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ABSTRACT

Adolescents’ perceptions of parental discipline techniques (as well as parental warmth) and the impact of those techniques on the moral self were investigated in the present study. Inductive discipline (relative to power assertion and love withdrawal) was expected to be perceived more favorably by adolescents, and to relate positively to their sense of morality to the self. Participants included 93 male and female fifth, eighth and tenth graders and 35 mothers from Midwestern Ohio. Students completed self-report measures concerning their perceptions of parental discipline techniques, feelings of overall warmth or acceptance/rejection, and moral self-concept. Mothers reported on their parental discipline and warmth. Induction was found to be positively related to adolescents’ evaluations of appropriateness or fairness and overall feelings of acceptance. Adolescents’ positive and guilt-related (vs. negative) emotional responses decreased with greater parental use of power assertion. Induction was positively related to moral self-relevance, especially among adolescents who viewed induction favorably. A major facet of induction, i.e., parental expressions of disappointment, played an important contributory role in this relation of induction to the moral self. These findings highlight the importance of considering adolescents’ cognitive and affective perceptions of
discipline and parental warmth, as well as the contribution of induction (especially parental expressions of disappointment) to the development of the moral self.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

During the past two decades, the socialization literature has seen a resurgence of interest in parental disciplinary strategies and their impact on children’s and adolescents’ prosocial and moral attitudes, values, and behaviors. Crucial to discipline’s impact may be the child’s cognitive and affective perception of the discipline and overall parenting. Accordingly, researchers (e.g., Grusec, 2006, Grusec & Goodnow, 1994; Hoffman, 1994; Kuczynski, Marshall, & Schell, 1997) have increasingly attended to how the child perceives various discipline practices. Encompassed within “perception” have been adolescents’ evaluations of the appropriateness or fairness of parental discipline techniques, emotional reactions toward parental discipline, and even their sense of overall warmth or acceptance by the parent.

Among parental discipline techniques as classified by Hoffman (e.g., Hoffman, 2000), parents’ use of inductions has received particular study (Eisenberg, Fabes, & Spinrad, 2006). “Inductions” typically highlight the consequences for others of the child’s transgression, but may also convey a disappointment and expectation that the child is capable of better conduct. Study of adolescents’ perceptions of discipline techniques may be especially important for understanding induction’s impact in the
socialization process. Inductions may be more likely to be evaluated as fair or appropriate, to be met with positive and moral emotions, and to foster overall feelings of parental warmth or acceptance. Hence, parental inductions may especially contribute to adolescents’ moral self-concept or identity (Gibbs, 2010; Hardy & Carlo, 2005; Pratt, Hunsberger, Pancer & Alisat, 2003).

This introductory chapter reviews pertinent research and theoretical literature concerning parental discipline techniques (especially induction) in socialization; children’s cognitive and affective perceptions of those techniques as well as of overall parental acceptance or rejection; and the relation of inductive discipline in particular to adolescents’ moral self-concept. We conclude with statements of the hypotheses investigated in this dissertation.

Parental Discipline Techniques and Socialization

Hoffman’s widely influential typology of parental discipline techniques features inductive discipline, a key aspect of which is parental expression of disappointment. 

Hoffman’s typology of parental discipline. Parental inductions are often highlighted in Hoffman’s (2000; cf. Hoffman & Saltzstein, 1967) widely accepted classificatory model of parental discipline techniques for their role in fostering moral internalization in children (Eisenberg et al., 2006). Through empathic appeals and explanation, the parent may cultivate the child’s empathic predisposition and thereby promote prosocial behavior. As noted, the typical induction highlights the consequences of the child’s transgression for the victim (typically a peer but also others such as the parent). So-called “other-oriented” induction, according to Hoffman, induces empathy-
based guilt in the child, which with repeated exposure helps the child to internalize parental moral values (Eisenberg et al., 2006; Hoffman, 2000). Inductive discipline has been positively associated with moral reasoning and prosocial behavior in children and adolescents (Carlo, Fabes, Laible, & Kupanoff, 1999; Eisenberg & Valiente, 2002; Janssens and Dekovic, 1997; Janssens & Gerris, 1992; Krevans & Gibbs, 1996; Kuczynski, 1983).

Along with induction, parental love withdrawal and power assertion comprise Hoffman’s typology of discipline techniques. These discipline strategies involve some removal of emotional support (love withdrawal) and threat or use of corporal punishment and/or deprivation of privileges (power assertion). Although potentially helpful at moderate levels in the communication of an induction (arousing concern with parental approval and motivating attention to the parent), both techniques as predominant practices have shown either no relationship or a negative relationship with prosocial behavior and moral reasoning/internalization in children (Eisenberg et al., 2006; Eisenberg & Valiente, 2002; Hoffman & Saltzstein, 1967).

**Role of Parental Expression of Disappointment in Inductive Discipline.** In the context of the use of induction, parents’ expressions of disappointment may be especially important in the socialization process (Bikhazi, 2006; Gibbs, 2010; Janssens & Gerris, 1992; Krevans & Gibbs, 1996). Expressions of disappointment indicate disappointed *expectations*, i.e., convey not only parental disapproval of the child’s transgression but also an implied or expressed reminder to the child that he or she is capable of better behavior or a higher moral standard (Gibbs, 2010; Hoffman, 1963; Krevans & Gibbs,
Parental expression of disappointment has traditionally been regarded as a facet of inductive discipline (Hoffman, 2000). Yet Hoffman (1963; personal communication, February 24, 2007) also characterized the technique as not only conveying the hurt felt by the parent, but also the parent’s confidence that the child can live up to a character ideal. This latter aspect of the technique may entail a socialization influence process not entirely reducible to other-oriented induction (Patrick & Gibbs, 2007).

Krevans & Gibbs (1996; cf. Janssens & Gerris, 1992) found that parent-reported use of statements of parental disappointment (relative to traditional other-oriented induction statements) mostly accounted for the relation of induction to adolescent prosocial behavior. Indeed, other-oriented induction with adolescents may even be counter-productive. Parents who participated in Krevans and Gibbs’ study often suggested that pointing out how their preadolescents’ or early adolescents’ transgression affected others would have been demeaning or alienating: Their adolescents were already aware of how a transgression of theirs had harmed another and would have felt hurt, scolded, or “talked down to” by an explicit description (J. Krevans, personal communication, December 30, 2002).

Insofar as they attribute to the child an ability to attain a higher standard of conduct, expressions of disappointed expectations are theoretically distinct from ego attacks that chastise the child for poor performance (Hoffman, 1963). Ego attacks, as tactics to trigger feelings of shame in the child, may reflect love withdrawal. In contrast, the parental disappointment message does not convey removal of emotional support or
parental rejection. Bikhazi (2006) found that parental expressions of disappointment are negatively associated with aggression. In contrast, ego attacks were positively related to aggression in children.

**Perceptions of the Discipline Techniques and of Parental Acceptance**

Crucial to the socialization impact of parental discipline techniques is the child’s perception of (or reaction to) those techniques. Adolescents’ (and preadolescents’) cognitive and affective perceptions of induction and other discipline techniques entail evaluations of appropriateness or fairness as well as emotional responses (such as anger or guilt). Adolescents’ sense of overall acceptance or rejection by the parent (typically the mother) will also be reviewed.

**Perceived Appropriateness of Discipline.** Induction and other discipline techniques have been studied in terms of children’s cognitive perception of their appropriateness or fairness. Grusec & Goodnow (1994) proposed that children’s and adolescents’ evaluations of the *appropriateness* of a discipline technique could affect whether parental messages are accepted and thereby internalized (Bugental & Grusec, 2006; Eisenberg et al., 2006).

Children’s and adolescents’ perceived appropriateness of various discipline styles differ across age. Interestingly, young children (preschool and younger primary school students) have evaluated power assertion and love withdrawal as comparable in appropriateness and even preferable to inductive discipline (Barnett, Quackenbush, & Sinisi, 1996; Paikoff, Collins, & Laursen, 1988; Siegal & Cowen, 1984). Young children may relate better to more concrete demonstrations of discipline, as opposed to discipline
that requires more advanced verbal reasoning capabilities and perspective taking skills (Barnett et al., 1996; Horton, Ray, & Cohen, 2001; Peterson, 2005). Older children and adolescents rate induction as more appropriate when compared to love withdrawal or power assertion techniques. Adolescents viewed parental discipline less fairly or favorably when power assertion (spanking, withdrawal of privileges) and love withdrawal (ego attacks, isolation) were used in fictional stories of parent-child conflict and wrongdoing (e.g., teasing others, disobeying one’s parent). Instead, it was parental use of reasoning and other-oriented induction that was favored (Barnett et al., 1996; Paikoff et al., 1988). In another study, parents’ yelling in response to a transgression such as lying was evaluated as less appropriate than parental reasoning (Padilla-Walker & Carlo, 2004).

Starting in the early adolescent years, parent-child encounters often entail the adolescent’s expectations of social mutuality; such expectations may contribute to a more positive appraisal of the inductive approach (Gibbs, 2010; Gibbs, Basinger, Grime, & Snarey, 2007; Holmbeck, Paikoff, & Brooks-Gunn, 1995; Paikoff, et al., 1988). Parental inductions seem to convey to the adolescent a sense that he or she is capable of making good choices and behaving appropriately (Peterson, 2005); this may be especially true of parental expressions of disappointment.

The child’s perception of inductive discipline as appropriate may imply that he or she understands and accepts its use; acceptance, in turn, should promote the internalization process (Buck, Vittrup & Holden, 2007; Grusec & Goodnow, 1994). In particular, if parental expressions of disappointment are perceived as appropriate, the
adolescent may be more open to reflecting on not only their parent’s disappointment but also their own shortcomings with respect to living up to a character-ideal. In short, induction may foster moral self-relevance.

By the same token, discipline practices (e.g., power assertion, love withdrawal) that are more likely to be viewed as inappropriate or unfair may hinder moral internalization, especially when used as the predominant form of discipline in the household. In this connection, it should be noted that parental discipline techniques generally share elements of induction, power assertion, and love withdrawal; otherwise negative elements can play a supportive secondary role (Hoffman, 1980). Inductive discipline which is at times reinforced by power assertive techniques has been reported as an appropriate form of discipline by children and adolescents (Siegal & Cowen, 1984). Hoffman (2000) suggests that some children may be more inclined to “stop, attend, and process inductive messages,” if the messages are made more salient with the occasional use of power assertion. In other words, some “pressure” is sometimes needed to carry out an effective induction (p. 153).

Despite this heterogeneity of elements in the discipline encounter, a dominant theme is typically identifiable. Accordingly, the present study focused on perceptions of the discipline strategy most frequently used (primary or dominant technique) by their own mothers in hypothetical discipline encounters.

**Emotional Responses to Discipline.** Of increasing interest to researchers is the affective perception or emotional reaction of children and adolescents to various discipline techniques. These reactions can lead to the child’s experience of emotions
such as guilt. Hoffman (1980) suggested that parental induction can help to promote empathy in the offending child toward a victim or hurt other. Children who feel the resulting empathic distress and who also recognize their causal role and ability to make better decisions may experience an “affectively unpleasant and cognitive self-blaming,” or guilt response (p. 312). Although guilt has traditionally been conceptualized in negative terms, empathy-based guilt is also considered a moral emotion that is important to the internalization of values. In fact, guilt is related to prosocial motives and behavior (Baumeister, Stillwell, & Heatherton, 1994; Hoffman, 2000), especially among highly empathic adolescents (Krevans & Gibbs, 1996). Studies have also found that children’s positive emotion or mood is associated with helping behaviors (Carlson, Charlin & Miller, 1988, as cited in Eisenberg 2000). Inductive discipline has been associated with positive and guilt emotions in children and adolescents, compared to power assertion and love withdrawal which tend to elicit negative emotions, such as anger (Padilla-Walker, 2008; Padilla-Walker & Carlo, 2004; Tagney & Dearning, 2002).

Feeling a positive and guilt-related response to induction may better focus the child toward the parental message and increase acceptance of it, thereby promoting the internalization of values (Grusec & Goodnow, 1994; Padilla-Walker 2008). Hoffman (2000) suggested that the frequent use of power assertive and love-withdrawal techniques may elicit anger and fear of punishment or invoke fear of reduction/loss of parental love, thereby directing the child toward more self-oriented concerns and away from the consequences of their actions for the victim. With induction, however, the child is encouraged to think about how their misbehavior hurt another person in a less coercive
atmosphere, which should reduce anger and resentment in the child (Strayer, 2004). Also, the likelihood of experiencing positive and moral emotion may increase if the child perceives discipline as appropriate or reasonable. Padilla-Walker (2008) found that when parenting practices (including power assertion) were perceived as appropriate, adolescents tended to experience positive and guilt-related reactions.

Researchers have also found that as children grow older, guilt-related experiences become more “internalized and self-relevant” (Tagney & Dearing, 2002, p. 142). It is possible that if a child or adolescent responds to parental expressions of disappointment with positive or guilty emotion, this may increase his/her propensity to reflect upon the importance of morality to the self.

**Perceived parental acceptance-rejection.** Adolescents’ perceptions of parental discipline extend to its emotional context (Collins, Madsen, & Susman-Stillman, 2002; Eisenberg & Valiente, 2002; Holmbeck et al., 1995), which includes the adolescents’ overall feelings of perceived parental warmth/acceptance and rejection. Parental warmth in general has been found to be positively related to “self-esteem, identity formation, prosocial behavior,” and reduced psychological and behavioral difficulties among adolescents (Holmbeck et al., 1995, p. 102; Peterson, 2005). Similarly, adolescents who have a close attachment to their parents report increased empathy, perspective taking and helping behaviors (Eisenberg et al., 2006).

Nonetheless, other researchers have found mixed or no support for a positive association between parental warmth and positive outcomes such as prosocial values and behavior. Of crucial importance may be whether warm or accepting parents also use
authoritative parenting or inductive discipline (Eisenberg & Valiente, 2002; Eisenberg et al., 2006). Janssens & Dekovic (1997) found that parental support (“warmth, nurturance, and responsiveness”) and authoritative parenting practices (e.g., reasoning) were related to children’s prosocial behavior/reasoning, whereas lack of support and more controlling or power assertive techniques were not. Moreover, Pratt et al. (2003) found that warmth and “strictness,” which comprise the authoritative discipline style, were both influential in predicting the similarity of values between adolescents and parents. This study examined adolescents’ views of discipline in the context of perceived parental “acceptance,” i.e., “warmth, affection, care, comfort, concern, nurturance, support, or simply love” (Rohner, 2004, p. 831).

Hoffman suggested that nurturance or warmth fosters the child’s receptivity to parental inductive practices (Gibbs, 2010; Hillaker, Brophy-Herb, Villarruel, & Haas, 2008; Knafo & Schwartz, 2003) and hence the effectiveness of the parent’s message (Grusec & Goodnow, 1994). Inductive discipline or authoritative parenting can lose effectiveness when both the child and parent feel that the relationship is unstable and unrewarding; “the success of these techniques requires mutual trust and caring” (Bretherton, Golby, & Cho, 1997, p.128). Thus, parental induction may not promote internalization or facilitate a moral self unless the child generally feels accepted or loved by the parent.

The absence of parental warmth may build up children’s feelings of perceived parental rejection. Authoritarian parenting (especially corporal punishment) has been associated with psychological maladjustment, aggressiveness, and other behavioral
problems (Rohner, Kean, & Cournoyer, 1991; Rubin & Burgess, 2002). However, Mcloyd & Smith (2002) found that parents’ use of corporal punishment when used in the “context of high emotional support” (vs. low) was not associated with behavioral problems in children (p. 50). Additionally, feelings of rejection may subside when corporal punishment is not perceived as harsh or inappropriate (Erkman & Rohner, 2006; Rohner, Bourque, & Elordi, 1996; Rohner et al., 1991).

The insecure bond or lack of emotional attachment between the parent and child resulting from parental rejection can impede the transmission of moral values (Simons, Robertson, & Downs, 1989). Consequently, it is important to consider the adolescent’s overall perception of parenting strategies against the background of feelings of parental acceptance and rejection.

**Induction and the Moral Self**

A key feature of how perceived discipline relates to the internalization of moral values is the impact of the particular discipline technique upon the adolescent’s sense of self. Inductions may be especially important in promoting the relevance or centrality of morality to the child’s self-concept. Moral self-relevance or moral identity pertains to individual differences in the degree to which individuals perceive moral qualities (e.g., honest, fair, generous) as very or centrally important to their sense of self or self-concept (Gibbs, 2010; Hardy, 2006; Moshman, 2005). A strong moral identity may encourage individuals to abide by their own moral code and to be accountable for one’s actions (Hardy & Carlo, 2005). Moral exemplars and other individuals high in moral self-relevance are likely to evidence relatively high levels of prosocial behavior such as
community service, or reduced levels of antisocial behavior (Aquino & Reed, 2002; Barriga, Morrison, Liau, & Gibbs, 2001; Colby & Damon, 1993; Hardy, 2006; Hardy & Carlo, 2005; Hart, Atkins, & Donnelly, 2006; Pratt et al., 2003).

Inductions may be particularly effective in inculcating the moral self as children reach and enter adolescence. Adolescents who perceive their parents as having an authoritative parenting style (cf. inductive discipline) are more likely to espouse values consistent with those of their parents (Pratt et al., 2003), suggesting an appropriation, internalization, or value transmission. Adolescents identified as “care exemplars” attributed to themselves more moral characteristics and aspirations, and were more “oriented toward their ideals and parental values” than other teens (Hart & Fegley, 1995, p. 1356). The cumulative effect of inductions over time may facilitate internalization and foster moral self-relevance among adolescents.

Moreover, parental expressions of disappointment (as a facet of induction) may play an important role in fostering the centrality of morality to the self-concept during the adolescent years. The appeal to a hypothetical ideal in parental expression of disappointment may presuppose requisite abilities on the part of the recipient. Preadolescents and adolescents have a greater cognitive ability or “readiness” (Eisenberg, Cumberland, Guthrie, Murphy, & Shepard, 2005; Moshman, 1998) to reflect on the implications for the self of the parent’s disappointed expectations. Research has indicated that the use of moral terms to describe and evaluate the self typically increases with the onset of adolescence (Damon & Hart, 1988; Hardy & Carlo, 2005; Power & Khmelkov, 1998). Damon & Hart (1988) found that individuals’ self-descriptions by early
adolescence reflect a concern for others. By middle to late adolescence, these values start to become integrated into the self (pp.117-122). Furthermore, adolescents tend to make moral self appeals in justifying moral decisions or values (Power & Khmelkov, 1998). Hence, in response to parental expression of disappointment, adolescents may be more likely to reflect upon and thereby appropriate or internalize their parents’ higher expectations for them. Regarding an incident in which she had stolen candy from a local store, one adolescent recounted her parents’ reaction and its impact: “They were very disappointed in me that I hadn’t lived up to their expectations. . . . As I thought about it, I, too, was disappointed in myself” (Lickona, 1983, p.155).

While there is reason to believe induction may foster a higher moral self-relevance, there do not appear to be any studies that directly examine this relationship. In particular, research is needed that compares induction to other discipline techniques, and attends to the role of parental expression of disappointment.

Aim and Hypotheses

This study investigated adolescents’ cognitive and affective perceptions of parental discipline techniques and warmth or acceptance, with the particular aim of investigating the relation between induction and adolescent moral self-relevance. The possible relation of inductive discipline (including parental expressions of disappointment) to the moral self in adolescence represents an important issue that (to the best of this researcher’s knowledge) has not yet been studied. Specified for particular attention was the primary, dominant, or most frequent discipline technique, as reported by the adolescent as well as the mother. Although previous studies have examined
aspects of discipline, perception, and moral self-concept variables, all of these variables are encompassed in the present study.

Accordingly, the study entailed the following four main hypotheses nested within the study’s two main themes: perceptions of parental discipline and the relation of induction to the moral self. First, with respect to adolescents’ perceptions of parental discipline techniques and parental acceptance:

1. Adolescents’ cognitive and affective perceptions of parental discipline techniques (and parental acceptance) will interrelate.

2. Adolescents’ cognitive and affective perceptions of induction (and parental acceptance) will be more favorable than their perceptions of other parental discipline techniques.

With respect to the second theme of induction and the moral self:

3. Adolescents who primarily receive induction will evidence higher levels of moral self-relevance.

4. The relation between induction and moral self-relevance will be especially evident among adolescents whose cognitive and affective perceptions of induction (and parental acceptance) are favorable.

The above hypotheses are delineated in a more fine-grained fashion in the next chapter (see Statistical Analysis Plan).
CHAPTER 2

METHODS

The following sections of this chapter will describe the participants, recruitment and testing procedures, instruments, and statistical analysis plan used in the study. The chapter will conclude with a delineated version of the hypotheses introduced in the previous chapter.

Participants

This study included a sample of 102 male and female students aged 10 to 16 years. Participants were recruited from two predominantly middle-class public school districts located in Minerva, Ohio and Portsmouth, Ohio. To corroborate adolescent self-report, mothers were also asked to participate in a portion of the study. Thirty-seven parents of participating children agreed to be a part of the study.

Of the 102 students who participated, data from 9 were excluded as children rated someone other than their mother (e.g., grandparent, father). In total, the study included 43 female and 50 male students (M age=13yrs) from the 5th, 8th, and 10th grades. The sample sizes for the 5th, 8th and 10th grades were 44, 32, and 26, respectively. The self-reported ethnicity of the sample was primarily Caucasian (96%) with four percent specifying, African-American (2%) or “Other” (2%). Of the 37 participating parents, 2 were not
included as they were fathers of the participating children. A total of 35 mothers were included in the study. Self-reported ethnicity of mothers was primarily Caucasian (94%) with the remainder of the sample indicating, “Other” or not specified. The sample was comprised of mostly married women (77%) with the remaining women reporting their marital status as divorced (17%), single (3%) or not specified (3%). The mean income of the mothers was between $30,000-49,999, which is consistent with the median family income from Minerva and Portsmouth combined ($M= 41,995) as reported by the United States Census Bureau (2000). Most mothers reported that they had completed some college or technical school and the data indicated that most, if not all, mothers had graduated high school.

Recruitment

The investigator requested approval from superintendents, principals and teachers to conduct research at the elementary, middle and high schools located in the Minerva and Portsmouth public school districts (See Appendix A). Once approval had been granted, children and adolescents from the 5th, 8th, and 10th grades were given a brief oral presentation by a researcher describing the study and its importance. Information regarding the study and a parental consent form (see Appendix B) were presented to each student to give to his or her parent or guardian during this time. An incentive for participation and return of the parental consent form within one week was offered to students. Students who returned an unsigned consent form to their teacher (declining participation) were entered once into a raffle for a $50 gift certificate to a local department store. Students who returned a signed parental consent allowing for their
participation in the study were entered twice in the class raffle. If a student participant
decided to withdraw from the study before completion, he or she was still entered twice
into the raffle. After the study was completed, teachers from each participating grade
were instructed to randomly select an eligible student’s name from a box. Gift certificates
with a note of appreciation were then mailed out by the investigator to the five raffle
winners. In addition, all participating students were verbally thanked for participating and
teachers received a note of appreciation.

The information packet given to the children also contained an additional consent
form and informative letter requesting the parent or guardian’s participation in the study
(see Appendix C). Mothers were offered a $10 gift certificate to a local grocery store for
their time commitment (approximately 30-45 minutes) in completing the questionnaires.
After all students had completed the study, those children who had returned a signed
consent form for parental participation were given a packet containing the questionnaire
materials for the parent to complete. Children were instructed to bring the packet home to
the parent. Upon receipt of the enclosed questionnaire materials from the parent, the
investigator mailed out $10 gift certificates and a note of appreciation to each
participating parent. If the parent received the questionnaire packet and decided at that
time to withdraw from the study, then the incentive was still issued. All questionnaire
packets (complete or incomplete) needed to be returned via business reply mail to the
investigator before incentives were distributed to the parents. Monetary incentives for
students and parents were funded through a $2000 OSU Alumni Grant for Graduate
Research and Scholarship.
Testing procedures

Participating students were tested together in the classroom within their respective grades. Testing was conducted during two sessions (45 minutes each) over the course of two weeks. Students not participating were asked to work quietly on their school work during each assessment. At the beginning of the first session, the researcher verified receipt of signed parental consent forms from participating students. Participating students were then provided with a form requesting their assent to participate in research (see Appendix D). The researcher explained aloud the purpose of the study, the amount of time required to complete the questionnaires, the voluntary nature of their participation and any risks associated with participation in the study. After asking participants if they had any questions about the study, the researcher asked the students who wished to participate to read and sign the assent form.

During the first session, participating students completed the demographic questionnaire (see Appendix E) and the child-version of the Perceived Parental Discipline questionnaire (PPD; Patrick, Krevans, Gibbs, & Hoffman, 2008). During the second session, students completed The Moral Self-Relevance measure (MSR; Patrick, Barriga, Campbell, & Gibbs, 2008) followed by the child version of the Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ; Rohner & Khaleque, 2005). Prior to the distribution of the questionnaires, a researcher did the following: 1) read aloud the instructions of each instrument, 2) explained the order in which the forms should be filled out, 3) instructed the students to complete the questionnaires at their own pace, and 4) told students that the he or she was available to answer any questions. The researcher was present to monitor
for student questions and to collect study materials. The participating students’ assent forms were temporarily attached to the survey packet, so that the researcher could match the survey materials with the correct respondent over the two sessions. After testing, the assent forms were removed and each questionnaire packet received a numeric code to ensure confidentiality.

After completion of the second session, children were asked to take a questionnaire packet home to their mother (or primary caregiver), if their parent had also consented to participate. This packet contained an informational letter (see Appendix F), a form required for the distribution of the monetary incentive, and a questionnaire packet containing the demographic questionnaire (see Appendix G), the adult version of the PPD questionnaire and the parent version of the PARQ. Participating parents were instructed in the letter to do the following: 1) find a quiet area to complete the questionnaires, 2) fill out the demographic questionnaire followed by the adult version of the PPD questionnaire and then the parent version of the PARQ, 3) fill out the questionnaires in one session (taking approximately 30-45 minutes), and 4) return the packets using the enclosed business reply envelope within two to three weeks of receipt. The participating parents’ forms for the monetary incentive were temporarily attached to the returned survey packet, so that the researcher could distribute the incentive to the correct respondent. These forms were then removed and each questionnaire packet was only identifiable with a numeric code for confidentiality purposes.
Measures

The measures administered in the study pertained to parental discipline, perceived acceptance or rejection by the parent, and moral self-relevance. In particular, this study investigated (a) children’s and adolescents’ (and their mother’s when appropriate) cognitive and affective perceptions of discipline techniques via the PPD measure against the background of parental acceptance/rejection (measured by the PARQ); and (b) the relation of inductive discipline to the child’s moral self-concept or degree of moral self-relevance using the MSR measure. All measures demonstrate adequate validity and reliability, as described below.

1. Perceived Parental Discipline Questionnaire (PPD)

   The PPD (Patrick et al., 2008) is a revised version of Krevans’ (1992) adaptation of Hoffman & Saltzstein’s (1967) Parental Discipline Questionnaire. Krevans’ adaptation consists of two parent-child conflict scenarios and four child-other conflict scenarios. Examples include, “your child gets angry at a friend and does some damage to the friend’s things” (child-other conflict) and “your child is sassy or talks back to you in angry voice” (parent-child conflict; see Krevans, 1992). The structured component following each of the six scenarios is made up of 10-14 discipline technique items, resulting in a maximum response total of 72 items. The discipline items comprising power assertion (e.g., “Hit or spank him,” “Make him go to his room or ground him,” and “Take away some privileges if he doesn’t get going right away”), love withdrawal (e.g., “I wouldn’t say much, but I’d ignore him for a while,” and “Tell him that I’m embarrassed and ashamed to
be his mother”), and induction (e.g., “Ask how he would feel; suggest he put himself in the other child’s place,” and “Ask him how he’d like it if someone came over and ruined his things”) are respectively similar across scenarios.

Participants are asked to rate the frequency with which each type of discipline is used in each scenario using a 4-point Likert scale (Usually, Sometimes, Rarely, Never). These ratings are used to “warm-up” the respondents to the different techniques and are not scored. Participants are also asked to identify and rank the three items used most often in each situation. Ranked items are subject to an inverse scoring system of (0-3), in which the discipline technique used most frequently is given 3 points, second most often receiving 2 points, and third most often receiving 1 point. Items not chosen are scored as zero.

Krevans’ (1992) adaptation of the original instrument also included an introductory open-ended section in the parent version (for construct validation purposes), refined some item wording, and emphasized to a greater extent peer-related transgressions among scenarios (consistent with Hoffman’s emphasis on peer conflicts among transgression situations). Krevans’ adapted questionnaire evidenced adequate validity. Krevans and Gibbs (1996) reported split-half internal consistency coefficients generally of .65 to .85 for their modified version of Hoffman and Saltzstein’s (1967) measure. In terms of construct validity, Krevans and Gibbs (1996) found positive correlations between the mothers’
open-ended responses to scenarios of child misbehavior and their selections on the discipline questionnaire.

The PPD questionnaire (see Appendix H) used in this study represents a further adaptation of the scenarios and item wording of Krevans (1992) revised parental discipline questionnaire (parent and child versions), as well as supplementation of the disappointment items. The PPD measure also examines the child’s perceptions of appropriateness of discipline and emotional reactions to parental discipline techniques, thereby highlighting the importance of the child’s viewpoint in the socialization process. Furthermore, this measure utilized the ratings of each of the discipline items which allowed for a more thorough statistical assessment of the data. The following paragraphs describe how the measure was revised for this study.

Although Krevans’ adapted questionnaire evidenced adequate validity, recent research (Patrick & Gibbs, 2007) suggested the content and face validity of the instrument could be improved. In particular, 5 additional disappointment items were added to the structured portion to more adequately represent the induction category (content validity); increasing the maximum response total to 77 items. In addition, some items were updated, revised or eliminated to increase the face validity of the measure. Overall, the number of items representing the discipline categories of induction, power assertion and love withdrawal were 31, 19, and 21, respectively. Of the 31 induction items, there were 11 that reflected
parental expression of disappointment. In addition, six items reflecting parental permissiveness were retained.

The PPD instrument was evaluated by a convenience sample of older children and adolescents. This sample consisted of 4 males and 3 females (ages 9-14). Researchers read aloud the scenarios/items and asked the children the following questions: 1) “does this (transgression) sound like something you could have done before?” (“If not, what is more likely?”), 2) “how often have you been in this type of situation?”, and 3) “do you think this scenario could happen in most families?” In addition, children were asked whether the wording and content of the scenarios, items and directions, “made sense.”

The feedback from this sample of children regarding each scenario and item was scrutinized by experts in the field. The investigator collaborated with Martin Hoffman (one of the original authors of the Parental Discipline Questionnaire) and other scholars in the revision of this instrument. For example, it was determined that the item “Hit” was interpreted by some children as a punch or abusive practice on the part of the parent. This was not the original intent of the power assertion item, so it was replaced with “spank or slap” (Hoffman, personal communication, April 23, 2008). In addition, the love withdrawal item “Gets upset with you and tells you that you are an embarrassment to the family” was revised, as none of the children could understand or personally relate to this statement. Using the suggestions of the participants, it was altered to read, “Tells you that she’s embarrassed and ashamed to be your mother.” Other modifications
were made to the instrument to make the scenarios and items more clear and concise. The language was updated so that the wording was more in line with what children today may experience. Finally, the items were placed in random order after each scenario to avoid any pattern detection by the participant.

In order to examine the child’s perceived appropriateness of parental discipline, the child version of the questionnaire now includes an additional question, adapted from Horton, Ray & Cohen (2001) and Padilla-Walker and Carlo (2004), to be administered following each scenario. Participants responded to the item, “How fair or appropriate would the thing she does most often be in this situation?,” using a five point Likert scale ranging from “Very Unfair” to “Very Fair.” Also, the open-ended question, “How do you feel when she does that?” was included to assess the child’s emotional response to the mother’s discipline. Responses were coded as guilty (e.g., ashamed, embarrassed), positive (e.g., happy, comforted), negative emotions (e.g., annoyed, angry) or uncodeable by a researcher trained to use these guidelines. Interrater reliability was established by selecting 168 coded items from thirty participants and comparing these items to an independent coder; the Kappa value was .91. This question about the child’s emotional response and the coding scheme was adapted from Padilla-Walker (2008).

In addition, a new scoring system was devised which utilizes the ratings in the measure instead of the rankings increasing the power in the instrument. A score which reflects the frequency of use of each discipline technique was derived.
from the 4-point Likert scale (3 = usually, 2 = sometimes, 1 = rarely, 0 = never). For each technique, the subject’s score and total possible score for the scenario were tallied; the ratio of these two scores represents a frequency-of-use fraction. These fractions were normalized across discipline techniques within each scenario, so that they summed to one. The frequency-of-use fractions were also averaged across the six scenarios to get an average score for each discipline technique per child or adult.

The Cronbach’s coefficient alphas calculated for the induction, power assertion, and love withdrawal items were .92, .91 and .84, respectively. Also, Cronbach’s coefficient alphas were calculated separately for the other-oriented items (.88) and disappointment items (.82). The PPD measure takes approximately 45 minutes to 1 hour to complete.

2. Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ)

Perceptions of parental acceptance and rejection were assessed via the PARQ (Rohner & Khaleque, 2005). The PARQ is a self-report questionnaire that assesses the individual’s perceptions of the overall warmth experienced in their parent-child relationship along four dimensions: “warmth/affection, hostility/aggression, indifference/neglect, and undifferentiated rejection (Rohner & Khaleque, 2005).” The Child PARQ is comprised of 60 questions that ask the respondent to indicate how their mother or father “treats” him or her. The number of items representing the categories of warmth, hostility/aggression, indifference/neglect, and undifferentiated rejection were 20, 15, 15, and 10,
respectively. Of the 60 items, 27 items were positive statements about how the parent treats the child and 33 of the items were more negative. The child is asked to respond using a Likert scale ranging from 4 (Almost always true) to 1 (Almost never true) to questions such as, “My mother seems to dislike me” and “My mother pays a lot of attention to me.” The Child PARQ was designed to be used with children ages seven years through adolescence. The scale takes approximately 15 to 20 minutes to complete. The Parent PARQ is identical in format to the Child version except that it is from the viewpoint of the mother (regarding how she treats her child) and takes about 10 to 15 minutes to complete.

The instrument was scored using the PARSCORE IV software program (Noman & Rohner, 2005). Higher subscale and overall scores indicate more perceived rejection by the child or the parent. The low and high possible scores and midpoints for the scales are listed as follows: warmth/affection scale (20-80; midpoint 50), the hostility/aggression scale (15-60; midpoint 37.5), the indifference/neglect scale (15-60; midpoint 37.5), the undifferentiated rejection scale (10-40; midpoint 25), and total scale (60-240; midpoint 150). The undifferentiated rejection scale measures the child’s general belief that overall the parent does not care for or love him or her. Scores above the midpoints suggest more perceived rejection than acceptance and scores falling below the midpoints indicate more perceived acceptance than rejection. On average, scores falling in the range of 90-110 are common for youths in the U.S. and are representative of warm, accepting parent-child relationships. The PARQ’s reliability has been
established via several validation studies and through use in over 400 studies. A recent meta-analysis of over 50 studies indicated a mean Cronbach’s alpha of .89 for the Child PARQ and .84 for the Parent PARQ (see Rohner, 2005 for a review). In addition, this study calculated a Cronbach’s alpha to assess the relationship between the subscales; all subscales were highly correlated (.86).

3. The Moral Self-Relevance Measure (MSR)

The MSR (Patrick et al., 2009) was modeled after the adapted Good-Self Assessment (GSA; Barriga et al., 2001) to assess the child’s moral self or identity. The adapted GSA revised Mary Lou Arnold’s (1993) Good Self Assessment to create a measure that was administrable to groups (i.e., pencil-paper format). The adapted GSA measure is comprised of 16 questions that assess the importance of moral (e.g., fair, honest) and non-moral qualities (e.g., athletic, outgoing) to the child’s sense of self. These questions are evenly distributed throughout the measure; each moral item separated from each non-moral item. The moral or non-moral qualities within each question are presented in synonym pairs (e.g., careful or cautious; considerate or courteous) to aid the reader’s understanding. After viewing a diagram (concentric circles displaying levels of importance), participants rate these qualities using a 4-point Likert scale that ranges from “not important to me” to “extremely important to me.” The adapted GSA uses a “difference score” calculated by subtracting the mean of the total number of non-moral items from the mean of the total number of moral items. Greater moral self-relevance is reflected by positive scores versus negative scores. The adapted GSA correlated negatively with self-serving cognitive distortions.
and externalizing behaviors, suggesting adequate construct validity (Barriga et al., 2001). A factor analysis was conducted on the items to assess whether they grouped together separately as non-moral (neutral) and moral items. The Cronbach’s coefficient alphas were .64 for the non-moral terms and .82 for the moral terms, respectively (Barriga, et al., 2001).

The adapted GSA contributed importantly to the construction of the MSR (see Appendix I) measure used in this study. The bulls-eye diagram illustrating the importance of qualities to the self and the basic structure of the rating section was retained. The first portion of the MSR still contains the 16 questions (eight moral & eight non-moral) which are evenly distributed throughout the instrument. However, the number of questions displayed on each page was changed slightly to avoid any detection of a pattern of responses. Some simplification of the instructions and rewording of terms were also necessary to make this questionnaire more accessible to both younger and older respondents. Also, the designated non-moral terms “hardworking or industrious” were substituted with “careful or cautious” as selected from a list of non-moral items in Pratt et al. (2003). This substitution was made because the term “hardworking” was identified as a moral trait in a psychometric study by Aquino & Reed (2002). Lastly, it was decided that improvements to the scaling and scoring were needed.

In order to improve a range of response problem with the GSA, the Likert scale was expanded to include five response options (from “not important to me” to “extremely important to me”) and an additional ranking component was
included. The additional component, termed the “Pick 8” asked respondents to circle 8 out of a possible 32 qualities (moral and neutral) that describe who they are as a person. The Pick 8 score ranges from 0-8 depending on the number of moral items selected. The eight moral terms were selected from synonym pairs present in the rating section of the GSA. These moral terms were interspersed among 24 non-moral terms. Eight of the non-moral terms were selected from the synonym pairs present in the rating section. Additional non-moral characteristics were selected by the investigator and some were also selected from a list of characteristics (e.g., lucky, popular, talkative) rated by individuals as “peripheral and non central to good character” (Lapsley & Lasky, 2001 p. 350). Scoring for the MSR was calculated by taking the mean of the moral items from the Likert scale portion of the instrument and summing this with the Pick 8 score divided by 2 and multiplying this total by 4 (Average of moral items + Pick8 score/2)*4). This scoring method gives equal weight to the moral items and Pick 8 score while maintaining a possible range of scores from 0-32. This scoring method was designed to counter problems associated with the original scoring of the GSA.

Completion of the MSR typically requires approximately 15 minutes. Instructions for the Likert response section and the Pick 8 portion of the MSR are to be read aloud by the researcher. The Cronbach’s coefficient alphas calculated for this study sample were .67 for the more unrelated non-moral terms and .83 for the more similar moral terms, respectively. In addition, the Cronbach’s coefficient
alpha for the moral terms and Pick 8 score (number of circled moral items) combined was a .83.

**Statistical Analysis Plan**

The study’s hypotheses as stated in chapter 1 are restated and further specified below. The elaborated restatements include the statistical analysis plans for the assessment of the hypotheses. The four hypotheses below are nested within the study’s two themes pertaining to perceptions of discipline and relations between inductive discipline and the moral self.

1. **Perceptions of Parental Discipline.** Hypothesis 1 and 2 with their respective statistical plans pertain to the study’s first theme of adolescents’ perceptions of parental discipline techniques and warmth.

   1. Adolescents’ cognitive and affective perceptions of parental discipline technique (and parental acceptance) will interrelate.

      1a. Relations between cognitive and affective perceptions. Adolescents’ positive and/or guilt-related responses will relate positively to appropriate/fair evaluations of discipline techniques.

      A one-way ANOVA was conducted to look at the relationship between emotional response and appropriateness ratings of individual discipline techniques. For each child and each scenario, a discipline technique was identified as primary if its relative frequency of use was at least as high as all other discipline strategies. As a result, a single scenario could have more than one technique identified as primary. For an individual discipline strategy, all
combinations of child and scenario for which that discipline strategy was identified as primary were used in an ANOVA with appropriateness as the dependent variable and emotional response as the independent variable.

\[ Y_{ij} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 I_{[X_{ij} = \text{Positive}]} + \beta_1 I_{[X_{ij} = \text{Negative}]} + \epsilon_{ij} \]

i indexes children and j indexes scenarios

\( Y_{ij} \) = Dependent variable; measure of child’s perceived appropriateness

\( \beta \) = Influence of the particular type of emotional response on the child’s rating of appropriateness

\( \epsilon_{ij} \) = Error term

1b. Relations between cognitive perception and parental warmth.

Adolescents who evaluate their primary parental discipline technique as appropriate will also feel more accepted by the parent (as reported by child and parent).

A regression analysis was used to analyze this hypothesis. Each scenario for each participant was classified according to the primary discipline technique used (e.g., the largest frequency-of-use fraction). Each technique was then analyzed separately. For a given technique, the child’s appropriateness scores were averaged across all scenarios classified as primarily using that technique. For some children, no score was generated for a given technique as it may not have been chosen in any scenario. For each child the total average acceptance score (ranging from 60-240) was tallied. The lower the PARQ score, the more perceived acceptance reported by the child. To make interpretation of results more intuitive, the signs of coefficients were reversed, which has no effect on the corresponding significance tests. A simple regression of acceptance as a function
of appropriateness was then conducted for each discipline technique. This analysis was performed three separate times: 1) using the children’s PARQ responses 2) using the parent’s PARQ responses, and 3) using an aggregate score generated from both the child and parent report. The aggregate score was calculated by taking the average acceptance rating between parent and child, but keeping the child’s rating in the event of a non-participating parent.

\[ Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_i + \varepsilon_i \]

\( Y_i \) = Dependent variable; measure of acceptance/rejection  
\( \beta \) = Influence of the discipline technique’s average rating of appropriateness on the acceptance/rejection score  
\( X_i \) = Average appropriateness rating  
\( \varepsilon_i \) = Error term

1c. Relations between affective perception and parental warmth.

Adolescents’ positive and guilt-related emotions of induction will relate positively to feelings of parental acceptance.

For each child and each scenario, the primary discipline technique was identified as in previous hypotheses. For each discipline technique, focus was limited to only those child-scenario combinations in which that discipline technique was primary. Then, the numbers of positive, negative, and guilt responses were tallied. For each child, an emotional response was considered the child’s primary response to that discipline technique if its tally was greater than the other emotional responses. Using this data, an ANOVA was performed using
the PARQ score as the dependent variable and primary emotional response (to a specific discipline technique) as the independent variable.

\[ Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 I_{\{X_i = \text{Positive}\}} + \beta_1 I_{\{X_i = \text{Negative}\}} + \varepsilon_i \]

- \( Y_i \) = Dependent variable; measure of acceptance/rejection
- \( \beta \) = Influence of emotional response to a specific discipline strategy on the PARQ score
- \( X_i \) = Emotional response to discipline strategy
- \( \varepsilon_i \) = Error term

2. Adolescents’ cognitive and affective perceptions of induction (and parental acceptance) will be more favorable than their perceptions of other parental discipline techniques.

2a. Cognitive perception and Induction. Adolescents will evaluate inductions (relative to power assertion and love withdrawal) as more appropriate or fair.

A linear mixed model was used to evaluate this hypothesis. This type of modeling approach was needed as repeated measurements were nested within individuals and scenarios. Specifically, for each child there were six observations that were correlated. The set of observations within each child was closer than the observations between each child; thus each child had an effect. Also, each scenario was be done by many children, making it different from the other scenarios; thus each scenario had an effect. A linear mixed model approach allowed for the scenario effects and the child effects to be separated mathematically.
The linear mixed model was applied with perceived appropriateness as the response variable, the normalized frequency-of-use fractions of each discipline technique as the fixed effects, and the child and scenario as the random effects. Thus, the appropriateness rating was a function of the fraction of time each of the discipline techniques was reportedly used in each scenario. The child and scenario effects accounted for the dependence within the repeated measures of a child or a scenario. This linear-mixed model was also adapted to look at the effects of other-oriented induction and parental expressions of disappointment, separately.

\[ Y_{ij} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{ij}^{IN} + \beta_2 X_{ij}^{PA} + \beta_3 X_{ij}^{LW} + \gamma_i + \delta_j + \epsilon_{ij} \]

Baseline = \( X_{ij}^P = 1 - (X_{ij}^{IN} + X_{ij}^{PA} + X_{ij}^{LW} + X_{ij}^{D}) \)

i indexes children and j indexes scenarios
Y_{ij} = Dependent variable; measure of child’s perceived appropriateness
\( \beta = \) Influence of the particular type of discipline on the child’s rating of appropriateness
\( \gamma_i = \) Child effect
\( \delta_j = \) Scenario effect
\( \epsilon_{ij} = \) Error term

2b. Affective perception and Induction. Adolescents will experience more positive and guilt-related emotions in response to induction as a primary discipline technique (relative to power assertion and love withdrawal).

A nominal regression was used in the analysis of this hypothesis, as this method was amenable to a categorical dependent variable (emotional response). For each child and each scenario, the emotional response was paired with the normalized frequency-of-use fractions for each discipline strategy. The frequency-of-use fractions were used as independent variables in the nominal
regression on emotional response. Positive coefficients were expected for induction effects when negative emotional response was used as the baseline.

2c. Parental warmth and Induction. Adolescents who receive induction as their primary parental discipline technique will feel more accepted by the parent (as reported by child and parent).

A regression analysis was used to analyze this hypothesis. For each child and each scenario, a discipline style was identified as primary if its relative frequency of use was at least as high as all other discipline strategies. As a result, a single scenario could have more than one strategy identified as primary. For each child, the total average acceptance score (ranging from 60-240) was tallied. A simple regression of acceptance as a function of the primary discipline technique was then conducted. In addition, the effects of other-oriented induction and parental expressions of disappointment were examined separately. The lower the PARQ score, the more perceived acceptance reported by the child. To make interpretation of results more intuitive, the signs of coefficients were reversed, which has no effect on the corresponding significance tests. This analysis was performed three separate times: 1) using the children’s PARQ responses 2) using the parent’s PARQ responses, and 3) using an aggregate score generated from both the child and parent report. The aggregate score took the average acceptance rating between parent and child, but kept the child’s rating in the event of a non-participating parent

\[ Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_i + \varepsilon_i \]
\[ Y_i = \text{Dependent variable; measure of acceptance/rejection} \]
\[ \beta = \text{Influence of the particular type of discipline on the child’s} \]
\[ \text{acceptance/rejection score} \]
\[ X_i = \text{Frequency of designated discipline technique} \]
\[ \epsilon_i = \text{Error term} \]

**Induction and the Moral Self.** Hypothesis 3 and 4 with their respective statistical plans pertain to the study’s second theme of induction and the moral self. For each of the hypotheses below the statistical analysis plan also included a separate examination of a theoretically distinct facet of induction, namely, parental expressions of disappointment and higher expectations.

3. Adolescents who receive induction as their primary parental discipline technique (as reported by child and parent) will evidence higher levels of moral self-relevance.

A regression analysis was used to analyze this hypothesis. Frequency-of-use fractions for each discipline technique were averaged across scenarios for each child to generate a single score for each technique. For each child the MSR score was also calculated. A simple regression of moral self-relevance as a function of the average discipline score was conducted. This analysis was performed three separate times: 1) using the children’s discipline responses 2) using the parent’s discipline responses, and 3) using an aggregate score generated from both the child and parent report. The aggregated frequency-of-use score was calculated by taking the average frequency of use of primary discipline between parent and child, but keeping the child’s frequency of use score in the event of a non-participating parent.
\[ Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_i + \varepsilon_i \]

\( Y_i \) = Dependent variable; Moral Self-Relevance score  
\( \beta \) = Influence of the designated discipline technique on the moral self-relevance score  
\( X_i \) = Frequency of the designated discipline technique  
\( \varepsilon_i \) = Error term  

The relation between induction and moral self-relevance will be especially evident among adolescents whose cognitive and affective perceptions of induction (and parental acceptance) are favorable.

4a. Cognitive perception and the Induction—Moral Self-Relevance relation. The induction—moral self-relevance relation will be stronger for adolescents who evaluate inductions as more appropriate or fair.

A simple regression of moral self-relevance as a function of the average appropriateness rating of induction was conducted. Each scenario for each participant was classified according to the primary discipline technique used (e.g., the largest frequency-of-use fraction). Then for each technique, the child’s appropriateness ratings were averaged across all scenarios classified as primarily using that technique.

\[ Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_i + \varepsilon_i \]

\( Y_i \) = Dependent variable; Moral Self-Relevance score  
\( \beta \) = Influence of appropriateness rating for a specific discipline technique on the moral self-relevance score  
\( X_i \) = Appropriateness rating of a specific discipline technique  
\( \varepsilon_i \) = Error term  

4b. Affective perception and the Induction—Moral Self-relevance relation. The induction—moral self-relevance relation will be stronger for
adolescents who report positive emotions and guilt-related emotions (relative to negative emotions) towards induction.

A simple ANOVA of moral self-relevance as a function of the most frequent emotional response to induction was conducted. Each scenario for each participant was classified according to the primary discipline technique used (e.g., the largest frequency-of-use fraction). Then for each technique, the child’s emotional responses were tallied across all scenarios classified as primarily using that technique. The child’s most frequent emotional response was the emotional response with the highest tally. For some children, no score was generated for a given technique as it may not have been the primary technique used in any scenario or the tally was the same for two or more emotional responses for that technique.

\[ Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 I_{\{X_i = \text{Positive}\}} + \beta_1 I_{\{X_i = \text{Negative}\}} + \varepsilon_i \]

\( Y_i = \) Dependent Variable; Moral Self-Relevance score
\( \beta = \) Influence of emotional response to a specific discipline technique on the moral self-relevance score
\( X_i = \) Emotional response to a specific discipline technique
\( \varepsilon_i = \) Error term

4c. Parental warmth and the Induction—Moral Self-Relevance relation. The induction—moral self-relevance relation will be stronger for adolescents who primarily receive induction and feel accepted by the parent (as reported by child).

We conducted simple regression of moral self-relevance as a function of warmth among participants for which a discipline technique was primary. Each
scenario for each participant was classified according to the primary discipline technique used (e.g., the largest frequency-of-use fraction). Then, each participant was defined to have a given discipline technique as primary if that technique was primary in at least as many scenarios as any other technique. Then for each technique, the children for whom that technique was primary were used in a regression of warmth against moral self-relevance.

\[ Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_i + \varepsilon_i \]

\( Y_i \) = Dependent Variable; Moral Self-Relevance Score  
\( \beta \) = Influence of warmth for a specific discipline technique on the moral self-relevance score  
\( X_i \) = Warmth score for a child with a specific primary discipline technique  
\( \varepsilon_i \) = Error term
CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

This chapter presents the study’s findings, organized in accordance with the hypotheses as stated generally in Chapters 1 and more specifically in Chapter 2. All analyses were evaluated in accordance with the modeling and statistical methodology outlined in Chapter 2 (see Statistical Analysis Plan). The results include the entire sample of children (\(N = 93\)) from the 5\(^{th}\), 8\(^{th}\) and 10\(^{th}\) grades and their mothers (\(N = 35\)). Stated results reflect the children’s report unless otherwise specified, as either the parent’s report or combined parent-child report. All analyses were conducted using SPSS software (Version 17). Analyses are presented with gender and grade combined, except in those instances where such effects were found.

Research Hypotheses

The study investigated four main hypotheses nested within two themes: first, adolescents’ perceptions of parental discipline techniques and warmth; and, second, relations between inductive discipline and the adolescent’s moral self-concept. The hypotheses are further delineated below.
Perceptions of Parental Discipline.

1. Adolescents’ cognitive and affective perceptions of parental discipline techniques (and parental acceptance) will interrelate.

1a. Relations between cognitive and affective perceptions. Adolescents’ positive and guilt-related responses will relate positively to appropriate/fair evaluations of discipline techniques.

For induction, emotional response was found to be significantly related to appropriateness rating ($F_{2,339} = 35.14, p < 0.001$). Positive and guilt-related emotional responses to induction were associated significantly with higher mean appropriateness ratings than negative emotional responses (0.88, $p < 0.001$ and 0.87, $p < 0.001$, respectively). For power assertion, emotional response was also found to be significantly related to appropriateness ratings ($F_{1,42} = 8.89, p = .005$). No guilt responses were identified, so the emotional response effect had only 1 degree of freedom. Positive emotional responses to power assertion had significantly higher average appropriateness ratings compared to negative responses ($β = 1.10, p = .005$). No significant relationship was found between emotional responses and appropriateness ratings of love withdrawal ($F_{2,20} = 1.90, p = 0.175$).

1b. Relations between cognitive perception and parental warmth. Adolescents who evaluate their primary parental discipline technique as appropriate will also feel more accepted by the parent (as reported by child and parent).
This hypothesis was examined in terms of child-report, parent-report, and an aggregate measure of child and parent report.

**Child-Report.** Adolescents’ ratings of appropriateness for induction and power assertion were positively associated with adolescent’s feelings of acceptance, \( \beta = 13.03, p < .001 \) and \( \beta = 18.25, p = .004 \), respectively. However, no significant relationship was found between appropriateness ratings of love withdrawal and PARQ scores, \( \beta = 7.16, p = .200 \).

**Parent-Report.** The analysis was repeated using parental reports of acceptance rather than the child’s report. No effects were found for appropriateness ratings of any discipline technique with the parent report of the PARQ.

**Parent- and Child-Report Combined.** However, the aggregate score, which took the average acceptance rating between parent and child, but kept the child’s rating in the event of a non-participating parent, revealed significant effects. Consistent with the child-report, adolescents’ ratings of appropriateness for induction and power assertion were positively associated with the combined aggregate score for the PARQ, \( \beta = 12.84, p < .001 \) and \( \beta = 18.22, p = .004 \), respectively. No significant relationship was found between appropriateness ratings of love withdrawal and PARQ scores (\( \beta = 5.79, p = .292 \)).

**1c. Relations between affective perception and parental warmth.** Adolescents’ positive and guilt-related emotions of induction will relate positively to feelings of parental acceptance.
Emotional response to induction was found to be significantly related to the PARQ score \((F_{2,69} = 9.29, p < 0.001)\). Positive and guilt-related responses to induction were associated with more perceived acceptance relative to negative emotional responses. The mean differences in the PARQ between positive and guilt emotion to induction versus negative emotion were 25.47, \(p < .001\) and 22.85, \(p = .037\), respectively. Emotional responses (positive, negative, and guilt) to love withdrawal and power assertion had no significant impact on the PARQ \((F_{2,18} = 3.46, p = .053\), and \(F_{2,20} = 2.22, p = .135\) respectively).

2. Adolescents’ cognitive and affective perceptions of induction (and parental acceptance) will be more favorable than their perceptions of other parental discipline techniques.

2a. Cognitive perception and Induction. Adolescents will evaluate inductions (relative to power assertion and love withdrawal) as more appropriate or fair.

Adolescents’ ratings of appropriateness were positively associated with induction, \(\beta = .56, p = .022\) and negatively associated with power assertion, \(\beta = -.94, p = .007\). No significant relationship was found between appropriateness ratings and love withdrawal, \(\beta = -.67, p = .078\).

Parental Expressions of Disappointment. This hypothesis was also investigated specifically with reference to a theoretically distinct facet of induction, namely, parental expressions of disappointment and higher expectations. The effects of other-oriented induction and parental expressions of
disappointment were examined separately. While both were positively associated with appropriateness ratings when put together in the model, upon separation parental expressions of disappointment remained significant, $\beta = .62$, $p = .039$, and other-oriented inductions lost significance, $\beta = .51$, $p = .081$.

2b. Affective perception and Induction. Adolescents will experience more positive and guilt-related emotions in response to induction as a primary discipline technique (relative to power assertion and love withdrawal).

This hypothesis was partially supported. Although co-varying in the predicted direction, induction’s relation with positive and guilt-related responses (relative to negative emotion) did not reach significance. Positive and guilt-related emotional responses decreased (relative to negative emotion) with increasing frequency of use of power assertion, $\beta = -6.81$, $p < 0.001$ and $\beta = -7.08$, $p < 0.001$, respectively. No significant findings were present for emotional response and love withdrawal.

2c. Parental warmth and Induction. Adolescents who receive induction as their primary parental discipline technique will feel more accepted by the parent (as reported by child and parent).

This hypothesis was examined in terms of child-report, parent-report, and an aggregate measure of child and parent report.

Child-Report. Adolescents’ PARQ scores were positively associated with inductions, $\beta = 14.70$, $p < .001$ and negatively associated with power assertion, $\beta = -.22.12$, $p < .001$ and love withdrawal, $\beta = -.25.56$, $p = .004$. 
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Parent-Report. No effects between primary discipline technique and the parent report of the PARQ were found.

Parent- and Child-Report Combined. However, the aggregate score which took the average acceptance rating between parent and child, but kept the child’s rating in the event of a non-participating parent, revealed significant effects. Consistent with the child-report, aggregate PARQ scores were positively associated with inductions, \( \beta = 13.40, p < .001 \) and negatively associated with power assertion, \( \beta = -22.19, p < .001 \) and love withdrawal, \( \beta = -24.74, p = .003 \).

Parental Expressions of Disappointment (child-report & aggregate). Within induction, the effects of other-oriented induction and parental expressions of disappointment were examined separately. While both were positively associated with acceptance scores, parental expressions of disappointment carried more significance, \( \beta = 28.05, p < .001 \) than did other-oriented inductions, \( \beta = 12.03, p = .044 \) (child-report). Moreover, when the aggregate scores were used, parental expressions of disappointment retained significance, \( \beta = 25.72, p < .001 \), yet the pure other-oriented inductions were not significant, \( \beta = 9.62, p = .100 \).

Induction and the Moral Self

Hypotheses with respect to the second theme of induction and the moral self were also examined. In addition, each of these hypotheses was investigated specifically with reference to a theoretically distinct facet of induction, namely, parental expressions of disappointment and higher expectations. We begin by presenting an analysis of MSR means.
Means by Grade and Gender for the MSR. Means and comparisons for the MSR were calculated for children by grade and gender. Observed means for each grade on the MSR for the 5th, 8th and 10th grades were 14.92, 14.50 and 17.81, respectively. MSR scores ranged from 0-32. A significant grade difference ($F_{2, 90} = 3.2, p = .045$) was detected. Means were then compared across grades using ANOVA and no significance was found. However, when means for the 5th and 8th grades were combined and then compared against the 10th grade, a significant difference was detected ($F_{1, 91} = 6.36, p = .013$). Calculated means were slightly different for females (16.45) and males (14.47) on the MSR. A one-way ANOVA was conducted but no significant gender differences were detected.

3. Adolescents who receive induction as their primary parental discipline technique (as reported by child and parent) will evidence higher levels of moral self-relevance.

This hypothesis was generally supported across type of report. Within “induction” a specific contribution was found for parental expression of disappointment/higher expectations.

Child-Report. Induction was positively associated with the MSR, $\beta = 2.22$, $p = .004$. Power assertion and love withdrawal were not significantly related to MSR, $\beta = -1.11$, $p = .551$ and $\beta = -1.53$, $p = .156$, respectively. One grade effect was present; the relationship between induction and moral self-relevance scores was significantly positive for 10th graders, $\beta = 3.188$, $p = .038$, but not for 5th or 8th graders.
Parent-Report. No effects between primary discipline technique as reported by the parent and the child’s report of the MSR were found.

Parent & Child-Report Combined. However, the aggregate score which took the average frequency of use of primary discipline between parent and child, but kept the child’s frequency of use score in the event of a non-participating parent, revealed significant effects. Consistent with the child-report, adolescents’ MSR ratings were positively associated with the combined aggregate score for induction, $\beta = 1.71, p = .041$. Power assertion and love withdrawal were not significantly related to MSR. No grade effects or gender effects were found.

Parental Expressions of Disappointment (Child-Report and aggregate). Within induction, the effects of other-oriented induction and parental expressions of disappointment were examined separately. While both were positively associated with MSR ratings when together, other-oriented inductions alone retained significance, $\beta = 3.47, p = .004$, while parental expressions of disappointment did not retain significance, $\beta = 13.60, p = .083$ (child-report). Consistent with the child-report, parent and child-report combined indicated that other-oriented induction related to the MSR, $\beta = 3.47, p = .010$, while parental expressions of disappointment did not retain significance, $\beta = -.709, p = .589$.

4. The relation between induction and moral self-relevance will be especially evident among adolescents whose cognitive and affective perceptions of induction (and parental acceptance) are favorable.
4a. Cognitive perception and the Induction—Moral Self-Relevance relation. The induction—moral self-relevance relation will be stronger for adolescents who evaluate inductions as more appropriate or fair.

Adolescents’ ratings of the appropriateness of induction were positively associated with moral self-relevance, $\beta = 1.42, p = .043$. Perceived appropriateness of love withdrawal and power assertion had no significant impact on the MSR.

Parental Expressions of Disappointment. Within induction, the effects of other-oriented induction and parental expressions of disappointment were examined separately. While both were positively associated with moral self-relevance ratings when put together in the model, upon separation parental expressions of disappointment remained significant, $\beta = 2.14, p = .002$, and other-oriented inductions lost significance, $\beta = 1.048, p = .128$.

4b. Affective perception and the Induction—Moral Self-Relevance relation. The induction—moral self-relevance relation will be stronger for adolescents who report positive emotions and guilt-related emotions (relative to negative emotions) towards induction.

A significant relationship was found between emotional response to induction and MSR ($F_{2,69} = 5.69, p = .005$). Positive and guilt-related (relative to negative) responses to induction were associated with a higher MSR score. The mean differences in MSR between positive and guilt emotion to induction versus negative emotion were $3.54, p = .020$ and $5.59, p = .014$, respectively. Emotional
responses (positive, negative, and guilt) to love withdrawal and power assertion had no significant impact on the MSR.

**Parental Expressions of Disappointment.** Within induction, the effects of other-oriented induction and parental expressions of disappointment were examined separately. Interestingly, a significant relationship was found between emotional response to disappointment and MSR ($F_{2,41} = 3.67, p = .034$). The mean differences in MSR between positive and guilt-related response to disappointment relative to negative responses were, 3.58, $p = .049$ and 6.62, $p = .008$, respectively. Other-oriented inductions alone did not retain significance.

**4c. Parental warmth and the Induction—Moral Self-Relevance relation.**

The induction—moral self-relevance relation will be stronger for adolescents who primarily receive induction and feel accepted by the parent (as reported by child).

For adolescents’ whose primary discipline was induction, there was a significant association between perceived feelings of acceptance and moral self-relevance, $\beta = .129, p = .044$. Among adolescents whose primary discipline was love withdrawal or power assertion, there was no association between parental acceptance-rejection and the MSR.

**Parental Expressions of Disappointment.** Within induction, the effects of other-oriented induction and parental expressions of disappointment were examined separately. While both were positively associated with moral self-relevance ratings when put together in the model, upon separation both parental
expressions of disappointment and other-oriented inductions lost significance, $\beta = .061$, $p = .587$ and $\beta = .121$, $p = .146$. 
CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

The present study investigated adolescents’ perceptions of parental discipline techniques, and the impact of those techniques on adolescents’ attribution of moral qualities to the self. Adolescents’ cognitive and affective perceptions of parental disciplinary techniques and overall feelings of parental acceptance-rejection were found to be interrelated. Among discipline techniques, induction was perceived more favorably. Also, induction as a primary discipline technique was found to be positively related to adolescents’ moral self-relevance or moral identity. This was especially true when adolescents’ affective and cognitive perceptions of induction (and warmth) were taken into account. Furthermore, a theoretically distinct facet of induction, namely, parental expressions of disappointed expectations, was found to play an important contributory role in the relation of induction to the moral self. We will discuss the main findings and conclude with limitations of the study, applied implications, and directions for future research.

Perceptions of Parental Discipline Techniques

Adolescents reported their cognitive and affective perceptions of their parents’ discipline techniques as well as overall acceptance-rejection (parents’ reports, where
available, corroborated adolescent reports on discipline and warmth). Cognitive perceptions pertained to evaluations of appropriateness or fairness; affective reactions included positive, guilt-related, or negative emotions. The perceptions referred to discipline techniques as classified in Hoffman’s typology of induction (including parental expressions of disappointment), love withdrawal, and power assertion. Adolescents’ perceptions generally interrelated. Also, induction was generally perceived more favorably.

**Perceived Appropriateness or Fairness.** The adolescents’ perceptions of whether or not parental discipline is fair or appropriate could influence the effectiveness of that technique for socialization. Induction was evaluated as more appropriate or fair than power assertion. These findings are consistent with previous research (Barnett et al., 1996; Paikoff et al., 1988; Padilla-Walker & Carlo, 2004) that found older children’s and adolescents’ evaluations to be high for induction and reasoning relative to power assertion and love withdrawal techniques. These latter techniques direct the child’s attention not to the evident harm to the other but instead to more self-oriented concerns including fear of punishment and loss of love; a child might not as easily see how discipline is fair in these cases (Hoffman, 1970). The adolescent’s favorable evaluation of induction as fair and appropriate fosters the likelihood that the child will attend, accept and internalize the socialization message (Bugental & Grusec, 2006; Eisenberg, 2006; Grusec & Goodnow, 1994).

**Emotional Responses.** The adolescent’s emotional reaction to parental discipline could also influence the effectiveness of discipline techniques for socialization. Positive
and guilt-related emotions declined with greater use of power assertion by the parent. The relation between these emotions and induction, although in the predicted (positive) direction, was not significant.

These findings are generally consistent with prior research on emotional responses to discipline (Padilla-Walker, 2008; Padilla-Walker & Carlo, 2004; Tagney & Dearing, 2002). Predominant use of power assertion, unaccompanied by explanation and with its coercive, controlling, and punitive qualities, tends to generate feelings of frustration, hostility and anger, especially in the older child and adolescent (Hoffman, 1970). Negative emotion (e.g., fear, anger) is related to aversive outcomes such as aggression, anxiety and depression (Fredrickson & Cohn, 2008) and may disrupt the child’s ability to attend to and accept any parental messages, thereby hindering the socialization process (Grusec & Goodnow, 1994; Hoffman, 2000; Padilla-Walker, 2008). Power assertion (in contrast to induction) is “associated with low empathy, [low] helping, and [low] guilt,” and hence is not conducive to the internalization of moral values or behaviors (Hoffman, 2008, p.448).

**Relations between Fairness Perceptions and Emotional Responses.** As expected, adolescents’ cognitive and affective perceptions of parental discipline were found to interrelate. Adolescents who experienced positive and guilt-related emotions (vs. negative emotions) to induction also reported this disciplinary practice as fair or appropriate. Also, those adolescents who did respond with positive emotion (vs. negative) toward power assertion rated this technique as appropriate. A similar pattern of results
was found by Padilla-Walker (2008) in her study of appropriateness evaluations and emotional responses to discipline techniques such as induction and power assertion.

These results point to the important relations between the emotional and cognitive appraisals of discipline techniques. The adolescents’ emotional reaction to discipline may influence whether a discipline technique is positively evaluated as fair. The empathy-related guilt induced in the child by the parent may not only elicit a desire to make a reparative gesture toward the “other,” but may also strengthen the child’s view that the parent is fair in pointing out the child’s role in the transgression. Also, positive emotion has been linked to an increase in children’s receptivity towards information (“openness”), “flexibility” of thinking, and motivation to “engage with their environments,” which may in turn influence fairness appraisals of discipline and its impact (Fredrickson & Cohn, 2008, pp.779, 785). The positivity felt in some cases toward power assertion was related to fairness appraisals of this technique, which may reduce any harmful effects of frequent use of this discipline. For those adolescents receiving induction as their most common discipline, the strong relation between positive or guilt-related emotion and perceived fairness may increase the effectiveness of this technique for socialization.

Perceived Parental Acceptance-Rejection. Perceived parental acceptance or warmth has been thought to be an important contextual variable in the influence of inductive discipline on socialization. As expected, adolescents’ feelings of acceptance were positively associated with inductions and negatively associated with power assertion and love withdrawal, consistent with previous studies (e.g., Krevans & Gibbs, 1996). Inductions’ association with parental warmth would likely increase the effectiveness of
this discipline practice and promote internalization, as the adolescent would be more likely to accept inductive messages (Eisenberg et al., 2006; Grusec & Goodnow, 1994; Tagney & Dearing, 2002). The association between power-assertive techniques (e.g., corporal punishment) and rejection is also consistent with the literature (Rohner et al., 1991; Rubin & Burgess, 2002). The relation of power assertion to emotional and behavioral problems is often intensified in the absence of a warm parent-child relationship (Deater-Deckard, Dodge, & Sorbring, 2005; Mcloyd & Smith, 2002; Strayer, 2004).

**Relation of Fairness Evaluations and Emotional Responses to Acceptance-Rejection.** In general, adolescents’ cognitive and affective perceptions of discipline positively related to their feelings of acceptance by the parents. For induction and power assertive techniques, evaluations of fairness or appropriateness related positively to perceived acceptance. For love withdrawal, however, fairness evaluations and feelings of acceptance-rejection did not significantly relate, although they covaried in the same direction. In addition, positive and guilt-related emotions to induction related to adolescents’ feelings of acceptance. For love withdrawal and power assertion, however, the relation of emotional responses (positive, negative, and guilt) to acceptance feelings did not reach significance. Overall, favorable cognitive and affective appraisals of discipline techniques (especially induction) in the context of a warm parent-child relationship may foster the child’s receptiveness to the parent and thereby increase the effectiveness of moral socialization.
Interestingly, adolescents in this study who felt generally accepted were more likely to view power assertion as appropriate. In more negative terms, previous studies have shown that children’s feelings of rejection relate to evaluations of this discipline technique as harsh or inappropriate (Erkman & Rohner, 2006; Rohner, Bourque, & Elordi, 1996; Rohner et al., 1991; Smith, Lindsey, & Hansen, 2006). Power-assertive techniques may not be as deleterious if used in the context of a warm parent-child relationship (Deater-Deckard, Dodge, & Sorbring, 2005; Dodge, Coie, & Lynam, 2006). It is possible that children who feel accepted might think that power assertion even as a predominant technique is fair because the parent has the child’s best interest at heart (e.g., seeking to protect or instruct the child), thereby offsetting any long-term negative outcomes. And as noted, some degree of power assertion may help to foster the child’s attention to an inductive disciplinary message (Hoffman, 2000). However, excessive use of power assertion also diminishes the association of parental induction with prosocial behavior in children (Eisenberg et al., 2006). Moreover, power-assertive techniques (contrary to induction) are related to aggressive outcomes.

Parental Expression of Disappointed Expectations. Parental expressions of disappointment within the induction category received particular attention with respect to adolescents’ perceptions of discipline techniques. For some of the hypotheses, it was possible to look separately within induction at other-oriented induction and parental expressions of disappointment. In these instances, disappointment’s contribution to the induction construct could be assessed. As noted, induction overall (relative to power assertion and love withdrawal) related positively to parental acceptance and to
evaluations of fairness or appropriateness. Separate inspection of disappointment and other-oriented induction, however, revealed that induction’s relation to fairness evaluation and feelings of acceptance was attributable mainly to the former facet.

Parental expressions of disappointment were perceived favorably and in some instances, even more favorably than other-oriented induction statements. This result suggests that parental expressions of disappointment are not merely reducible to overall induction or love-withdrawal (cf. Hoffman, 1963, 2000). Parental expressions of disappointment not only contributed to the positive association between induction and perceptions of appropriateness and feelings of acceptance, but these expressions seemed to make a significant contribution beyond standard other-oriented inductions. These expressions distinguish themselves from ego-attacks or harsh criticisms, which are more reflective of love withdrawal. As noted, love withdrawal (contrary to parental disappointment) was significantly related to feelings of rejection. Adolescents are likely to feel more accepted by their parents, insofar as they attend to the positive elements inherent in the expressions of disappointed expectations, e.g., “…you knew better than to act that way” and “…surprised because you usually ask before taking others’ things.” In these statements, it is apparent that the parent is not merely belittling or attacking the child. Rather, there is an affirmation of acceptance, higher regard and expectation for the child that may be appreciated by the emerging adolescent. How parental disappointment is operationalized may be crucial to its perception. The disappointment items in this study evidently conveyed a disappointment in the child for not living up to a character ideal, one that the parent believes the child or adolescent is capable of attaining.
Induction and the Moral Self

A major theme of the present study pertained to the influence of induction on the moral self. Adolescents who show a strong moral identity tend to live according to moral concerns, are accountable for their actions, and evidence high levels of prosocial behavior and low levels of antisocial behavior (Aquino & Reed, 2002; Barriga et al., 2001; Colby & Damon, 1993; Hardy, 2006; Hardy & Carlo, 2005; Hart, Atkins, & Donnelly, 2006; Pratt et al., 2003). This study found induction (especially when perceived favorably; see below) to be related to moral self-relevance. This finding is consistent with broader correspondences between parental and child moral values found with authoritative parenting (Pratt et al., 2003). In contrast, power assertion and love withdrawal were not related to moral self-relevance.

Interestingly, the tenth graders accounted for the greatest portion of the variance between induction and moral self-relevance. The tenth graders reported higher moral self-relevance than did fifth and eighth graders. Adolescents who have experienced an extended cumulative effect of induction may be more likely to have internalized parental/societal values into their sense of self.

Favorable Perception of Induction and Moral Self-Relevance. The relation between induction and moral self-relevance was especially evident among adolescents whose cognitive and affective perceptions of induction (and parental acceptance) were favorable. For adolescents who received induction as their primary discipline, those who rated induction as fair or appropriate, responded with positive and guilt-related emotion to this technique, and felt generally accepted by the parent also reported higher moral
self-relevance. In contrast, love withdrawal and power assertion did not relate to moral self-relevance even when cognitive and affective perceptions (and acceptance-rejection) were taken into account.

These favorable perceptions of inductive discipline, then, facilitate the impact of this technique on the moral self and prosocial values. Evaluating induction as appropriate or fair and with positive or guilt-related emotion would seemingly make adolescents more receptive to this technique, thereby increasing its effectiveness in value transmission. Over time, the adolescent’s increasing ability to realize (independently of the parent) the moral repercussions of his or her actions may elicit feelings of guilt that “include conscious self criticism,” and hence result in “a resolution to behave in a more prosocial manner in the future” (Hoffman, 1970, p. 117). Lastly, inductive messages seem to be more effective when received by an adolescent who also perceives the parent as generally warm and accepting, thereby fostering the moral self. Indeed, induction when used in the context of a warm parent-child relationship has been linked to children’s and adolescents’ prosocial behavior and moral values (Eisenberg & Valiente, 2002; Eisenberg et al., 2006; Pratt et al., 2003).

Role of Parental Expression of Disappointed Expectations. Within induction (especially its perception and relation to the moral self), the facet of parental expressions of disappointment was found to play a significant role. As noted, the adolescents’ cognitive and affective perceptions of overall induction related to moral self-relevance. Interestingly, when put separately into the models, parental expressions of disappointment remained significant and other-oriented induction lost significance.
Thus, expressions of parental disappointment do have a substantial effect on adolescents who perceive them favorably. This type of parental message does not seem to depend on how often it is used; the frequency of use of parental expressions of disappointment did not significantly relate to moral self-relevance. However, for those adolescents who do experience parental disappointment, and who react with positive and guilt emotions and/or view these expressions as appropriate or fair, there is a greater likelihood of high moral self-relevance. This finding relates to the broader positive relationship found between parental disappointment and prosocial behavior (Krevans & Gibbs, 1996; cf. Janssens & Gerris, 1992).

The use of parental expressions of disappointment may be especially effective for adolescents who already understand the repercussions of their actions for others. It is possible that some adolescents may perceive standard other-oriented inductions as less fair (relative to disappointment) because they feel the parent is lecturing or unfairly talking down to them, thereby reducing their influence (J. Krevans, personal communication, December 30, 2002). Expressions of parental disappointment may not constitute an established parenting technique (Patrick & Gibbs, 2007), but they do seem to impact socialization outcomes even when used on occasion. These expressions may constitute a stimulus akin to that of a measuring stick. Its intent is to point out to the adolescent that he or she fell short of parental expectations and is capable of better behavior. An adolescent who receives such parental feedback favorably would likely reflect on the parent’s disappointment, and as a result, feel some sense of disappointment in their “self” for not living up to a character ideal. Such reflection on the implications for
the self of the parents’ disappointed expectations may depend to some extent upon the hypothetical cognitive abilities that typically emerge with the onset of adolescence (Moshman, 1998).

Also, parental expressions of disappointment may be particularly meaningful to the adolescent who is in the process of developing a mature morality and relating it to the self. The results indicated a significant mean difference in moral self-relevance scores between the 10th graders and 5th and 8th graders combined; with the 10th graders scoring higher relative to the younger students. These findings are consistent with research that points to early and mid-adolescence as the time in which individuals begin to use moral qualities to describe and evaluate the self (Damon & Hart, 1988; Hardy & Carlo, 2005; Power & Khmelkov, 1998). For some adolescents, it is likely that some “dissonance” is felt as a result of the realization that their actions do not align with their moral self-relevance or identity. Upon reflection, these adolescents may be more likely to appropriate or internalize their parents’ higher expectations for them and thereby to act more morally or prosocially in the future.

Also, older adolescents may be more inclined to feel more positive/guilt emotions to disappointment, as they care about their “self” in terms of a moral evaluation. These adolescents, in turn, may be more motivated to “stay on track” through self-reflection and re-evaluation. It is important to reiterate that parental expressions of disappointed expectations are not ego-attacks, as the parent is pointing out to the child that they disapprove of the behavior (not the child) and expect that he or she is capable of better behavior. This is a crucial point because tactics like love withdrawal can elicit shame,
which can result in negative emotion and disturbances in thinking and behavior that are destructive to the entirety of the self (Lewis, 2008). Parental statements of disappointment have been found to be negatively (and ego attacks positively) related to aggression in children (Bikhazi, 2006). An individual who feels shame may not feel that he or she can rescue or redeem the self. Guilt, on the other hand, occurs “when individuals evaluate their behavior as failure but focus on the specific features or actions of the self that led to the failure…the focus of guilt is on the self’s actions and behaviors that are likely to repair the failure” (Lewis, 2008, p. 748). In this sense, the guilt felt can be constructive to the adolescent, thereby contributing to their moral self-relevance.

In sum, parental expressions of disappointment (inducing one to evaluate a moral transgression with respect to its implications for self-concept), when viewed favorably, impact the adolescent’s moral self-identity. This parenting strategy may be most effective among adolescents who are somewhere in the process of adopting those internalized values into their own self-identity and who are capable of reflecting on the meaning of the parental disappointment for one’s moral self. If the adolescent views disappointment as appropriate, this would increase their receptivity toward the parent and motivate the person to engage in the reflective process. In addition, responding with positive and guilt emotions toward parental disappointment shows that adolescents are taking these statements to heart, thereby strengthening the relevance of those moral values to their self-concept. In conclusion, there seems to be a major role of parental expression of disappointed expectations in the overall induction construct. The induction--moral self-
relevance relationship is especially strong where the disappointment component is perceived favorably.

Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

The present study had several limitations. One important limitation concerned the correlational nature of the study’s design. The main goal of this study was to examine the impact of discipline (especially induction) on adolescents’ moral self-relevance. However, we note that any outcome effects could also be attributed to the child’s influence on the parent (bi-directionality) and other extraneous factors not examined in this study (Miller, 2007). For example, a parent of a child who is generally open to reason and relatively easy to discipline may be more likely to use inductive discipline over power assertive techniques (Carlo, Fabes, Laible & Kupanoff, 1999).

Another limitation pertained to the exclusive use of self-report measures. Such data may contain inaccuracies such as the misinterpretation of questions or reporting of false information. A strength of this study was that it examined both adolescent and parent report (when available) and found similar findings across hypotheses. However, future research may wish to also include observational data and other sources (e.g., grandparents, spouse) of information concerning the disciplinary techniques used by the parent (Miller, 2007). It would also be of interest for future researchers to take repeated measurements over time; a longitudinal design could directly examine any individual changes regarding adolescents’ perceptions of discipline and its potential impact on moral self-relevance.
Additionally, the present findings have limited generalizability to more diverse populations. Due to demographic limitations, this study’s sample consisted of predominantly Caucasian, middle-class students from suburban areas of Midwestern Ohio. Future research may benefit from using larger and more diverse samples.

Finally, the moral self has been found in the literature to relate to adolescents’ prosocial behavior. Future studies examining the relationship between discipline and the moral self should consider including a direct measure of prosocial behavior.

Conclusion

This study highlighted the importance of examining the adolescents’ perceptions of discipline, especially in relation to moral self-relevance or identity. Overall, adolescents’ cognitive and affective perceptions of induction (including acceptance-rejection) were more favorable relative to other discipline techniques (e.g., power assertion). Moreover, parental use of inductive discipline during the adolescent years was found to be linked with increased moral self-relevance. This was especially true for adolescents who perceived overall induction (including parental expressions of disappointment) as favorable. Parental expressions of disappointment were particularly effective for adolescents who responded to these statements positively, thereby increasing their influence. In light of the study’s findings, it would be of interest to extend this research to further examine the impact of parental expressions of disappointment on adolescents’ moral and prosocial values, attitudes, and behaviors.
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Appendix A: Sample Letter to Schools

APPROVAL FOR PARTICIPATION IN SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH

As Principal of Mary Irene Day Elementary School, I __________________________ (Principal’s printed name here) have given approval for Renee Patrick to conduct her dissertation research at Mary Irene Day Elementary School. I acknowledge that Principal Investigator John C. Gibbs, Ph.D. or his authorized representative Renee Patrick, M.A. has informed me of the purpose of this study titled “The Developing Self and Parenting”, the procedures to be followed, and the expected duration of the data collection during the month of May 2008.

I acknowledge that I have been provided with the opportunity to obtain additional information regarding the study, and that any questions I have raised have been answered to my full satisfaction. Furthermore, I understand that any student, parent/legal guardian, or teacher involved is free to withdraw consent at any time and discontinue participation in the study without penalty.

Date: ____________________     Signature of School Principal: ____________________

Signature of Principal Investigator or authorized representative: ____________________
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Appendix B: Sample Letter to Parent and Consent (child participation)

TO: Parent (or legal guardian) of student in Mr. Leatherberry’s class
FROM: John C. Gibbs, Ph.D. & Renee B. Patrick, M.A.
DATE: May 12th, 2008

Minerva Middle School, with the approval of the Minerva Middle School administration, is cooperating in a study of children’s and adolescents’ views of parenting and the developing self. The study is being conducted by Renee B. Patrick, M.A. for her Dissertation Thesis, under the supervision of Professor John C. Gibbs of the Ohio State University Graduate Department of Psychology. The results of this study could help increase our understanding of how children perceive parenting and their own individual characteristics. The results may also help us understand how parenting can contribute to positive or helpful behaviors among children and adolescents.

Participation will involve answering three surveys concerning: 1) Parenting Techniques; 2) Parent-Child relationships; and 3) Self-Concept. Surveys will be given during two different class periods chosen by the School Principal and teachers involved. Participants will not miss regular classes.

Your adolescent’s participation is voluntary, but in addition to your child’s informed consent, written consent of a parent or legal guardian is required for his/her participation. As an incentive and gesture of appreciation for the prompt return of this consent form, your child will enter a raffle drawing for a $50 Wal-Mart gift certificate. Students receive one raffle ticket for returning this consent form by May 19th, 2008, regardless of whether they participate in the study. Those students who do provide parental and personal consent to participate will receive an additional raffle ticket as a thank you for their time and effort. You and/or your child may withdraw consent for your child’s participation in this study at any time, but still remain eligible for the raffle drawing. Non-participants will stay in class to quietly study during the survey times. All survey participants will be assigned a code number to ensure the confidentiality of his/her participation and responses. Also, individual responses will not be released to parents or school administrators. The only information that will be made available to parents and appropriate school personnel will be a summary of results for the entire group.

If you have any questions, please call Renee Patrick at 614-718-9543 or Dr. Gibbs at 614-292-7918. If neither is available, please leave a message. If you would like your child to participate, please read and sign the accompanying parental consent form.
The Ohio State University Parental Permission
For Child’s Participation in Research

Study Title: The Developing Self and Parenting
Researchers: John Gibbs and Renee Patrick

This is a parental permission form for research participation. It contains important information about this study and what to expect if you permit your child to participate.

Your child’s participation is voluntary.

Please consider the information carefully. Feel free to discuss the study with your friends and family and to ask questions before making your decision whether or not to permit your child to participate. If you permit your child to participate, you will be asked to sign this form and will receive a copy of the form.

Purpose:

In this study, we are investigating children’s and adolescents’ views, attitudes, and thoughts about human behaviors and characteristics. Your child is being asked to participate in this research study because your child’s feedback will help us learn more about children’s perceptions of parenting and their own individual characteristics.

Procedures/Tasks:

Surveys will be given to students together in a classroom with other members of their grade.

Duration:

The participating students will fill out surveys across two sessions (45 minutes each) within the span of one week. Your child may leave the study at any time. If you or your child decides to stop participation in the study, there will be no penalty and neither you nor your child will lose any benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. Your decision will not affect your future relationship with The Ohio State University.

Risks and Benefits:

There are no anticipated risks to participating in the study. The results of this study will add to our knowledge of human behavior.
Confidentiality:

Efforts will be made to keep your child’s study-related information confidential. However, there may be circumstances where this information must be released. For example, personal information regarding your child’s participation in this study may be disclosed if required by state law. Also, your child’s records may be reviewed by the following groups (as applicable to the research):

- Office for Human Research Protections or other federal, state, or international regulatory agencies;
- The Ohio State University Institutional Review Board or Office of Responsible Research Practices;
- The sponsor, if any, or agency (including the Food and Drug Administration for FDA-regulated research) supporting the study.

Incentives:

Your child will be given the opportunity to be entered into a drawing for a $50 gift certificate to Wal-Mart with your permission. If your child returns the parent permission slip by the deadline, he or she will be entered once into the raffle. If your child participates in the study, he or she will be entered a second time into the raffle. After the class has finished the study, the teacher will randomly select one student’s name out of a box to receive the gift certificate.

Please check one of the boxes below:

- ☐ I wish that my child does participate in the raffle.
- ☐ I wish that my child does not participate in the raffle.

Participant Rights:

You or your child may refuse to participate in this study without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you or your child is a student or employee at Ohio State, your decision will not affect your grades or employment status.

If you and your child choose to participate in the study, you may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits. By signing this form, you do not give up any personal legal rights your child may have as a participant in this study.

An Institutional Review Board responsible for human subjects research at The Ohio State University reviewed this research project and found it to be acceptable, according to applicable state and federal regulations and University policies designed to protect the rights and welfare of participants in research.
Contacts and Questions:

For questions, concerns, or complaints about the study you may contact John Gibbs at gibbs.1@osu.edu or by phone at 614-292-7918 or Renee Patrick at patrick.108@osu.edu.

For questions about your child’s rights as a participant in this study or to discuss other study-related concerns or complaints with someone who is not part of the research team, you may contact Ms. Sandra Meadows in the Office of Responsible Research Practices at 1-800-678-6251.

If your child is injured as a result of participating in this study or for questions about a study-related injury, you may contact John Gibbs by phone at 614-292-7918.

Signing the parental permission form

I have read (or someone has read to me) this form and I am aware that I am being asked to provide permission for my child to participate in a research study. I have had the opportunity to ask questions and have had them answered to my satisfaction. I voluntarily agree to permit my child to participate in this study.

I am not giving up any legal rights by signing this form. I will be given a copy of this form.

______________________________________________
Printed name of participant

______________________________________________  ________________________________
Printed name of person authorized to provide permission for participant  Signature of person authorized to provide permission for participant

Relationship to the participant  Date and time

Investigator/Research Staff

I have explained the research to the participant or his/her representative before requesting the signature(s) above. There are no blanks in this document. A copy of this form has been given to the participant or his/her representative.

______________________________________________
Printed name of person obtaining consent

______________________________________________  ________________________________
Signature of person obtaining consent  AM/PM

Date and time
Appendix C: Sample Letter to Parent and Consent (parent participation)

TO: Parent (or legal guardian) of student in Mr. Leatherberry’s class
FROM: John C. Gibbs, Ph.D. & Renee B. Patrick, M.A.
DATE: May 12\textsuperscript{th}, 2008

We would also like to invite you to participate in this study about parenting and the developing self that is being conducted by Renee B. Patrick, M.A. for her Dissertation Thesis, under the supervision of Professor John C. Gibbs of the Ohio State University Graduate Department of Psychology. Your participation would be very valuable in helping us to better understand how parents view parenting styles and the parent-child relationship.

If you agree to participate in this study on the developing self and parenting, you will be asked to fill out two surveys that will take about one hour. Participation will involve answering two survey’s about: 1) Parenting Techniques and 2) Parent-Child Relationships.

Your decision to participate in the study is voluntary and will not affect your child’s or adolescent’s ability to participate. If you decline, your student will still be in the study pending your permission.

As an incentive and gesture of appreciation for your participation and time commitment in this study, you will be given a $10 gift certificate to Kishman’s IGA. If you receive the survey packet and then choose to withdraw from the study, you will still receive the gift certificate. All questionnaire packets (complete or incomplete) must be returned via business reply mail (at no charge to you) within 2-3 weeks before incentives can be issued.

If you have any questions, please call Renee Patrick at 614-718-9543 or John Gibbs at 614-292-7918. If neither is available, please leave a message. If you would like to participate in this study, please read and sign the accompanying consent form by May 19\textsuperscript{th}, 2008.
The Ohio State University Consent to Participate in Research

Study Title: The Developing Self and Parenting

Researchers: John Gibbs and Renee Patrick

This is a consent form for research participation. It contains important information about this study and what to expect if you decide to participate.

Your participation is voluntary.

Please consider the information carefully. Feel free to ask questions before making your decision whether or not to participate. If you decide to participate, you will be asked to sign this form and will receive a copy of the form.

Purpose: In this study, we are investigating children’s and adolescents’ views, attitudes, and thoughts about parenting and their own individual characteristics. We are also interested in parents’ views on parenting and the parent-child relationship. Your feedback would give us important insights into how parents view parenting styles.

Procedures/Tasks: After your child completes the surveys for the study, he or she will bring a packet home for you to complete. Enclosed in the packet will be an informational letter, two surveys, and a business reply envelope. You will be instructed to complete two surveys on your own in one session (taking approximately 1 hour) at any time convenient for you. After completion, you will be asked in the letter to enclose the surveys in the business reply envelope and to return it within 2-3 weeks of receipt. The surveys and business reply envelope will not display your name or address; a numerical code will be used by the researchers to protect the confidentiality of your responses.

Duration: You will be asked to complete two surveys, which we believe should take about 1 hour. You may leave the study at any time. If you decide to stop participating in the study, there will be no penalty to you, and you will not lose any benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. Your decision will not affect your future relationship with The Ohio State University.

Risks and Benefits: There are no anticipated risks to participating in the study. The results of this study will add to our knowledge of human behavior.
Confidentiality:

Efforts will be made to keep your study-related information confidential. However, there may be circumstances where this information must be released. For example, personal information regarding your participation in this study may be disclosed if required by state law. Also, your records may be reviewed by the following groups (as applicable to the research):

- Office for Human Research Protections or other federal, state, or international regulatory agencies;
- The Ohio State University Institutional Review Board or Office of Responsible Research Practices;
- The sponsor, if any, or agency (including the Food and Drug Administration for FDA-regulated research) supporting the study.

Incentives:

You will be offered a $10 gift certificate from Kishman’s IGA grocery store for your time commitment (approximately 1 hour) in completing the surveys. If you receive the questionnaire packet and choose to withdraw from the study, then you will still receive the gift certificate after returning the incomplete forms. All questionnaire packets (complete or incomplete) must be returned via business reply mail (at no charge to you) before incentives can be issued.

Participant Rights:

You may refuse to participate in this study without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you are a student or employee at Ohio State, your decision will not affect your grades or employment status.

If you choose to participate in the study, you may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits. By signing this form, you do not give up any personal legal rights you may have as a participant in this study.

An Institutional Review Board responsible for human subjects research at The Ohio State University reviewed this research project and found it to be acceptable, according to applicable state and federal regulations and University policies designed to protect the rights and welfare of participants in research.

Contacts and Questions:
For questions, concerns, or complaints about the study you may contact John Gibbs at Gibbs.1@osu.edu or by phone at 614-292-7918 or Renee Patrick at Patrick.108@osu.edu.
For questions about your rights as a participant in this study or to discuss other study-related concerns or complaints with someone who is not part of the research team, you may contact Ms. Sandra Meadows in the Office of Responsible Research Practices at 1-800-678-6251.

If you are injured as a result of participating in this study or for questions about a study-related injury, you may contact Gibbs.1@osu.edu or by phone at 614-292-7918.

Signing the consent form

I have read (or someone has read to me) this form and I am aware that I am being asked to participate in a research study. I have had the opportunity to ask questions and have had them answered to my satisfaction. I voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

I am not giving up any legal rights by signing this form. I will be given a copy of this form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed name of participant</th>
<th>Signature of participant</th>
<th>AM/PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date and time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed name of person authorized to consent for participant (when applicable)</th>
<th>Signature of person authorized to consent for participant (when applicable)</th>
<th>AM/PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date and time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship to the participant</th>
<th>Date and time</th>
<th>AM/PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Investigator/Research Staff

I have explained the research to the participant or his/her representative before requesting the signature(s) above. There are no blanks in this document. A copy of this form has been given to the participant or his/her representative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed name of person obtaining consent</th>
<th>Signature of person obtaining consent</th>
<th>AM/PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date and time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Child Assent Form

The Ohio State University Assent to Participate in Research

Study Title: The Developing Self and Parenting
Researcher: John C. Gibbs

- You are being asked to be in a research study. Studies are done to find better ways to treat people or to understand things better.
- This form will tell you about the study to help you decide whether or not you want to participate.
- You should ask any questions you have before making up your mind. You can think about it and discuss it with your family or friends before you decide.
- It is okay to say “No” if you don’t want to be in the study. If you say “Yes” you can change your mind and quit being in the study at any time without getting in trouble.
- If you decide you want to be in the study, an adult (usually a parent) will also need to give permission for you to be in the study.

1. What is this study about?

You are being asked to participate in this research study because we would like to find out what you think about parenting and your views about your own personal characteristics.

2. What will I need to do if I am in this study?

You will be asked to fill out surveys about your beliefs and views.
A researcher will
1) read aloud the instructions
2) explain the order in which the forms should be filled out
3) ask you to complete the surveys at your own pace and to hand the forms in after you are done
4) let you know that he or she is available to answer any questions that you may have.

3. How long will I be in the study?

You will be asked to participate in two sessions that will last up to 45 minutes each. Your total time in the study will be about 1 ½ hours. This is the amount of time we think is needed to fill out the surveys.

4. Can I stop being in the study?

You may stop being in the study at any time. You will not get into any trouble if you decide to stop filling out the surveys. If you decide to stop participating at any time, you will still be entered into the raffle for the gift certificate.

5. What bad things might happen to me if I am in the study?

We do not believe any bad things should happen to you, if you are in this study.

6. What good things might happen to me if I am in the study?

You will not benefit directly from participating in the study.

7. Will I be given anything for being in this study?

You will be given the opportunity to be entered into a drawing for a $50 gift certificate to Wal-Mart. If you returned the parent permission slip by the deadline, you will be entered once into the raffle. If you choose to participate in the study, you will be entered a second time into the raffle. After the class has finished the study, your teacher will randomly select one student’s name out of a box to receive the gift certificate.

8. Who can I talk to about the study?

For questions, concerns, or complaints about the study you may contact John Gibbs at Gibbs.1@osu.edu or by phone at 614-292-7918 or Renee Patrick at Patrick.108@osu.edu.
To discuss other study-related questions with someone who is not part of the research team, you may contact Ms. Sandra Meadows in the Office of Responsible Research Practices at 1-800-678-6251.

Signing the assent form

I have read (or someone has read to me) this form. I have had a chance to ask questions before making up my mind. I want to be in this research study.

Signature or printed name of participant                        Date and time

Investigator/Research Staff

I have explained the research to the participant before requesting the signature above. There are no blanks in this document. A copy of this form has been given to the participant or his/her representative.

Printed name of person obtaining assent                                Signature of person obtaining assent
                                                                                   Date and time
                                                                                   AM/PM

This form must be accompanied by an IRB approved parental permission form signed by a parent/guardian.
Appendix E: Demographic Questionnaire (child)

Research ID # ___________

Name _________________________

How old are you? ______ years old

When is your birthday? ____/____/____
   mo   day   year

Gender? (Circle One): Male/Female

How many brothers or sisters do you live with? ______

   If you do have siblings, are you a youngest, middle or oldest child? ______

Who do you live with? (Circle One):

   Mother and Father
   Mother Only
   Father Only
   Grandparent Only
   Mother or Father and grandparent
   Mother and Father and grandparent
   Guardian/Other (Please Specify): ____________________

Ethnicity (Circle One):

   Caucasian (White)         African-American        Asian-American
   Hispanic-American         Native-American

Other (Please Specify):_______________
Appendix F: Informational Letter to Parent

TO: 
FROM: John C. Gibbs, Ph.D. & Renee B. Patrick, M.A.
DATE: May 15, 2008

Thank you for agreeing to participate in our study about parenting and the developing self that is being conducted by Renee B. Patrick for her Dissertation Thesis, under the supervision of Professor John C. Gibbs of the Ohio State University Graduate Department of Psychology. Your participation again will be very valuable in helping us to better understand how parents view parenting styles and the parent-child relationship.

Please complete the two surveys that are enclosed in this packet at a time that is convenient for you. Please find a quiet location to fill out the surveys in one sitting or time period. We ask that you fill out the Parental Discipline Questionnaire first and then the Parent PARQ. We believe your completion of the surveys should take about 30-45 minutes.

Your decision to participate in the study is voluntary. You may stop participation at any time without penalty. If you receive this survey packet and then choose to withdraw from the study, you will still receive the gift certificate described below.

As an incentive and gesture of appreciation for your participation and time commitment in this study, you will be given a $10 gift certificate from Wal-Mart. All questionnaire packets (complete or incomplete) must be returned via business reply mail (at no charge to you) before incentives can be issued.

If you have any questions, please call Renee B. Patrick at 614-718-9543. If she is not available, please leave a message. A copy of your signed consent form is enclosed for you. This document has additional information about the study and information on how to contact research personnel with any questions or concerns about this study.
Appendix G: Demographic Questionnaire (parent)

Research ID # ______

**What is your gender?** (Circle One): Male/Female

**Are you the child’s biological parent?** (Circle One): Y/N

If not, please specify:__________________

**Marital Status:** Single Married Divorced Widowed

**Ethnicity** (Circle One):

- Caucasian (White)
- African-American
- Asian-American
- Hispanic-American
- Native-American

Other (Please Specify): ________________

**What is your combined household income (before taxes)?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000-14,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000-19,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000-29,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000-49,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-74,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000-99,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 or over</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How much education have you completed?**

1= Elementary or junior high school
2= High School Graduate
3= Some College or technical school
4= Graduated from a 2 year college/technical school
5= Graduated from a 4 year college
6= Some school beyond 4 year college
7= Master’s Degree
8= Doctoral Degree
Appendix H: Perceived Parental Discipline Questionnaire (child)

Participant ID#___________________

Parental Discipline Survey (Child Version)

- Please read the situations on the following pages.

- After each situation presented, there will be a list of things that some mothers we’ve talked with say they do. Read each item carefully and check how often your mother does each thing.

- After you have checked the boxes, you will be asked to indicate the things your mother does most often, second most often, and third most often.

- Each situation also has two short questions at the end.

If your main caregiver is NOT your mother, who will you be filling out this questionnaire for (circle one)?

1=Grandmother  2=Step-mother  3=Father

4=Other___________________
Think of a time when this type of situation or something like it occurred: Your mother comes in and asks you to do something important right away. You say you want to see the rest of a TV program, finish a game, or finish whatever you are doing, and then maybe you’ll do what she wants later.

Please read each of the items carefully and check how often (usually, sometimes, rarely, or never) your mother does each thing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reminds you of how much she does for you or how hard she works.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tells you that you ought to be ashamed of yourself for being so selfish.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asks you how you’d feel if you needed help right away for something important and you had to wait.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tells you if you don't do it right away, she won't let you have something you like or do something you like to do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tells you she’s upset with you or gives you an upset look.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explains why she needs help, for example, says that she's tired or not feeling well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tells you she'll slap or spank you if you don’t do it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tells you that she is disappointed or that she expected you to be more helpful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shows you she doesn't like it by not talking to you for a while.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanks or slaps you.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tells you if you don't do it now, she'll have to do it and that isn't fair to her.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goes over and turns off the television, removes your game or ends your activity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tells you that it's all right, she'll do it herself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tells you that you’re a good kid and you will see that you should help.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tells you to go ahead and watch the program but not to come around later and say that you are sorry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Next, put a 1 next to the thing your mother does the most often, a 2 next to the thing she does second most often, and a 3 next to the thing she does third most often.**

How fair or appropriate would the thing she does most often be in this situation?  
Very Unfair | Neutral | Very Fair
1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5

How do you feel when she does that?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
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You have agreed to meet someone, perhaps a teacher or coach, but later on, you decide you are not going to bother to show up when you said you would. Your mother finds out about it.

Please read each of the items below carefully and check how often (usually, sometimes, rarely, or never) your mother does each thing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say or do much of anything.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tells you to get going right away before she slaps you.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reminds you that the other person is counting on you.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tells you how little she thinks of people who do that sort of thing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reminds you of what time it is and tells you she knows you'll keep your promise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yells that you'd better get going.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Says that she thought you were more considerate and responsible than that.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Says you should think about how the person will feel when you don't show up.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Says she'll take away some privileges if you don't get going right away.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignores you for a while.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks you to think about how you feel when other people don't show up for you.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gets upset with you and tells you that you are an embarrassment to her.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next, put a 1 next to the thing your mother does the most often, a 2 next to the thing she does second most often, and a 3 next to the thing she does third most often.

How fair or appropriate would the thing she does most often be in this situation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Unfair</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Fair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How do you feel when she does that?

______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
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Kids sometimes break things or say mean things when they get angry. Imagine that you get angry at a friend and damage something that meant a lot to your friend, say something mean about your friend, or something like that. Your mother finds out about it.

Please read each of the items below carefully and check how often (usually, sometimes, rarely, or never) your mother does each thing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tells you she is disappointed in you.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaps or spanks you or has some other adult in the family slap or spank you.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say or do anything.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks you how you'd like it if someone did something mean like that to you.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tells you how little she thinks of you when you do things like that.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Says that she's surprised by your behavior, that you are better than that.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes your allowance or punishes you in some other way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points out how your friend must feel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tells you that she's embarrassed and ashamed to be your mother.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tells you she'll slap you if you don't go right over and apologize.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She wouldn't say much, but she'd ignore you for a while.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Says you had no right to hurt the other person’s feelings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next, put a 1 next to the thing your mother does the most often, a 2 next to the thing she does second most often, and a 3 next to the thing she does third most often.

How fair or appropriate would the thing she does most often be in this situation?  
Very Unfair  Neutral  Very Fair

How do you feel when she does that?
________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
You are sassy or talk back to your mother in an angry voice, or shout or mumble something angry.

Please read each of the items below carefully and check how often (usually, sometimes, rarely, or never) your mother does each thing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanks or slaps you.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tells you that you ought to be ashamed of yourself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tells you that she's hurt by what you said.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doesn't let you have something you like or do something you like to do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tells you she never expected to hear you talk like that.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asks you how you can treat her that way after all that she does for you.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tells you that she'll spank or slap you if you ever talk to her like that again.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shows you she doesn't like it by not talking to you for a while.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does nothing about it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tells you that what you said makes her feel you don't respect her.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tells you that she won't talk to you or have anything to do with you if that's how you're going to act.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tells you that you should have more self-control and respect than that.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tells you she's upset with you or gives you an upset look.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next, put a 1 next to the thing your mother does the most often, a 2 next to the thing she does second most often, and a 3 next to the thing she does third most often.

How fair or appropriate would the thing she does most often be in this situation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Unfair</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Fair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How do you feel when she does that?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
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You take something without asking that belongs to someone else, perhaps another student or neighbor. Your mother finds out about it.

Please read each of the items below carefully and check how often (usually, sometimes, rarely, or never) your mother does each thing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doesn't say much but she would ignore you for a while after that.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tells you the thing you took probably meant a lot to your friend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tells you that you ought to be ashamed of yourself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks you how you think that student or neighbor must feel about having his things taken.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tells you she'll spank or slap you if you ever do that again.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks you how you'd feel if someone took one of your things without asking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Says that she's surprised because you usually ask before taking others' things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tells you that you'll be punished for what you've done.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tells you she loves you but doesn't love what you did.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tells you she doesn't want to be around someone who steals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tells you not to worry, it was no big deal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanks or slaps you.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next, put a 1 next to the thing your mother does the most often, a 2 next to the thing she does second most often, and a 3 next to the thing she does third most often.

How fair or appropriate would the thing she does most often be in this situation?  
Very Unfair  1  2  3  4  Very Fair

How do you feel when she does that?  
____________________________________________________________________  
____________________________________________________________________  
____________________________________________________________________  
____________________________________________________________________
Sometimes kids make fun of other kids, like calling them names or teasing them. Suppose you do something like that and your mother finds out.

Please read each of the items below carefully and check how often (usually, sometimes, rarely, or never) your mother does each thing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Says that if she ever learns that you did that again, she will punish you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Says in an upset or angry voice why do you do things like that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Says that she thought you knew better than to act that way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Says that you should be ashamed of yourself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Says that the other child's feelings were hurt by what you did.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Doesn’t bother to bring it up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reminds you that the other child was usually nice to you, and probably thought that you were friends before this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanks or slaps you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gets mad at you and doesn't talk to you for a while.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asks how you would feel; suggests you put yourself in the other child's place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Makes you go to your room or grounds you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Says you won't have any friends if you keep doing that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tells you you're a bully or something like that.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next, put a 1 next to the thing your mother does the most often, a 2 next to the thing she does second most often, and a 3 next to the thing she does third most often.

How fair or appropriate would the thing she does most often be in this situation?  

How do you feel when she does that?  
_______________________________________________________________________  
_______________________________________________________________________  
_______________________________________________________________________  
_______________________________________________________________________  
_______________________________________________________________________
Appendix I: Moral Self-Relevance Measure

ID#__________________________  Date________________

INSTRUCTIONS

On the following pages, you will be presented with qualities or characteristics that may or may not describe you.

You will be asked to answer questions about how important these qualities are to who you are as a person.

It may help to imagine yourself as the picture below when deciding how important you think a quality is to you.

- Some qualities will be extremely important to you.
- Some qualities will be very important to you.
- Some qualities will be important to you.
- Some qualities will be sort of important to you.
- Some qualities will not be important to you.
Please answer all of the questions on the following pages without skipping. If you have any questions, please raise your hand and I will come to your desk to help you.

Please stay silent until everyone has finished

1) How important is it to you that you are creative or imaginative?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Important to Me</th>
<th>Very Important to Me</th>
<th>Important to Me</th>
<th>Sort of Important to Me</th>
<th>Not Important to Me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2) How important is it to you that you are considerate or courteous?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Important to Me</th>
<th>Very Important to Me</th>
<th>Important to Me</th>
<th>Sort of Important to Me</th>
<th>Not Important to Me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3) How important is it to you that you are careful or cautious?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Important to Me</th>
<th>Very Important to Me</th>
<th>Important to Me</th>
<th>Sort of Important to Me</th>
<th>Not Important to Me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4) How important is it to you that you are honest or truthful?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Important to Me</th>
<th>Very Important to Me</th>
<th>Important to Me</th>
<th>Sort of Important to Me</th>
<th>Not Important to Me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5) How important is it to you that you are outgoing or sociable?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Important to Me</th>
<th>Very Important to Me</th>
<th>Important to Me</th>
<th>Sort of Important to Me</th>
<th>Not Important to Me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
6) How important is it to you that you are **kind** or **helpful**?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Important to Me</th>
<th>Very Important to Me</th>
<th>Important to Me</th>
<th>Sort of Important to Me</th>
<th>Not Important to Me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7) How important is it to you that you are **athletic** or **agile**?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Important to Me</th>
<th>Very Important to Me</th>
<th>Important to Me</th>
<th>Sort of Important to Me</th>
<th>Not Important to Me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8) How important is it to you that you are **understanding** or **sympathetic**?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Important to Me</th>
<th>Very Important to Me</th>
<th>Important to Me</th>
<th>Sort of Important to Me</th>
<th>Not Important to Me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9) How important is it to you that you are **funny** or **humorous**?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Important to Me</th>
<th>Very Important to Me</th>
<th>Important to Me</th>
<th>Sort of Important to Me</th>
<th>Not Important to Me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10) How important is it to you that you are **generous** or **giving**?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Important to Me</th>
<th>Very Important to Me</th>
<th>Important to Me</th>
<th>Sort of Important to Me</th>
<th>Not Important to Me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
11) How important is it to you that you are logical or rational?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Important to Me</th>
<th>Very Important to Me</th>
<th>Important to Me</th>
<th>Sort of Important to Me</th>
<th>Not Important to Me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

12) How important is it to you that you are sincere or genuine?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Important to Me</th>
<th>Very Important to Me</th>
<th>Important to Me</th>
<th>Sort of Important to Me</th>
<th>Not Important to Me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

13) How important is it to you that you are independent or self-reliant?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Important to Me</th>
<th>Very Important to Me</th>
<th>Important to Me</th>
<th>Sort of Important to Me</th>
<th>Not Important to Me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

14) How important is it to you that you are fair or just?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Important to Me</th>
<th>Very Important to Me</th>
<th>Important to Me</th>
<th>Sort of Important to Me</th>
<th>Not Important to Me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
15) How important is it to you that you are active or energetic?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Important to Me</th>
<th>Very Important to Me</th>
<th>Important to Me</th>
<th>Sort of Important to Me</th>
<th>Not Important to Me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

16) How important is it to you that you are responsible or dependable?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Important to Me</th>
<th>Very Important to Me</th>
<th>Important to Me</th>
<th>Sort of Important to Me</th>
<th>Not Important to Me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### PICK 8

Pick the 8 qualities that you think are **MOST** extremely important to you as a person and circle them completely.

Please remember to circle 8 words.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Athletic</th>
<th>Sincere</th>
<th>Logical</th>
<th>Energetic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smart</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Stylish</td>
<td>Considerate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular</td>
<td>Clever</td>
<td>Sympathetic</td>
<td>Fast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>Funny</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Honest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>Organized</td>
<td>Talkative</td>
<td>Independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgoing</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Careful</td>
<td>Sensible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generous</td>
<td>Imaginative</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Relaxed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucky</td>
<td>Clean</td>
<td>Dependable</td>
<td>Proud</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>