligence quotient	Number of subjects		
	Humanistic group	Conventional group	"Externalized" subject
> 130	0	2	
120-129	4	3	
110-119	1	1	
100-109	2	1	1
90- 99	0	2	
Unknown			

Distribution of Ordinal Positions

Ordinal position	Number of subjects		
	Humanistic group	Conventional group	"Externalized" subject
1st	3	1	1
2nd	1	4	
3rd	2	1	
4th	1	3	
5th	1	0	

Distribution of Mother's Education

Mother's education	Number of subjects		
	Humanistic group	Conventional group	"Externalized" subject
High school graduate	5	5	1
Some college	2	2	
College graduate	1	1	
Unknown	0	1	

Distribution of Mother's Occupation

Mother's occupation	Number of subjects		
	Humanistic group	Conventional group	"Externalized" subject
Housewife	5	5	1
Skilled laborer	2	2	
Office worker	1	2	

Distribution of Father's Education

Father's education	Number of subjects		
	Humanistic group	Conventional group	"Externalized" subject
Some high school	4	2	
High school graduate	0	4	1
Some college	3	0	
College graduate	1	3	

Distribution of Father's Occupation

Father's occupation	Number of subjects		
	Humanistic group	Conventional group	"Externalized" subject
Unskilled laborer	1	1	
Skilled laborer	4	6	1
Office worker	2	0	
Professional	1	2	

APPENDIX C

INSTRUMENTS FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF CONSCIENCE ORIENTATION AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR ADMINISTERING THEM

INSTRUMENTS FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF CONSCIENCE

ORIENTATION AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR ADMINISTERING THEM

Number _____

Name of School or Boy Scout Troop _____

What is your father's occupation? _____

What is your mother's occupation? _____

How much education did your father and mother have?

Father	Mother	
_____	_____	Grammar school only
_____	_____	Some high school but didn't finish
_____	_____	High school graduate
_____	_____	Some college but didn't finish
_____	_____	Graduated from college
_____	_____	Other (please describe in a few words any other kind of schooling or training your father or mother had.)

How many brothers do you have? _____

How old are they? _____

How many sisters do you have? _____

How old are they? _____

Are you a member of the Boy Scouts of America? Yes _____ No _____

How old are you? _____ When is your birthdate? _____

Number _____

Name of School or Boy Scout troop _____

Name _____
First Last

Father's name _____

Address _____ Phone number _____

Questions About Stories

On the next few pages are some stories and some questions about them for you to answer. We are interested in the different ways kids answer the questions.

This is not a test and there are no right or wrong answers. So please do your own work and don't look at anyone's paper. Then there will be many different answers and that is what we want.

PLEASE TRY TO ANSWER THE QUESTIONS THE BEST WAY YOU KNOW HOW. DON'T WORRY ABOUT SPELLING OR GRAMMAR. NO ONE AT SCHOOL WILL SEE YOUR PAPER.

PLEASE DON'T TALK TO YOUR NEIGHBOR. IF YOU WANT TO ASK A QUESTION, YOU MAY RAISE YOUR HAND.

NOW PLEASE TURN THE PAGE AND BEGIN. READ THE STORIES AND ANSWER THE QUESTIONS ABOUT THEM.

(Questions about stories items and Sentences to finish items from Hoffman, 1964.)

I. Two young men, Al and Joe, were in trouble. They were secretly leaving town in a hurry and needed money. Al broke into a store and stole $500. Joe went to a man who was known to help people in town. Joe told the man that he was very sick and needed $500 to pay for an operation. Really he wasn't sick at all and he had no intention of paying the man back. Although the man didn't know Joe very well, he loaned him the money. So Al and Joe skipped town, each with $500.

1. If you had to decide who did worse, Al who broke into the store and stole $500 or Joe who borrowed $500 with no intention of paying it back, which one would you say did worse? Why do you think he did worse?

2. Which would you feel worse doing, stealing the money like Al or borrowing it and not paying it back like Joe? Why?

3. a. Why <u>shouldn't</u> someone steal from a store anyway?

   b. What harm do you think it does when someone steals from a store?

   c. If Al got caught for stealing, what punishment do you think he should get?

4. Who would feel worse, the store owner who was robbed or the man who was cheated out of the loan? Why?

5. What do you think of the man who loaned Joe the money?

(Now please turn the page and continue)

II. In Europe a woman was near death from a special kind of cancer. There was one drug that the doctors thought might save her. It was a form of radium that a druggist in the same town had recently discovered. The druggist was charging over twice what the drug cost to make. He paid $800 for the radium needed to make the drug and charged $1800 for a small dose of the drug.

The sick woman's husband, Lawrence, went to everyone he knew to borrow the money. He also went to banks and loan companies. But he could only get together about $900 which is half of what the drug cost. He told the druggist that his wife was dying, and asked him to sell the drug cheaper, or to let him pay the rest later. But the druggist said, "I'm sorry, but I discovered the drug and it's only fair that I make money from it." So Lawrence got desperate and broke into the man's store to steal the drug for his wife.

1. Do you think Lawrence was right or wrong to do that? Why?

2. If you were Lawrence, do you think you would have done the same thing?

3. Do you think a good husband would think it was his duty to steal the drug if he were in Lawrence's place? Why?

4. Lawrence was arrested for stealing. If you were the judge, do you think you would punish him or let him go free?

5. If the judge decided to punish him, what do you think should be the punishment?

(Now please turn the page and continue)

Now let's continue the story about Lawrence. Lawrence was arrested and the judge sentenced him to ten years in jail for breaking in and stealing the medicine. But after four years, he escaped from the prison and went to live in another part of the country under a new name. He worked hard, saved his money, and slowly built up a big factory. He gave his workers high wages and used most of his profits to build a hospital for work in curing cancer. Twenty years later a salesman passing through the town recognized the factory owner as being Lawrence, the escaped convict whom the police had been looking for back in his home town.

6. Do you think it would be right or wrong if the salesman kept it secret and did not report Lawrence to the police? Why?

7. If you were the salesman, do you think you would keep it secret or report Lawrence to the police?

8. Suppose the salesman had been a good friend of Lawrence's. Do you think he should keep it secret or report it to the police?

9. Do you think the judge and jury ought to send Lawrence back to jail?

10. Do you think you would like a person like Lawrence? Why?

(Now please turn the page and continue)

III. One day about 11 o'clock in the morning, Mr. Jones was backing out of a large parking lot. He banged into a parked car, denting its fender badly and scraping off a lot of paint. Mr. Jones took one look at the damage and drove off in a hurry. Did he do the right thing or the wrong thing by driving off like that? Why did he do the right or wrong thing?

IV. Johnny's class was taking a test one day. He couldn't answer some of the questions. So he copied the answers from Mark who always did well on tests. Was Johnny right or wrong to cheat on the test? Why was he right or wrong to cheat on the test?

(Now please turn the page and continue)

THESE TWO STORIES ARE ABOUT KIDS YOUR OWN AGE.

V. One day Fred's friend says to him, "Fred, I have a secret I want to tell you. I just bought a pair of ice skates with money I've been saving. My parents won't allow me to have skates because they're afraid I might get hurt. So I'm hiding them in my room."

On his way to school the next day Fred sees his friend's mother. They say "Hello" to each other. Fred thinks to himself, "It's my duty to tell her about the skates." So he tells her and she takes the skates away from his friend.

1. Do you think Fred was right or wrong to tell his friend's mother about the skates? Why?

2. If you were in Fred's place, do you think you would tell the friend's mother about the skates?

3. Do you think you would like a boy like Fred?

VI. Jim is the best bowler of all his friends. His average score is 155. One day some of the boys are teasing his friend, Bobby, about how poorly he bowled the day before. They keep saying Bobby doesn't know how to bowl and never did. Bobby isn't smiling at all. Finally he says, "I didn't bowl very well last night, but once I bowled 145." The other boys don't believe him. They just laugh.

Jim never saw Bobby bowl 145. But he says, "It's true what Bobby says. I was there when he bowled 145. I saw him myself."

1. Do you think Jim was right or wrong to say that? Why?

2. Do you think you would say that if you were in Jim's place?

   Would you be tempted to say it?

3. Do you think you would like a boy like Jim?

(Now please turn the page and continue)

Sentences to Finish

Here are some sentences for you to finish. Try to finish each of them with the first thought that comes to your mind. Don't worry about spelling or grammar. This is not a test. No one at school will see your paper.

If you can't finish a sentence, put a circle around the number and go on to the next one. If you have time at the end, you may go back and try to finish the sentences you left out.

1. What kids my age need most is

2. I sometimes feel bad when I

3. The main thing about my mother is

4. The main thing about my father is

5. If parents made less rules

6. I feel angry when

7. Kids my age are often afraid that

8. If I got a hundred dollars I would

9. Because of father I

10. If someone says "I don't agree with you" I

11. Because of mother I

12. The most important thing parents should do is

INSTRUCTIONS FOR RATING CONSCIENCE ORIENTATION RESPONSES

The purpose of rating moral judgment (questions about stories) and sentence completion items for this research is to differentiate junior high school boys' responses into the following three categories.

Humanistic - H:

Those responses which show humanistic principles such as concern for others' feelings and trust, and flexibility of conventional principles when extenuating circumstances arise, primarily in reference to another's feelings or life. The humanistic individual has internalized society's standards but in the cases of theft to save another's life, lying to assist a friend, etc., can override internalized standards.

Rigid-Conventional - C;

Those responses which show rigid adherence to conventional moral standards. The rigid-conventionally oriented individual considers deviation from moral standards, such as theft and lying to be wrong in all circumstances. This individual might state, "the law is the law," "a person who steals in one circumstance might steal from you"--disregarding the circumstance. This individual may show concern for loss of property, etc., but the emphasis on others' feelings seen in the H responses is absent.

"Externalized" - E:

Those responses which show concern with the deviant person's chances of being caught and punished. The external circumstances are important here. The responses may show much greater concern with the "hero's" well-being than with other rationales for behavior. This individual would respond to "Why shouldn't someone steal?" in terms of, "You may get caught and sent to jail." The "externalized" oriented individual shows an absence of internalized standards. He may fear external punishment but does not respond to internal conscience strivings.

The moral judgment and sentence completion items will be rated in terms of these general category descriptions. Rate those responses that clearly show these characteristics in H, C and E categories. Sometimes a response will show a predominant orientation and a secondary orientation. An example of a combination scoring would be: Should Lawrence be reported? "Should report him for his own good, but might not." (Score C(H)) Some combination responses can be differentiated through utilizing clarifying responses. Always read through clarifying responses although the original response may show a definite orientation. Try to use as few combination scores as possible. There will be some responses which are impossible to differentiate. Code these as "can't code." An example would be: Who did worse, Jo or Al? "Joe did it under false pretense." and "Stealing (is worse). It's dishonest."

Note on the scoring sheet that each H, C and E response receives a 3 point score for H, C and E categories respectively. Combination

responses receive 2 points for the predominant category and 1 point for the secondary category. It seemed easiest to total each category and then multiply. Moral judgment and sentence completion items are equally weighted.

APPENDIX D

INSTRUCTIONS FOR RATING CONSCIENCE ORIENTATION RESPONSES

Moral Judgment Items (Questions About Stories):

H	C	E
Story I (Al and Joe)		
1. (Item 2 for clarification)		
General: Feelings of other person most important.	General: The rule is the most important thing.	General: Chances of getting caught most important.
Usually Joe--borrowing, but if emphasis is on store owner's feelings, Al is H response.	Usually Al--but if emphasis is on rule, Joe is scored C.	Easier to get caught if you borrow, they know you.
Lying is as bad as stealing. Did it under false pretense.	Al stole instead of borrowing.	Joe might not be able to pay money back (weak E response).
Have to face man.	Doesn't bother Al, does Joe.	
Money would help someone else.		
3a. (Items 3b, 3c, 4 and 5 for clarification)		
Emphasis on damage to the other person. 3a might show "against the law," but other responses clarify H orientation.	Emphasis on guilty conscience or importance of rule.	Emphasis on being caught.
Damage to man who owns store.	Break the law.	On 5, man stupid, could be manipulated.
Breaking into a man's life.	Ruins (thief's) life.	
Break trust.	Might steal again.	
Believed Joe honest.	On their conscience.	
Story II (Lawrence)		
1. (Items 2, 3, 4, and 5 for clarification)		
General: Lawrence right because helping wife.	General: Lawrence wrong because stealing is stealing.	General: Lawrence right if not caught, wrong if caught.
Loved wife, helped wife.	Should earn instead of steal if good husband.	

Moral Judgment Items (Cont'd.)

H	C	E
6. (Items 7, 8, 9, and 10 for clarification)		
General: Keep secret. Works hard, doing good for others. Salesman likes Lawrence; he worked hard, helped people.	General: Report it. Law is law. Salesman doesn't like Lawrence; he might steal from you.	General: Not report, but for other than H reason. Out of jurisdiction Salesman doesn't like Lawrence; he was stupid, got caught.
Story III (Mr. Jones) NOT ON PRETEST DATA		
Generally wrong. Damage of emotional nature to person whose car was hit.	Generally wrong. Importance of hit-and-run.	Generally o.k. if don't get caught.
Story IV (Johnny) NOT ON PRETEST DATA		
Generally wrong. Disturbs interpersonal relationships. Damage to other kids.	Generally wrong. Importance of cheating as a standard.	O.k. of don't get caught.
Story V (Fred)		
Generally wrong. Trust Friendship	Generally right. Should obey parents.	Generally wrong; absence of H principles.
Story VI (Jim)		
Generally right. Friendship Might stop teasing.	Generally wrong. He's lying, etc.	Generally right.

Note: There will probably be few H responses on Stories III and IV, and few E responses on Stories V and VI.

Sentence Completion Items

	H	C	E
	General: Understanding, concern, trust, affection, help others.	General: Achievement, obedience, attends church, works hard, pleases parents.	General: Popular, avoid punishment or receive it from authority.
1.	Helps others, love, understanding, friends, help.	Good education, obey parents, responsibility.	Spanking. Nothing.
2.	DO NOT SCORE		
3.	Consideration, love, helps, nice, sits down and talks, understanding.	Expects me to obey, to take responsibility, to do well in school, to go to church, to work hard.	Tells me my mistakes. Punishes Popular
4.	(Score same as 3.)		
5.		Would be worse, I would still obey, they shouldn't	Be a better world, I would get away with anything, I would get in trouble.
6.	DO NOT SCORE		
7.	DO NOT SCORE		
8.	Help others (Count as H (3 points) if includes helps others.)	Save it	Spend it
9.	Growing up good Help others Am being good to others.	Do paper route, obey, do the right things that please him.	Aches and pains Get mad
10.	Activity of inquiry nature, "find out why," etc.	Passive or obedient response. "Let them believe it," "just listen," "agree."	
11.	(Score same as 9.)		
12.	Give love, time, care, help us, make children happy.	Teach us right things, to go to church, obey.	Not spank.

APPENDIX E

FAMILY INTERACTION SITUATIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR ADMINISTERING THEM

Instructions for Family Interaction Situations

We know that there are times when boys _____'s age and their parents agree and times when they disagree about what the boys have done or want to do. We know very little about how they tell each other they agree or what they say and do when they disagree. I would like you to help us learn more about how families act in some situations that might come up between boys _____'s age and their parents. These situations may or may not happen in your family, but for the next half hour, I would like you to take the roles of the boy and his parents in these situations. I would like you to tell _____ what you would tell him if these situations happened and for you, _____, to say what you would say to your parents in these situations.

Family Interaction Situations

Warm-up Situation

The parents of one of _____'s friends call you one evening. They say that their son says _____ borrowed their son's bicycle the week before and didn't return it. You know that you haven't seen the bicycle at your house. You decide to talk to _____ about it. What would each of you say when you did talk to him?

Coded Situation 1.

_____ is staying at his friend, Bill's, house overnight. About 3:00 a.m., Bill's parents call you and say that the boys are missing. Their beds have not been slept in, and it looks like they climbed out the window of Bill's room. About 4:00, the boys come into your house looking very "sheepish." Imagine that it's 4:00 a.m., and the boys have just come into the house. What would happen in your family?

Coded Situation 2.

One of your neighbors calls and says that he has just found that a nickel that is worth $5.00 as a rare coin is missing. _____ was playing with the neighbor's son that afternoon in the living room of the neighbor's house and could have taken the coin. The neighbor says he has talked to his own boy and is sure he hasn't taken the coin. He doesn't want to accuse _____ directly, but he can't think of anything else that could have happened to the nickel. The nickel is important to him since he waited a long time to find this special nickel and is more concerned about it's value as a rare coin than the $5.00 it is worth. After talking to the neighbor, you decide to talk to _____ about it. What would happen in your family?

Coded Situation 3.

_____ comes home with a 100 on a mathematics test. He has been having trouble with math all year. He is very quiet and finally says, "I copied all the answers from the kid in front of me." What would happen in your family?

Coded Situation 4.

_____ comes home from school and says, "Two kids kept teasing me in school today. I met them on the way home with my friend and we really left them a bloody mess." What would happen in your family?

APPENDIX F

ILLUSTRATIONS OF PARENTAL AND CHILD VARIABLES ASSESSED IN FAMILY INTERACTION SITUATIONS

Illustrations of Parental Variables Assessed in Family Interaction Situations

1. Parent elicits child's view. Calm request for information. Parent seeks information about the situation, the child's view of fair discipline or about others involved in the situation in a calm manner. Parent asks what led up to the child's decision to behave in a certain way, seeks information about the situation, gives the child a role in determining appropriate discipline, asks who was with him, who was affected by the situation, to describe their feelings and why they feel that way. Examples: "What made you decide to stay out until 3:00 in the morning?" "What did you do?" "What did you tell Bill's mother?" "What do you think we should do?" "What do you think you should give up?" "How badly was he hurt?" "How do you think Bill's mother feels?"

2. Parent gives information and establishes situation. Parent gives information relevant to experimental or deviation situation or gives clarification or direction to the other parent. Parent spontaneously or in response to the child's or the other parent's question, comments about role-playing, the role the child should assume in the situation or his own role. He may also describe his view of the deviation situation including what he has heard from someone else or what he has discovered about the child or clarify the situation. Examples: "You're supposed to pretend you did it." "Well, Mr. Smith called us this evening and said that his rare nickel is missing. He wants to know if you know anything about it." "But Mr. Smith didn't accuse you directly." "I think that's the father's role."

Illustrations of Parental Variables Assessed in Family Interaction Situations (Cont'd.)

3. Parent gives expectations for child, including emphasis on growth, mastery and preparation for future behavior. Calm expression of expectations. Parent calmly tells the child the family expects certain behaviors. Includes focus on increased responsibility and the child's maturation. Examples: "You know we don't permit this." Parent may also state society's limits explicitly. "You know it's not right to take things that don't belong to you." "People expect you to work things out without violence." "I would expect you to say that when you were six. Now there are other ways you can ask for things." "It will be good experience for you to talk to Mr. Smith about his coin. You can explain to him that you didn't take it." "You have to show interest before we'll buy it."

4. Parent gives highly emotional request or statement of expectations. Parent's voice may be shrill or the request or expression of expectations may have a demand quality. Content will be the same as in categories 1 or 3.

5. Parent suggests way(s) to restore situation and/or explains limits. Parent explains his view of situation, gives reasons why he accepts the child's statement or why he sets a particular limit. Examples: "You can't just leave the house at that hour because people worry." "If you cheat, you don't learn anything." "The teacher might even give you a chance to make up the exam if you tell her."

   Include physical or impersonal consequences when given as reasons. "He'll wait to beat you up worse."

Illustrations of Parental Variables Assessed in Family Interaction Situations (Cont'd.)

Include in this category parent's demands or requests that the child or parent fix, restore, undo or compensate directly for what the child has done. Examples: "You should pay for his trip to the doctor." "Don't you think you should tell her you're sorry?" "We will talk to the teacher."

6. Parent expresses disappointment or aversive consequences to self. Includes visible suffering where the parent makes it clear to the child that he is suffering from what the child has done. Include parent asks the child to anticipate consequences for self, aversive consequences for the parent or the child in terms of community reaction, and disappointment. Examples: "Don't you realize how much that hurts us?" "Can you imagine how we felt, how we suffered while you were out all that time?" "What do you think will happen to your grade now?" "What will happen then?" "Now the Smiths' won't want to be friends with us." "None of your friends will like you if they find out you cheated." "I didn't think you would do that." "I'm disappointed." "That's just one case where we put some trust in you...."

7. Parent gives alternative behavior. Parent suggests an alternative way in which the child could have handled the situation. Examples: "Remember the saying 'sticks and stones...' You surely could have ignored it and come back verbally." "You could have asked someone to help you with your math."

Illustrations of Parental Variables
Assessed in Family Interaction Situations (Cont'd.)

8. Parent uses power assertion. Parent threatens physical punishment, deprivation of privileges, isolation or extra chores. Parent expresses threat that child will be whipped, slapped, threatens to deprive the child of TV, trips, extra-curricular activities, or to isolate him from family or others. Examples: "You'll get a whipping for that later." "Would you believe a slap in the mouth!" "In that case you won't be able to stay with friends for two weeks."

9. Parent shows positive feeling and support for child and/or other parent. Parent expresses joy; happiness; concern for the child, including concern for child's safety; or supports the other parent. In the case of support for the other parent, one parent may not make a suggestion, but supports what the other parent has said. Examples: "We're happy you can defend yourself." "We do love you even if we can't buy everything you want." "Were you hurt?" "That's right. We expect you to stay in the house when you stay overnight with a friend." (to child, refers to other parent) "You should listen to your father." (Mother speaks to child.)

10. Parent shows rejection and/or negative feeling. Parent may ignore the child, be sarcastic, give no response or directly reject or express disbelief or suspicion of the child's statement. Include these responses to child and to other parent. Examples: "Do you mean to tell me that you were playing in your fort at 3:00 in the morning?" "It couldn't have happened that way. You must have been waiting for him in the street." "If it was in someone's house, you couldn't just

Illustrations of Parental Variables
Assessed in Family Interaction Situations (Cont'd.)

find it." "Are you calling him a liar?" "It's not necessary to just say 'no'. People feel like saying "I hate you' when they can't have something they want badly." (Parent to other parent.)

11. Parent gives irrelevant information or otherwise avoids situation. Parent gives information irrelevant to deviation situation. Parent becomes sidetracked from deviation situation and describes behavior of another of his children, what he would have done, returns to previous situations, etc. Examples: "We're more concerned about your sister with that...." "I've been thinking about that other case. What I would do is...." "What I want to know is how you knew that word?" "It's hard to think what to say. I can't say anything about that."

12. Parent reflects feeling. The parent states how he perceives that another person feels. Examples: "The teacher must be angry." "You know his parents will feel hurt." "We know you're curious and that's o.k." "You feel bad about getting poor grades in math."

13. Parent moralizes. The parent gives expectations for the child in such a manner that it sounds like a lecture or emphasizes the justification of severe punishment for the child's deviant acts. Examples: "It would serve you right to have the police catch you if you are out walking around at that hour of the night." "You've been taught right from wrong. Didn't we teach you that it's wrong to take things that don't belong to you...." (Parent continues for several seconds in this manner.)

Illustrations of Child Variables Assessed in Family Interaction Situations

1. Child requests information about experimental situation or deviation situation. Child asks parent to define his role in the experimental situation or to clarify what happened in the deviation situation from the parent's point of view. Examples: "Am I supposed to answer your questions?" "What should I do?" "Did Mr. Smith think I took the coin?" "Did they start the fight?"

2. Child gives information about experimental or deviation situation or about others involved. Child answers parent's question or gives information spontaneously. Examples: "We were playing in the fort." "And Bill's friend, Tom, asked us to come over to his house."

3. Child expresses moral standard. Child states expectations of family or community. Examples: "It was wrong." "It's more important to do the work than to get the grade."

4. Child gives reasons for deviant behavior. Child explains why he behaved in a certain way. (To be differentiated from 2.) Examples: "I copied on the exam because I knew you'd be mad at me if I got a poor grade." "He just kept teasing me and I thought he'd stop if I hit him."

5. Child reflects others' feelings spontaneously or as requested by parent. Child offers his perception of others' feelings. Examples: "He must really feel bad." "He was crying and his feelings were hurt." "His mother must feel really worried." "I planned it and it must have worried her."

Illustrations of Child Variables
Assessed in Family Interaction Situations (Cont'd.)

6. Child confesses. Child confesses that he is responsible for the deviation spontaneously or in response to parent's question. Examples: "I took the coin." Parent asks, "Did you take the coin from Mr. Smith's living room?" Child says, "Yes."

7. Child denies. Child denies that he is responsible for the deviation, spontaneously or in response to parent's question. Examples: "I didn't do it." Parent asks, "Did you take the coin from Mr. Smith's living room?" Child says, "No."

8. Child suggests discipline or fixes or restores situation. Child suggests what he considers to be a fair disciplinary action, or offers to fix, restore, compensate or undo. Examples: "I think my allowance should be taken away." "I think I should pay for fixing his broken teeth." Parent says, "You should tell the teacher." Child says, "I will."

9. Child refuses to commit self. Child gives indifferent response to parent's request or says, "I don't know."

10. Child minimizes or rationalizes situation. Child distorts or retells situation in such a way as to make deviant act less severe or gives "reasonable sounding" excuses for deviation. Examples: "But the class is boring and I have too much to do." "He wasn't hurt bad." "We were just sleeping in the basement."

11. Child gives highly emotional response. Child's voice may be shrill or communication may have a demanding or sarcastic quality. Content may appear in other categories.

APPENDIX G

THE ATTRIBUTE PREFERENCE INVENTORY

ATTRIBUTE PREFERENCE INVENTORY

Form 5

Instructions: After reading completely through the qualities or characteristics of persons, as listed below, assign number "9" to the quality or attribute which you believe would be the most desirable quality in this list for a _____ year old person. Then assign "8" to the attribute which you regard as second most desirable, "7" to the third most desirable and so on. Continue until you have assigned numbers 9 through 0 to all of these listed qualities. Or, you may prefer to begin with what you regard as the least desirable quality; if so, give it "0" and assign "1" to the next most undesired quality, etc. You may, of course, change your mind or correct any assigned numbers as you go along. Please assign a number to each of these attributes, even if you find it quite difficult to make some choices. No tie scores, please.

MALE

A. Responsible and trustworthy ____

B. Neat and Clean ____

C. Curious ____

D. Interacts well with others ____

E. Considerate and cooperative ____

F. Assertive and self-reliant ____

G. Able to make friends ____

H. Respectful toward adults ____

I. Fun-loving and carefree ____

J. Imaginative and creative ____

(When finished with this side, please turn the page over and continue.)

Attribute Preference Inventory (Cont'd.)

This time we would like to obtain your preferences of the same list of qualities, but with reference to a FEMALE of the same age, rather than for a MALE. The rest of the instructions are the same as before.

FEMALE

A. Responsible and trustworthy _____

B. Neat and clean _____

C. Curious _____

D. Interacts well with others _____

E. Considerate and cooperative _____

F. Assertive and self-reliant _____

G. Able to make friends _____

H. Respectful toward adults _____

I. Fun-loving and carefree _____

J. Imaginative and creative _____

For research purposes, the following information would be most helpful if you are willing to disclose it.

Your age or date of birth _____

Your sex (encircle): male female

Encircle the highest year of education you have completed:

Grade School: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
High School: 9 10 11 12
Business College or Technical Training: 13 14
Regular College: 1 2 3 4(BA), 5 6 7 8
Name(s) of Advanced Degree(s) _____

Your name, or, if you prefer, some 5-digit code number which you would be sure to recognize later, such as someone's birthdate or telephone number. Please avoid simple numbers like 12345 or 99999.

_____

THANKS FOR YOUR COOPERATION

APPENDIX H

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF RESPONSE FREQUENCIES OF FAMILY MEMBERS IN INTERACTION SITUATIONS

Means and Standard Deviations of Response Frequencies of Mother's Behaviors in Family Interaction Situations

Variable	Humanistic group		Conventional group	
	Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
Mother				
elicits child's view	36.50	14.17	33.69	18.50
gives information	14.20	6.76	18.36	21.07
gives expectations and emphasizes growth	8.05	5.79	7.03	3.48
explains, emphasizes restoration	11.73	2.61	12.17	4.22
shows disappointment, adverse consequences to parent	3.30	3.31	4.86	3.50
gives alternatives	4.15	3.15	2.99	2.30
uses power assertion	0.50	0.96	3.08	4.61
shows positive feeling	8.54	6.02	6.02	6.19
shows negative feeling	5.85	4.52	6.30	6.06
gives irrelevant information or avoids situation	3.94	8.73	0.80	1.78
reflects feeling	2.06	1.41	2.38	3.53
moralizes	0.56	0.67	1.10	1.33

N = 8 for humanistic group and N = 9 for conventional group.

Means and Standard Deviations of Response Frequencies of Father's Behaviors in Family Interaction Situations

Variable	Humanistic group		Conventional group	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Father				
elicits child's view	37.41	17.59	30.38	14.84
gives information	13.65	6.02	20.32	14.89
gives expectations and emphasizes growth	7.16	4.40	9.69	8.02
explains, emphasizes restoration	12.13	6.76	12.72	6.74
shows disappointment, adverse consequences to parent	1.54	1.87	3.76	2.77
gives alternatives	2.68	3.91	1.62	2.00
uses power assertion	1.30	1.70	1.42	2.73
shows positive feeling	6.40	4.27	5.96	7.14
shows negative feeling	8.80	8.16	7.66	6.64
gives irrelevant information or avoids situation	3.64	7.97	0.70	1.14
reflects feeling	0.61	0.76	1.57	2.18
moralizes	2.14	3.17	2.67	3.01

N = 8 for humanistic group and N = 9 for conventional group

Means and Standard Deviations of Response Frequencies of Child's Behaviors in Family Interaction Situations

Variable	Humanistic group		Conventional group	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Child				
requests information	4.00	3.40	1.30	2.30
gives information	60.04	13.09	65.73	13.89
gives reasons	5.49	3.35	4.07	2.24
confesses	1.91	1.38	2.08	2.75
denies	3.78	4.16	1.49	1.17
suggests discipline, restores situation	8.20	7.20	10.76	5.93
refuses to commit self	2.35	2.72	2.96	2.98
minimizes, rationalizes	6.95	7.78	3.41	7.35
shows highly emotional response	0.85	1.42	2.29	6.02

N = 8 for humanistic group and N = 9 for conventional group

APPENDIX I

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN FAMILY INTERACTION VARIABLES

TABLE 1

Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Family Interaction Variables for Mothers

Variable		Humanistic group: Variable A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Conventional group	Elicits child's view (A)	--	-50	-08	-56	-14	04	01	-36	-40	-48	-34	-38
	Gives information (B)	-78*	--	-27	38	-14	-13	-06	88**	-42	-14	42	-26
	Gives expectations (C)	27	-63	--	44	-11	65	-12	-50	-21	-14	-05	-23
	Explains (D)	-07	08	-10	--	-53	22	-28	08	-11	30	01	-24
	Shows disappointment (E)	44	-66	57	-01	--	-35	45	19	32	-32	69	58
	Gives alternatives (F)	70*	-54	41	-47	51	--	-53	-28	-37	-09	-21	-58
	Uses power assertion (G)	-62	80**	-79*	35	-34	-61	--	06	20	-27	27	67
	Shows positive feeling (H)	-16	-25	34	00	-11	-08	-32	--	-35	-33	68	-13
	Shows negative feeling (I)	-14	-31	22	-59	11	-09	-33	31	--	74*	-16	84**
	Gives irrelevant information (J)	-24	01	10	-53	-16	-30	-16	-06	76*	--	-54	37
	Reflects feeling (K)	-21	-21	44	55	05	-35	-24	47	11	-11	--	15
	Moralizes (L)	-09	-24	62	-54	59	39	-35	-02	47	41	-06	--

N = 8 for humanistic group and N = 9 for conventional group.
*p < .05.
**p < .01.

TABLE 2

Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Family Interaction Variables for Fathers

Variable		Humanistic group: Variable A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Conventional group	Elicits child's view (A)	--	-70	-37	04	-03	00	-30	-03	-63	-28	51	-47
	Gives information (B)	-08	--	05	46	-50	-09	12	-05	21	40	-65	-25
	Gives expectations (C)	-90**	19	--	06	-20	14	-08	72*	-07	-18	-16	40
	Explains (D)	-04	-73*	-10	--	-48	-08	-18	18	-56	-24	-25	-39
	Shows disappointment (E)	-54	-38	37	38	--	-13	11	-53	54	-18	46	67
	Gives alternatives (F)	-16	-46	-11	38	35	--	-45	16	-15	-20	52	-13
	Uses power assertion (G)	06	-22	-20	52	02	-28	--	12	48	-29	-70	-38
	Shows positive feeling (H)	-86**	13	77*	-04	67*	40	-39	--	-48	-25	-34	15
	Shows negative feeling (I)	21	-67*	-27	29	-25	03	29	-53	--	12	-18	47
	Gives irrelevant information (J)	-04	-28	-13	03	-29	17	-04	-24	74*	--	-13	-18
	Reflects feeling (K)	-13	-51	-07	34	52	87**	-25	42	-07	-16	--	-04
	Moralizes (L)	16	-63	-11	03	35	13	-16	-06	40	-03	37	--

N = 8 for humanistic group and N = 9 for conventional group.
*p < .05.
**p < .01.

TABLE 3

Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Family Interaction Variables for Children

Variable			Humanistic group								
			Variable								
			A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Conventional group	Requests information	(A)	--	-28	-15	-55	-07	-37	19	53	58
	Gives information	(B)	-61	--	-42	58	39	-60	-28	-68	-22
	Gives reasons	(C)	-01	-17	--	-49	-46	49	-12	-01	-11
	Confesses	(D)	27	-78*	28	--	59	09	-10	-77*	00
	Denies	(E)	-59	04	-54	14	--	-14	-33	-48	-17
	Suggests discipline, restores situation	(F)	-21	-25	-27	22	46	--	-18	-04	02
	Refuses to commit self	(G)	-30	-44	-03	41	58	44	--	27	52
	Minimizes, rationalizes	(H)	78*	-75*	31	52	-45	10	-15	--	07
	Shows a highly emotional response	(I)	51	-07	-47	-19	-20	-45	-14	-10	--

N = 8 for humanistic group and N = 9 for conventional group.
*p < .05.
**p < .01.

TABLE 4

Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Mothers' and Fathers' Family Interaction Variables in the Humanistic Group

Mothers' variables	Fathers' variables											
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Elicits child's view (A)	53	-82*	33	-35	20	03	17	44	-18	-60	26	27
Gives information (B)	-56	73*	33	79*	-36	-15	15	27	-10	-10	-59	06
Gives expectations (C)	27	-06	-36	-01	-26	84**	-31	-06	-25	-13	42	-48
Explains (D)	00	56	-25	53	-79*	17	-14	21	-52	34	-36	-63
Shows disappointment (E)	-10	-08	-51	-22	77*	-22	29	-82*	68	-20	20	26
Gives alternatives (F)	-02	-22	14	-14	-01	83**	-39	31	-28	-04	45	18
Uses power assertion (G)	46	-15	-27	34	21	-24	-35	-56	-10	-23	34	-34
Shows positive feeling (H)	-48	49	17	65	05	-41	35	07	07	-23	-52	33
Shows negative feeling (I)	-06	11	-44	-46	24	-36	-17	-68	42	79*	10	-16
Gives irrelevant information (J)	-30	41	-01	-30	-30	-15	-25	-11	15	96**	-20	-22
Reflects feeling (K)	-14	20	-50	39	39	-25	39	-47	24	-35	-15	16
Moralizes (L)	08	10	-50	-14	34	-40	-23	-87**	38	44	23	-27

N = 8.
*p < .05.
**p < .01.

TABLE 5

Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Mothers' and Fathers' Family Interaction Variables in the Conventional Group

Mothers' variables		Fathers' variables											
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Elicits child's view	(A)	24	44	-27	-12	09	-08	24	01	-69*	-74*	02	-21
Gives Information	(B)	-10	-15	04	12	-26	13	-22	-09	47	85**	-21	-28
Gives expectations	(C)	-29	-17	39	-01	58	25	-29	56	-36	-59	45	58
Explains	(D)	49	-52	-36	70*	01	03	22	-42	17	-17	11	10
Shows disappointment	(E)	-17	-13	09	08	81**	03	09	38	-40	-62	40	42
Gives alternatives	(F)	-30	71*	32	-47	32	-18	-21	53	-89**	-63	-09	-24
Uses power assertion	(G)	04	-30	-17	38	-11	-02	20	-30	52	67*	-16	-28
Shows positive feeling	(H)	-35	03	59	-01	-10	-10	-04	26	-08	-35	10	02
Shows negative feeling	(I)	-12	-06	10	-45	-08	-12	04	-04	36	11	07	50
Gives irrelevant information	(J)	-09	-30	-07	-16	-09	19	14	-10	61	51	07	44
Reflects feeling	(K)	36	-42	-04	11	-07	-08	-25	-24	20	-29	17	64
Moralizes	(L)	-60	-10	53	-23	69*	04	-20	61	-06	-05	17	54

N = 9.
*p < .05.
**p < .01.

TABLE 6

Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Mothers' and Children's Family Interaction Variables in the Humanistic Group

Mothers' variables	Children's variables								
	Requests information	Gives information	Gives reasons	Confesses	Denies	Suggests discipline, restores situation	Refuses to commit self	Minimizes, rationalizes	Shows highly emotional response
Elicits child's view	-67	-13	65	-12	-39	32	09	-14	-54
Gives information	22	42	-36	20	82*	-35	-61	-26	-30
Gives expectations	16	-32	-18	-49	-48	-07	00	80*	-16
Explains	31	-01	-22	-13	29	-07	-43	25	05
Shows disappointment	-02	55	-48	36	-19	-47	30	-24	20
Gives alternatives	07	-63	22	-45	-38	54	-36	63	-25
Uses power assertion	-35	36	-67	62	34	-32	52	-24	-02
Shows positive feeling	-04	67	-36	50	76*	-30	-62	-59	-30
Shows negative feeling	40	-15	-16	14	-19	01	67	-02	96**
Gives irrelevant information	66	-49	14	-25	-04	17	36	22	86**
Reflects feeling	-15	84**	-62	55	27	-46	-39	-43	-18
Moralizes	18	18	-55	44	06	-27	73*	-16	71*

N = 8.
*p < .05.
**p < .01.

TABLE 7

Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Mothers' and Children's Family Interaction Variables in the Conventional Group

Mothers' variables	Children's variables								
	Requests information	Gives information	Gives reasons	Confesses	Denies	Suggests discipline, restores situation	Refuses to commit self	Minimizes, rationalizes	Shows highly emotional response
Elicits child's view	-76*	74*	-40	-66	48	30	09	-71*	-24
Gives information	82**	-63	40	42	-63	-07	-26	93**	-04
Gives expectations	-60	42	-14	-20	47	-23	25	-77*	04
Explains	-19	-48	07	60	41	86**	53	22	-57
Shows disappointment	-52	36	-52	-24	72*	04	00	-54	00
Gives alternatives	-61	74*	-05	-74*	22	-29	-18	-56	-23
Uses power assertion	70*	-66	16	50	-36	26	-28	92**	-10
Shows positive feeling	-37	15	61	24	-17	-35	06	-34	-11
Shows negative feeling	18	07	-26	-08	-06	-60	-03	-33	86**
Gives irrelevant information	50	01	-43	-20	-29	-41	-16	-13	95**
Reflects feeling	-29	-45	17	63	47	22	84**	-18	-11
Moralizes	03	22	-26	-36	09	-61	-23	-34	50

$N = 9$.
*$p < .05$.
**$p < .01$.

TABLE 8

Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Fathers' and Children's Family Interaction Variables in the Humanistic Group

Father's variables	Children's variables								
	Requests information	Gives information	Gives reasons	Confesses	Denies	Suggests discipline, restores situation	Refuses to commit self	Minimizes, rationalizes	Shows highly emotional response
Elicits child's view	-75*	-01	01	31	-17	29	21	-08	-24
Gives information	76*	21	-41	-13	50	-56	-18	10	28
Gives expectations	05	-39	47	-33	25	22	-13	06	-38
Explains	-15	43	-57	44	86**	-26	-47	-22	-44
Shows disappointment	-27	15	-06	35	-32	16	19	-29	12
Gives alternatives	23	-60	-02	-63	-42	11	-01	90**	-28
Uses power assertion	-02	62	33	-09	-16	-43	-32	-45	-14
Shows positive feeling	-18	-29	67	-38	14	34	-53	03	-58
Shows negative feeling	51	17	-01	-22	-36	-46	34	01	43
Gives irrelevant information	60	-39	-01	-06	02	24	26	12	90**
Reflects feeling	-32	-46	-19	10	-36	42	42	38	-03
Moralizes	-12	01	42	02	-14	31	-30	-33	-13

N = 8.
*p < .05.
**p < .01.

TABLE 9

Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Fathers' and Children's Family Interaction Variables in the Conventional Group

Fathers' variables	Children's variables								
	Requests information	Gives information	Gives reasons	Confesses	Denies	Suggests discipline, restores situation	Refuses to commit self	Minimizes, rationalizes	Shows highly emotional response
Elicits child's view	-05	-40	-34	31	48	67*	73*	09	-08
Gives information	-27	45	35	-52	-23	-35	-16	-13	-23
Gives expectations	-11	26	61	-18	-43	-66	-41	-14	-07
Explains	-02	-13	-12	27	09	62	-10	12	-28
Shows disappointment	-25	28	-33	-17	38	-07	-30	-29	-04
Gives alternatives	06	20	-28	15	09	-01	-28	-04	-02
Uses power assertion	-01	13	-30	-26	-08	44	-22	-12	17
Shows positive feeling	-25	54	21	-30	-11	-59	-54	-28	-15
Shows negative feeling	76*	-70*	-16	48	-28	09	10	48	60
Gives irrelevant information	98**	-56	02	26	-64	-18	-30	77*	46
Reflects feeling	-21	21	-36	28	44	-02	-11	-27	-03
Moralizes	02	-32	-46	30	53	-04	51	-27	50

N = 9.
*$p < .05$.
**$p < .01$.

APPENDIX J

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN ATTRIBUTE PREFERENCES AND FAMILY INTERACTION VARIABLES

TABLE 1

Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Attribute Preferences for a Boy and Mothers' Family Interaction Variables

Mothers' family interaction variables	Attribute preferences for a boy					
	Humanistic group			Conventional group		
	Mother	Father	Child	Mother	Father	Child
Elicits child's view	-28	-31	-09	-14	05	-13
Gives information	-22	-30	75*	-02	-11	-07
Gives expectations	52	53	-54	20	-17	05
Explains	16	44	20	32	17	22
Shows disappointment	-05	-18	-52	-42	-32	26
Gives alternatives	85**	32	-29	-41	-23	-08
Uses power assertion	-41	-60	02	-18	03	24
Shows positive feeling	-28	-52	59	69*	68*	53
Shows negative feeling	10	32	-35	-03	00	-10
Gives irrelevant information	19	57	05	00	-10	-28
Reflects feeling	-07	-31	-14	46	-01	-06
Moralizes	-14	-07	-26	-42	-47	04

N = 8 for humanistic group and N = 9 for conventional group.
*$p < .05$.
**$p < .01$.

TABLE 2

Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Attribute Preferences for a Boy and Fathers' Family Interaction Variables

Fathers' family interaction variables	Attribute preferences for a boy					
	Humanistic group			Conventional group		
	Mother	Father	Child	Mother	Father	Child
Elicits child's view	-13	-25	-28	-01	-19	-59
Gives information	-12	30	44	-28	02	-24
Gives expectations	-16	-27	68	12	23	53
Explains	-28	-46	65	36	37	57
Shows disappointment	24	-33	-51	-26	-27	45
Gives alternatives	63	37	-31	41	-05	04
Uses power assertion	-46	12	-04	-04	53	45
Shows positive feeling	-13	-04	57	03	-05	39
Shows negative feeling	-02	25	-34	11	02	-06
Gives irrelevant information	32	51	-03	-10	-17	-23
Reflects feeling	52	-18	-51	36	-05	21
Moralizes	20	-25	-01	-03	-46	-21

N = 8 for humanistic group and N = 9 for conventional group.
*p < .05.
**p < .01.

TABLE 3

Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Attribute Preferences for a Boy and Children's Family Interaction Variables

Children's family interaction variables	Attribute preferences for a boy					
	Humanistic group			Conventional group		
	Mother	Father	Child	Mother	Father	Child
Requests information	25	68	00	-23	-23	20
Gives information	-58	-40	11	06	26	19
Gives reasons	-01	25	02	40	42	30
Confesses	-24	-74*	18	38	03	11
Denies	-38	-60	84**	-15	-38	-15
Suggests discipline, restores situation	53	-10	-03	08	09	-01
Refuses to commit self	-16	11	-33	16	-25	-47
Minimizes, rationalizes	53	64	-34	-18	-15	-05
Shows highly emotional response	22	48	-30	-23	-21	-26

N = 8 for humanistic group and N = 9 for conventional group.
*$p < .05$.
**$p < .01$.

TABLE 4

Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Attribute Preferences for a Girl and Mothers' Family Interaction Variables

Mothers' family interaction variables	Attribute preferences for a girl					
	Humanistic group			Conventional group		
	Mother	Father	Child	Mother	Father	Child
Elicits child's view	-10	-42	-07	-18	01	-36
Gives information	-32	-31	24	09	-02	-09
Gives expectations	49	66	-64	09	-21	11
Explains	-02	56	-22	51	03	16
Shows disappointment	-16	-29	-24	-42	-14	23
Gives alternatives	86**	46	-17	-41	-02	-29
Uses power assertion	-38	-40	-48	00	17	17
Shows positive feeling	-44	-60	19	67*	55	70*
Shows negative feeling	08	38	20	-28	-08	30
Gives irrelevant information	24	64	52	-25	-20	-12
Reflects feeling	-36	-39	-40	44	-26	32
Moralizes	-16	04	-09	-51	-21	09

N = 8 for humanistic group and N = 9 for conventional group.
*p < .05.
**p < .01.

TABLE 5

Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Attribute Preferences for a Girl and Fathers' Family Interaction Variables

Fathers' family interaction variables	Attribute preferences for a girl					
	Humanistic group			Conventional group		
	Mother	Father	Child	Mother	Father	Child
Elicits child's view	-16	-07	-71*	-05	-49	-38
Gives information	-18	26	34	-26	14	-33
Gives expectations	13	-31	65	20	49	42
Explains	-40	-29	-29	50	35	27
Shows disappointment	20	-39	-04	-20	-01	27
Gives alternatives	75*	52	-30	28	-22	05
Uses power assertion	-57	-32	25	04	58	12
Shows positive feeling	00	-12	34	04	18	24
Shows negative feeling	02	-02	43	05	-09	14
Gives irrelevant information	27	62	41	-14	-14	-17
Reflects feeling	61	11	-51	23	-22	38
Moralizes	22	-45	52	-18	-57	16

N = 8 for humanistic group and N = 9 for conventional group.
*$p < .05$.
**$p < .01$.

TABLE 6

Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Attribute Preferences for a Girl and Children's Family Interaction Variables

Children's family interaction variables	Attribute preferences for a girl					
	Humanistic group			Conventional group		
	Mother	Father	Child	Mother	Father	Child
Requests information	31	64	46	-25	-15	-10
Gives information	-81*	-58	-25	-03	30	-10
Gives reasons	13	03	50	56	47	28
Confesses	-44	-60	-28	43	-15	50
Denies	-45	-46	13	-18	-49	03
Suggests discipline, restores situation	54	08	11	23	-05	-21
Refuses to commit self	06	19	00	13	-51	-16
Minimizes, rationalizes	70	76*	-15	-03	-04	-02
Shows highly emotional response	17	52	32	-46	-23	-03

N = 8 for humanistic group and N = 9 for conventional group.
*p < .05.
**p < .01.

APPENDIX K

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN FAMILY INTERACTION VARIABLES AND SUBJECT VARIABLES

TABLE 1

Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Mothers' Family Interaction Variables and Child's Intelligence Quotient and Child's Ordinal Position

Mothers' family interaction variables	Humanistic group		Conventional group	
	Child's intelligence quotient	Child's ordinal position	Child's intelligence quotient	Child's ordinal position
Elicits child's view	-34	05	-28	-13
Gives information	38	-42	08	31
Gives expectations	-48	63	01	-38
Explains	-31	-01	08	-24
Shows disappointment	59	-19	-50	-13
Gives alternatives	-73*	81*	-49	35
Uses power assertion	53	-10	-02	25
Shows positive feeling	41	-58	64	-10
Shows negative feeling	11	00	21	-15
Gives irrelevant information	-15	09	35	-43
Reflects feeling	40	-41	18	-22
Moralizes	49	-10	-21	00

N = 8 for humanistic group and N = 9 for conventional group.
*$p < .05$.
**$p < .01$.

TABLE 2

Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Fathers' Family Interaction Variables and Child's Intelligence Quotient and Child's Ordinal Position

Fathers' family interaction variables	Humanistic group		Conventional group	
	Child's intelligence quotient	Child's ordinal position	Child's intelligence quotient	Child's ordinal position
Elicits child's view	-43	16	-24	-08
Gives information	48	-34	-29	70*
Gives expectations	05	08	29	26
Explains	23	-27	38	-61
Shows disappointment	17	11	-27	-26
Gives alternatives	-22	83**	06	-65
Uses power assertion	11	-75*	41	-33
Shows positive feeling	-46	-02	-07	02
Shows negative feeling	57	-20	42	-30
Gives irrelevant information	-19	11	16	06
Reflects feeling	-12	80*	-06	-64
Moralizes	-04	-04	-08	-40

N = 8 for humanistic group and N = 9 for conventional group.
*$p < .05$.
**$p < .01$.

TABLE 3

Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Child's Family Interaction Variables and Child's Intelligence Quotient and Child's Ordinal Position

Children's family interaction variables	Humanistic group		Conventional group	
	Child's intelligence quotient	Child's ordinal position	Child's intelligence quotient	Child's ordinal position
Requests information	38	11	09	15
Gives information	44	-80*	03	-22
Gives reasons	-63	01	36	50
Confesses	11	-37	09	-04
Denies	32	-42	-53	-42
Suggests discipline, restores situation	-81*	50	-06	-30
Refuses to commit self	36	21	-12	-04
Minimizes, rationalizes	01	76*	-10	42
Shows highly emotional response	04	03	17	-24

N = 8 for humanistic group and N = 9 for conventional group.
*p < .05.
**p < .01.

TABLE 4

Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Mothers' Family Interaction Variables and Fathers' Education and Occupation and Mothers' Education

Mothers' family interaction variables	Humanistic group			Conventional group		
	Father's education	Father's occupation	Mother's education	Father's education	Father's occupation	Mother's education
Elicits child's view	-67	-36	-18	-32	-22	-13
Gives information	28	-34	25	05	03	-18
Gives expectations	20	15	-36	-05	22	40
Explains	56	28	06	-10	41	37
Shows disappointment	-39	-34	-32	-52	-37	08
Gives alternatives	48	17	29	-62	-55	-30
Uses power assertion	-18	-39	-10	-09	-13	-19
Shows positive feeling	05	-57	29	46	54	79*
Shows negative feeling	20	66	03	58	00	06
Gives irrelevant information	52	93**	20	64	09	-16
Reflects feeling	-16	-64	-10	28	58	57
Moralizes	04	24	-07	-23	-39	-17

N = 8 for humanistic group and N = 9 for conventional group.
*p < .05.
**p < .01.

TABLE 5

Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Fathers' Family Interaction Variables and Fathers' Education and Occupation and Mothers' Education

Fathers' family interaction variables	Humanistic group			Conventional group		
	Father's education	Father's occupation	Mother's education	Father's education	Father's occupation	Mother's education
Elicits child's view	-22	-24	-08	14	15	-04
Gives information	39	26	-06	-31	-48	-44
Gives expectations	01	-03	28	-14	-07	24
Explains	29	-48	23	01	39	29
Shows disappointment	-27	-28	13	-49	-21	13
Gives alternatives	29	15	-12	25	53	58
Uses power assertion	-68	-29	-49	09	-13	-30
Shows positive feeling	-02	-08	18	-30	-07	31
Shows negative feeling	-34	16	-38	59	26	-06
Gives irrelevant information	64	87**	34	34	-01	-31
Reflects feeling	16	-02	19	20	50	79*
Moralizes	-19	-22	32	22	19	27

N = 8 for humanistic group and N = 9 for conventional group.
*p < .05.
**p < .01.

TABLE 6

Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Child's Family Interaction Variables and Fathers' Education and Occupation and Mothers' Education

Children's family interaction variables	Humanistic group			Conventional group		
	Father's education	Father's occupation	Mother's education	Father's education	Father's occuptation	Mother's education
Requests information	41	69	-17	27	-13	-36
Gives information	-47	-68	-29	-12	-11	03
Gives reasons	-29	24	01	03	22	25
Confesses	04	-51	45	31	54	61
Denies	33	-34	47	-30	02	34
Suggests discipline, restores situation	41	22	74*	-19	17	00
Refuses to commit self	-19	40	-34	08	29	20
Minimizes, rationalizes	32	50	-28	-06	-11	-23
Shows highly emotional response	35	78*	08	50	-14	-27

N = 8 for humanistic group and N = 9 for conventional group.
*p < .05.
**p < .01.

APPENDIX L

RESPONSE FREQUENCIES OF FAMILY INTERACTION VARIABLES

TABLE 1

Response Frequencies of Family Interaction Variables[a] of Fathers in the Humanistic Group

Variable	Subject							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Elicits child's view	31	36	61	12	42	63	26	28
Gives information	22	15	10	16	06	06	15	19
Gives expectations	08	06	03	05	11	04	16	05
Explains	28	13	13	06	10	09	10	08
Shows disappointment	00	01	00	04	04	04	00	00
Gives alternatives	00	12	00	00	04	02	03	01
Uses power assertion	01	00	03	04	00	00	02	00
Shows positive feeling	06	06	10	02	10	00	13	04
Shows negative feeling	02	06	00	26	03	10	12	11
Gives irrelevant information	02	00	00	02	02	00	00	23
Reflects feeling	00	01	00	00	01	02	00	00
Moralizes	00	00	00	07	07	00	03	00
Total frequency of response	63	77	31	116	72	57	47	127

[a]Data in % of total frequency of response of subject for all family interaction situations.

TABLE 2

Response Frequencies of Family Interaction Variables[a] of Fathers in the Conventional Group

Variable	Subject								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Elicits child's view	33	41	18	00	32	43	26	31	50
Gives information	17	15	12	41	16	06	10	17	50
Gives expectations	06	09	11	30	07	07	09	08	00
Explains	23	13	17	07	17	15	08	15	00
Shows disappointment	04	05	10	04	02	02	04	02	00
Gives alternatives	00	00	05	00	05	02	01	02	00
Uses power assertion	08	00	00	00	01	01	03	01	00
Shows positive feeling	00	04	18	18	07	01	03	02	00
Shows negative feeling	08	06	01	00	08	12	19	15	00
Gives irrelevant information	00	00	00	00	01	00	02	03	00
Reflects feeling	00	00	06	00	03	04	01	00	00
Moralizes	00	06	04	00	01	06	07	00	00
Total frequency of response	24	39	51	22	81	81	145	101	04

[a]Data in % of total frequency of response of subject for all family interaction situations.

TABLE 3

Response Frequencies of Family Interaction Variables[a] of Mothers in the Humanistic Group

Variable	Subject							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Elicits child's view	19	30	49	30	48	47	52	17
Gives information	28	14	11	16	13	05	16	12
Gives expectations	04	21	10	04	05	08	04	07
Explains	14	14	14	09	10	08	10	14
Shows disappointment	03	03	01	09	02	08	00	01
Gives alternatives	02	10	03	02	08	01	03	04
Uses power assertion	02	00	00	00	00	02	00	00
Shows positive feeling	20	04	06	14	10	02	07	04
Shows negative feeling	03	02	03	08	03	10	03	15
Gives irrelevant information	00	00	00	01	00	00	06	25
Reflects feeling	04	02	02	04	02	02	00	01
Moralizes	01	00	00	01	00	02	00	01
Total frequency of response	67	96	46	59	31	120	35	78

[a]Data in % of total frequency of response of subject for all family interaction situations.

TABLE 4

Response Frequencies of Family Interaction Variables[a] of Mothers in the Conventional Group

Variable	Subject								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Elicits child's view	53	38	44	29	38	21	20	00	61
Gives information	04	11	08	16	26	10	16	71	04
Gives expectations	04	11	10	09	08	08	08	00	04
Explains	16	16	12	07	12	18	06	14	09
Shows disappointment	06	07	12	05	00	05	05	00	04
Gives alternatives	03	04	05	06	02	00	02	00	06
Uses power assertion	05	00	03	00	00	03	02	14	00
Shows positive feeling	05	02	01	16	07	16	04	00	02
Shows negative feeling	03	02	04	08	03	10	20	00	07
Gives irrelevant information	00	00	00	00	02	00	05	00	00
Reflects feeling	00	07	00	01	02	10	02	00	00
Moralizes	00	02	03	02	00	00	03	00	00
Total frequency of response	56	50	39	43	49	31	67	07	69

[a]Data in % of total frequency of response of subject for all family interaction situations.

TABLE 5

Response Frequencies of Family Interaction Variables[a] of Children in the Humanistic Group

Variable	Subject							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Requests information	04	07	00	06	00	01	06	09
Gives information	77	49	70	76	49	62	51	46
Gives reasons	00	04	08	05	08	03	10	06
Confesses	04	00	02	02	03	03	00	02
Denies	14	00	02	02	04	02	04	04
Suggests discipline, restores situation	02	06	10	01	24	06	06	12
Refuses to commit self	00	02	00	02	00	08	04	04
Minimizes, rationalizes	00	23	01	02	03	06	10	11
Shows a highly emotional response	00	00	00	02	00	01	00	04
Total frequency of response	26	122	47	99	36	112	55	99

[a]Data in % of total frequency of response of subject for all family interaction situations.

TABLE 6

Response Frequencies of Family Interaction Variables[a] of Children in the Conventional Group

Variable	Subject								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Requests information	00	00	00	00	01	00	04	06	00
Gives information	74	56	79	79	76	52	62	40	74
Gives reasons	03	04	01	08	04	05	01	06	03
Confesses	00	02	01	00	01	08	01	05	00
Denies	02	03	03	00	01	03	01	00	02
Suggests discipline, restores situation	20	16	10	00	12	13	04	12	11
Refuses to commit self	02	08	00	00	02	07	02	01	04
Minimizes, rationalizes	01	01	00	00	01	03	02	23	01
Shows a highly emotional response	00	00	00	00	01	00	18	00	01
Total frequency of response	66	54	35	12	79	57	112	83	47

[a]Data in % of total frequency of response of subject for all family interaction situations.

APPENDIX M

RAW SCORES FOR ATTRIBUTE PREFERENCES

TABLE 1

Raw Scores for
Attribute Preferences for a Boy
in the Humanistic Group[a]

Subject	Family Member		
	Mother	Father	Child
1	9	7	23
2	25	29	7
3	10	22	11
4	15	21	8
5	23	9	14
6	11	11	7
7	7	19	20
8	20	31	12

[a]Possible range of scores from 1 to 43, where 1 represents the highest possible conventional score and 43 represents the highest possible expressive score.

TABLE 2

Raw Scores for
Attribute Preferences for a Boy
in the Conventional Group[a]

Subject	Family Member		
	Mother	Father	Child
1	18	30	16
2	13	7	6
3	13	11	13
4	21	25	15
5	34	24	8
6	32	25	13
7	13	14	8
8	14	15	10
9	11	14	4

[a]Possible range of scores from 1 to 43, where 1 represents the highest possible conventional score and 43 represents the highest possible expressive score.

TABLE 3

Raw Scores for
Attribute Preferences for a Girl
in the Humanistic Group[a]

Subject	Family Member		
	Mother	Father	Child
1	9	7	10
2	25	29	7
3	9	16	8
4	14	11	13
5	23	9	12
6	14	11	7
7	14	12	16
8	20	31	14

[a]Possible range of scores from 1 to 43, where 1 represents the highest possible conventional score and 43 represents the highest possible expressive score.

TABLE 4

Raw Scores for
Attribute Preferences for a Girl
in the Conventional Group[a]

Subject	Family Member		
	Mother	Father	Child
1	20	29	12
2	13	5	5
3	11	11	13
4	21	27	15
5	30	15	6
6	30	16	20
7	6	11	11
8	16	15	10
9	7	9	5

[a]Possible range of scores from 1 to 43, where 1 represents the highest possible conventional score and 43 represents the highest possible expressive score.

APPENDIX N

CONSCIENCE ORIENTATION SCORES

TABLE 1

Conscience Orientation Scores in the Humanistic Group

Subject	Manner of assessment								
	Moral judgment			Sentence completion			Total response		
	H[a]	C[b]	"E"[c]	H[a]	C[b]	"E"[c]	H[a]	C[b]	"E"[c]
1	09	12	03	15	03	03	24	15	06
2	15	09	00	09	06	00	24	15	00
3	16	08	00	06	15	00	22	23	00
4	12	03	06	12	03	06	24	06	12
5	12	08	04	06	06	06	18	14	10
6	15	09	00	03	09	03	18	24	03
7	13	07	04	06	12	03	19	19	07
8	12	03	03	00	12	06	12	05	09

[a]Humanistic score.
[b]Conventional score.
[c]"Externalized" score.

TABLE 2

Conscience Orientation Scores in the Conventional Group

Subject	Manner of assessment								
	Moral judgment			Sentence completion			Total response		
	H[a]	C[b]	"E"[c]	H[a]	C[b]	"E"[c]	H[a]	C[b]	"E"[c]
1	10	13	01	06	08	07	16	21	08
2	07	11	06	00	09	06	07	20	12
3	07	15	02	09	09	03	16	24	05
4	04	18	02	06	03	09	10	21	11
5	06	15	00	06	09	06	12	24	06
6	06	11	07	03	12	03	09	23	10
7	01	19	04	06	06	09	07	25	13
8	04	17	03	06	00	03	10	17	06
9	04	18	02	00	03	06	04	21	08

[a]Humanistic score.
[b]Conventional score.
[c]"Externalized" score.

APPENDIX O

RAW SCORES OF FAMILY OF "EXTERNALIZED" SUBJECT

TABLE 1

Conscience Orientation Scores of "Externalized" Subject

Manner of assessment								
Moral judgment			Sentence completion			Total response		
H[a]	C[b]	"E"[c]	H[a]	C[b]	"E"[c]	H[a]	C[b]	"E"[c]
04	08	12	06	09	06	10	17	18

[a]Humanistic score.
[b]Conventional score.
[c]"Externalized" score.

TABLE 2

Attribute Preference Scores
for Family of "Externalized" Subject

Family Member					
Mother		Father		Child	
11[a]	(08)[b]	11[a]	(10)[b]	12[a]	(14)[b]

[a]Preferred attributes for a boy.
[b]Preferred attributes for a girl.

TABLE 3

Family Interaction Responses of Parents of "Externalized" Subject[a]

Variable	Mother	Father
Elicits child's view	52	35
Gives information	14	17
Gives expectations	04	07
Explains	10	15
Shows disappointment	08	00
Gives alternatives	00	04
Uses power assertion	00	11
Shows positive feeling	02	00
Shows negative feeling	02	11
Gives irrelevant information	01	00
Reflects feeling	02	00
Moralizes	00	00
Total frequency of response	40	41

[a]Data in % of total frequency of response of subject for all family interaction situations.

TABLE 4

Family Interaction Responses of "Externalized" Child

Variable	Score
Child	
requests information	00
gives information	79
gives reasons	02
confesses	02
denies	00
suggests discipline, restores situation	10
refuses to commit self	00
minimizes, rationalizes	00
shows highly emotional response	00
total frequency of response	41

[a]Data in % of total frequency of response of subject for all family interaction situations.